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A3.1.1 The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the objectives of the programme of study and achieved the standard required for the award on which they are registered. The assessment strategy must be described in the programme and module specifications and handbooks, providing details of how the assessment requirements are aligned with the programme aims and learning outcomes, and with the programme strategy for teaching and learning. The principles underpinning the University’s approach to assessment are set out in the Brookes Assessment Compact.

A3.1.2 Students should experience a variety of modes of assessment over the course of their programme of study, as appropriate to the nature of the programme and the learning outcomes being tested. Assessment strategies should be designed for inclusivity, but arrangements must also be in place to allow for reasonable adjustments where necessary in order to enable disabled students to demonstrate the achievement of the learning outcomes (see 3.4 below).

A3.1.3 Assessment must reflect the achievement of the individual student in fulfilling module and programme objectives, and at the same time relate that achievement to a consistent national standard of awards, as articulated in the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications, subject benchmark statements, and relevant professional standards. 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, the University requires external examiners to be involved in the approval of all assignment briefs and examination papers, and in the sampling of assessed work, which contribute to the calculation of a University award. Their particular role is to ensure that the assessment process is carried out fairly, and that the academic standards of the University's awards are maintained.

A3.1.4 The programme specification must state the basis on which students will be assessed for an award, including rules for progression to subsequent stages of within the programme, criteria for the recommendation of each award to which the programme may lead and the rules governing the calculation of final award classifications, and any special assessment requirements in order to qualify for professional accreditation.

A3.1.5 Students must be provided with information on the assessment regulations which apply to their programme of study. Regulations on assessment for an award must be articulated in the Programme Handbook and should:

i. identify all the elements that will be assessed, including any assessed supervised work experience;

ii. specify when and how each of these elements will be assessed by internal and external examiners (see also section A3.6: Marking and moderation);

iii. specify which or how many elements must be passed to obtain an award and what weighting each carries in the assessments;

iv. identify any elements that may in no circumstances be the subject of compensation for failure;

v. specify the minimum and maximum number of elements to be attempted;#
vi. state the criteria for the recommendation of each award or level of award to which the programme may lead;
vii. specify what provisions will be made to enable students to make good an initial failure.

A3.1.6 Programme assessment regulations must cover all summative assessments, at whatever point in the programme they are undertaken. Students and examiners on the programme must abide by the approved regulations.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience).
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3.2.1 Credit is awarded for successful achievement of learning outcomes, verified through the successful completion of individual module assignments; and the descriptors of the modules making up the programme must therefore provide details of how the module contributes to the achievement of the overall objectives of the programme of which it is an element. In order to be eligible for the award of academic credit for a completed module, students must submit the required pieces of work for assessment and meet the requirements of the assessment regulations governing the module or programme of study.

3.2.2 Assessments for a particular module must be designed to enable students to demonstrate that they have achieved the intended learning outcomes, and the methods of assessment must be appropriate to the type of study (e.g. practice-based tasks, written assignments, portfolios of work, presentations, laboratory reports, etc). The decision on the number and weighting of assessment components for a module is a matter for the programme team, subject to approval at validation and thereafter subject to minor change. The minimum weighting for an assessment task should be 10%, however some modules include pass/fail components which are designed to meet professional body requirements and which may be weighted as 0%.

3.2.3 Students must be provided with full details of how they will be assessed on each module, including the assessment criteria against which their performance will be judged in order to provide guidance on the expected approach to the task and the standard required to pass the assessment. Assessment requirements must be set out in the module handbook provided for students, showing the relative weightings of individual assessment components and indicating whether all elements must be passed in order to gain an overall pass for the module. Students are also entitled to feedback on their assessed work, and the mechanisms for accessing this feedback should be clearly stated in programme or module handbooks.

3.2.4 All unseen examinations will normally be one or two hours in length, whether 100% examined or not, single (15 or 20 credit), double modules (30 or 40 credit) or triple modules (45 or 60 credit). In modules where there is an examination, normally there will only be one unseen examination. The definition of an unseen examination includes multiple choice exams. Examinations that can vary from this policy are open book or seen exams where the students are aware in advance of the type of material they will be examined on. In addition, examinations can vary from this policy where there is an explicit requirement or reason to do so, for example in order to support the expectations of a relevant Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB).

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience).
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Last updated:
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A3.3 Students’ Responsibilities

General responsibilities

A3.3.1 All assessments are intended to determine the skills, abilities, understanding and knowledge of each individual student undertaking the assessment. Students are expected to actively engage with the assessment activities provided on their programmes, and to act on feedback provided by their tutors, as articulated in the Brookes Assessment Compact. Students must ensure that they familiarise themselves with the assessment criteria and learning outcomes against which their work will be assessed, which must be given in programme and module handbooks.

A3.3.2 It is the responsibility of students to attend examinations and submit work for assessment as required. Students are required to observe all instructions given to them by examiners, invigilators and any member of the staff responsible for the assessment. If a student fails to attend examinations or at the right time to submit work for assessment without good cause, the examiners have authority to deem the student to have failed the assessments concerned.

A3.3.3 It is the student's responsibility to ensure that their work submitted for assessment is legible and, if necessary, to seek appropriate support and guidance. Where a disability or medical condition impedes the legibility of the work, it is the student's responsibility, in the first instance, to request an alternative assessment provision (see A3.4).

A3.3.4 It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all assessment deadlines are met or that approval for an extension has been granted in advance of the original deadline. Any assessment submitted after the deadline, or the approved extended deadline, will be deemed late and awarded zero marks. See A3.5 Mitigating Circumstances for details.

A3.3.5 Students must ensure they understand what constitutes academic misconduct (see A3.13 Cheating), and ensure they do not commit such offences in preparing for assessments. If a student is found to have cheated or attempted to gain an unfair advantage, the appropriate Disciplinary Officer or a Misconduct Committee, as the case may be, have authority to deem the student to have failed part or all of the assessments, or to require some other penalty.

A3.3.6 Any student who attends an examination or other part of an assessment process on behalf of or pretending to be another student, or who allows another person to attend any part of an assessment process on their behalf or pretending to be them, is committing, or colluding in, impersonation and may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's Disciplinary Procedure.

A3.3.7 Examinations

- Students may enter an examination room only when instructed to do so by an invigilator. It is advised that all students are seated 10 minutes before the scheduled start of the examination.

- Students are under examination conditions as soon as they enter the examination room and must not communicate with anyone but an invigilator while in the examination room, including before and after an examination.
iii Students are not permitted to open the examination paper or make any notes until instructed to do so by an invigilator.

iv Students arriving late, i.e. once the examination has begun, will be granted admission into the examination room up to 1 hour after the start time of the examination. Students arriving more than 1 hour after the start time of the examination will not be allowed entry regardless of the circumstances for the late arrival.

v Students granted late admission into the examination room will not be entitled to extra time to compensate for time lost due to arriving late.

vi Students are not permitted to leave the examination room in the first hour or the last fifteen minutes of an examination. Students may only leave an examination once the necessary attendance and identification checks have been completed, which may be after the scheduled end time for the examination.

vii Students who wish to attract the attention of an invigilator should raise their hand. Students may not leave their seats without permission.

viii Students are permitted only the following items at the examination desk:
- Brookes student card as identification. The ‘Valid Until’ date must not be earlier than the date of the examination.
- Writing implements, either loose or in a clear plastic pencil case
- One clear bottle of still water, with the label removed
- Materials which are stated on the front page of the examination paper
- Medication which has been approved by the Head of Examinations or nominee.
- Container of personal items placed under the examination desk.

All other items and materials are unauthorised and are not permitted at the examination desk or on or about the student’s person.

ix A container is provided at each examination desk for personal items. This container must be placed under the examination desk and students are not permitted to remove any items until their examination script has been collected and they are instructed they may do so by an invigilator.

x Students bringing electronic devices into the examination room must ensure that alarms are cancelled and the device is switched off. An electronic device which activates in the examination room is considered to be causing a disturbance.

xi Bags and coats must be left in the designated area of the examination room. The University accepts no responsibility for the safe-keeping of items deposited in the designated areas.

xii The possession of unauthorised items and/or materials at or about an examination desk or on or about the person is regarded as an act preparatory to an attempt to cheat. Students found with unauthorised items or materials on or about the examination desk or their person will be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University’s Student Disciplinary Procedure. Any unauthorised items or materials may be retained by the University at its discretion. The same consequences will follow for anyone found using any form of cheating or attempting to cheat or assisting someone else to cheat in examinations.

xiii Students who have a medical condition which may require them to leave the examination room during an examination must contact the Head of Examinations before the examination.

xiv Students whose examination involves arithmetical calculation that requires the use of electronic calculators will have a University approved calculator placed on the examination desk by the invigilator before the start of the examination. Students must not use any other calculator in the examination, unless instructions state otherwise. A watch or other device
capable of operating as a calculator counts as an unauthorised calculator for the purpose of this regulation.

xv Language dictionaries are not allowed in an examination room.

xvi Students must sit only at the desk on which there is a card showing their name, and leave it visible throughout the examination.

xvii Students must write their student name and number and any other information requested on every answer book. At the end of the examination, before handing the answer book(s) to the invigilator, students must fold and seal the section containing their name and number.

xviii Scrap paper is not permitted unless specified in the examination rubric. All rough work should be written in the answer book and crossed through. Supplementary answer sheets, even if they contain rough work only, should be attached to the back of the main answer book.

xix Answer books, used or unused, must not be removed from the examination room. Students must not damage or deface any paper or material supplied.

xx Students should write in ink or use a ballpoint pen, other than when completing a multiple choice answer sheet or when the instructions state otherwise.

xxi Except with the permission of the invigilator, students must not communicate with anyone but an invigilator while the examination is in progress.

xxii Students must not leave the examination room and re-enter, except in an emergency and with the permission of an invigilator. A student who has to leave the room in an emergency will not normally be allowed to re-enter and continue unless it has been possible to obtain an escort.

xxiii Electronic and smart devices, and their accessories, are not permitted on the student or on the exam desk under any circumstances – these items must be left in the belongings area or sealed inside the valuables container at the desk. Students who have any such items on their person or on their desk will be subject to disciplinary action. Any item suspected to be a smart device is subject to inspection and confiscation by the invigilator. This includes but is not limited to pens, glasses, wristbands and wearable items.

xxiv Students may not wear any watch or monitor while they are in the exam room. Analogue or simple digital watches may be placed in the clear plastic bag provided on the exam desk and left visible on the desk to be used for timekeeping. The watch must not have any smart capabilities such as a calculator, wireless connectivity or memory bank.

A3.3.8 In-class tests
This section relates to summative in-class tests (that is an in-class test which counts for marks towards the module’s overall assessment). For other forms of assessments in ‘class time’ where the following regulations would be inappropriate the General Regulations will apply and any additional regulations and/or guidelines specific to the module.

i. Students may enter a test room only when instructed to do so by an invigilator. It is advised that all students are seated 10 minutes before the scheduled start of the test.

ii. Students are under examination conditions as soon as they enter the test room and must not communicate with anyone but an invigilator while in the test room, including before and after the test.
iii. Students are not permitted to open the test paper or make any notes until instructed to do so by an invigilator.

iv. Students arriving late, i.e. once the test has begun, will be granted admission into the test room up to 1 hour after the start time of the test provided the test has not officially ended. Students arriving more than 1 hour after the start time of the test will not be allowed entry regardless of the circumstances for the late arrival.

v. Students granted late admission into the test room will not be entitled to extra time to compensate for time lost due to arriving late.

vi. Students are not permitted to leave the test room in the first hour or the last fifteen minutes of the test. Students may only leave a test once the necessary attendance and identification checks have been completed, which may be after the scheduled end time for the test.

vii. Students who wish to attract the attention of an invigilator should raise their hand. Students may not leave their seats without permission.

viii. Students are permitted only the following items at the desk:

- Brookes student card as identification. The ‘Valid Until’ date must not be earlier than the date of the test.
- Writing implements, either loose or in a clear plastic pencil case.
- One clear bottle of still water, with the label removed.
- Materials which are stated on the front page of the test paper.
- Medication which has been approved by the Module Leader.

All other items and materials are unauthorised and are not permitted at the test desk or on or about the student’s person.

ix. Students bringing electronic devices into the test room must ensure that alarms are cancelled and the device is switched off. An electronic device which activates in the test room is considered to be causing a disturbance.

x. Bags and coats must be left in the designated area of the test room.

xi. The University accepts no responsibility for the safe-keeping of items deposited in the designated areas.

xii. The possession of unauthorised items and/or materials at or about a test desk or on or about the person is regarded as an act preparatory to an attempt to cheat. Students found with unauthorised items or materials on or about the test desk or their person will be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University’s Student Disciplinary Procedure. Any unauthorised items or materials may be retained by the University at its discretion. The same consequences will follow for anyone found using any form of cheating or attempting to cheat or assisting someone else to cheat during tests.

xiii. Students who have a medical condition which may require them to leave the test room during a test must contact the Module Leader before the test.

xiv. Students whose test involves arithmetical calculation that requires the use of electronic calculators will have a University approved calculator placed on the desk by the invigilator before the start of the test. Students must not use any other calculator in the test, unless instructions state otherwise. A watch or other device capable of operating as a calculator counts as an unauthorised calculator for the purpose of this regulation.

xv. Language dictionaries are not allowed in a test room unless stated in the rubric of the test paper.
xvi. For written tests: Students must write their student name and number and any other information requested on every answer book or other paperwork used within the test.

Where answer books are used: At the end of the test, before handing the answer book(s) to the invigilator, students must fold and seal the section containing their name and number.

xvii. Scrap paper is not permitted unless specified in the test rubric.

Where answer books are used: All rough work should be written in the answer book and crossed through. Supplementary answer sheets, even if they contain rough work only, should be attached to the back of the main answer book.

xviii. Answer books, used or unused, must not be removed from the test room. Students must not damage or deface any paper or material supplied.

xix. Students should write in ink or use a ballpoint pen, other than when completing a multiple choice answer sheet or when the instructions state otherwise.

xx. Except with the permission of the invigilator, students must not communicate with anyone but an invigilator while the test is in progress.

xxi. Students must not leave the test room and re-enter, except in an emergency and with the permission of an invigilator. A student who has to leave the room in an emergency will not normally be allowed to re-enter and continue unless it has been possible to obtain an escort.

A3.3.9 Coursework
The following regulations should be read in conjunction with the general assessment regulations contained in this section, and the course/module guidelines:

i. Except where written instructions specify otherwise, students must ensure that all work submitted for assessment in fulfilment of course requirements was produced by them. Any student who submits work for assessment that was not wholly produced by them, except where specifically authorised to do so, may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's Disciplinary Procedure.

ii. Students must ensure that they do not plagiarise (i.e. take and use another person's thoughts, writings, inventions as their own) any part of any work submitted for assessment in fulfilment of course requirements. Quotations from whatever source must be clearly identified and attributed at the point where they occur in the text of the work by use of one of the standard conventions for referencing. Any student whose work submitted for assessment is plagiarised, in whole or in part, may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's Student Disciplinary Procedure.

iii. Except where written instructions specify that work for assessment may be produced jointly and submitted as the work of more than one student, students must not collude with others to produce a piece of work jointly, copy or share another student's work or lend their work to another student in the reasonable knowledge that some or all of it will be copied. Such collusion is cheating and any student who participates in collusion may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's Student Disciplinary Procedure.

iv. Students must ensure that work submitted for assessment in fulfilment of course requirements is not duplicated (the same as, or broadly similar to, work submitted earlier for academic credit, without acknowledgement of the previous submission). Such duplication is cheating and any student whose work submitted for assessment is duplicated, in whole or in part may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's Student Disciplinary Procedure.
v. Except where written instructions specify that investigations may be carried out jointly and
the results submitted as the work of more than one student, students must ensure that all
data included in work submitted in fulfilment of course requirements were obtained through
work carried out by them. The invention of data, its alteration, its copying from any other
source, or otherwise obtaining it by unfair means is falsification, as is the invention of quotes
and/or references. Any student whose work submitted for assessment contains material that
is falsified may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University's Student
Disciplinary Procedure.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

Approved by:
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Academic Board, 18 July 2012

Last updated:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 18 September 2013 (revisions to A3.3.7)
Academic Board, 12 February 2014 (revisions to A3.3.8)
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 January 2016 (points xxiii and xxiv added to
A3.3.7)
Reasonable adjustments on the grounds of disability

A3.4.1 If a student has a disability which may affect their academic performance, they should contact the Disability Service and/or Dyslexia/SpLD Service to discuss whether any alternative arrangements are required in order to enable them to engage fully with the assessment on their programme of study. Disabled students are encouraged to disclose their disability on admission to the University (or the partner organisation at which they are studying for a Brookes award), in order that appropriate support may be put in place as early as possible, including the consideration of reasonable adjustments that may be required to particular learning and assessment activities.

A3.4.2 If a student is unable, through disability, to be assessed by the assessment tasks approved for a module, examiners may vary the methods as appropriate and in accordance with the University’s procedure on the matter, bearing in mind the objectives of the programme and the need to assess the student on equal terms with other students. Reasonable adjustments may only be made to individual assessment tasks on the recommendation of the University’s Disabled Student Advisers.

Other changes to assessment arrangements

A3.4.3 All students are expected to be present for their examinations and timed assessments (including in-class tests) and are responsible for meeting set deadlines for coursework submission. Changed assessment arrangements, including extensions to coursework deadlines, will only be granted in exceptional circumstances.

A3.4.4 A student wishing to request a changed assessment arrangement must complete and submit the “Changed Assessment Arrangements, Request for Changed Examination Date” or “Changed Assessment Arrangements, Request for Changed Coursework Deadline” proforma, complete with appropriate evidence (see 3.4.6 below). These forms are available from the Academic Office.

The deadline for a request to change an examination date to be received by the Academic Office is:
5 working days after the publication of the examination timetable.

A3.4.5 Students affected by mitigating circumstances should submit an application for consideration of those circumstances through the mitigating circumstances procedure (see Regulation A3.5). The procedure for Changed Assessment Arrangements is not intended to cover students wishing to request consideration of mitigating circumstances.

A3.4.6 The University will normally only agree to a Changed Assessment Arrangement in the following circumstances:
   i. Religious observance or belief, including festival observance, prayer times etc.
      *Documentary evidence*: letter from the head of church or equivalent faith/belief leader.
   ii. Military training or Active Duty requirements.
      *Documentary evidence*: letter from an official of the relevant authority.
iii. National or international activities where the University or country of origin is represented
   
   **Documentary evidence:** letter from an official of the organising body.

iv. Activities undertaken by a dependent of the student which fall into one of the accepted
   categories within the Changed Assessment Arrangements procedure and for which there is
   a demonstrable support requirement on the student.
   
   **Documentary evidence:** see evidence requirements for i-iii above.

A3.4.7 A changed examination date/time will be within the relevant examination session provided the
student can be supervised under examination conditions in the interval between the timetabled
date/time and the changed date/time. This supervision period will be between examination
sessions on the same day or overnight on the day before or after the timetabled date. If
supervision is not possible, the changed examination date will be within the relevant resit
examination session.

A3.4.8 The University has specifically excluded the following grounds for making a request for a
Changed Assessment Arrangement:

i. Personal and family holidays;

ii. Weddings: either the student’s wedding or that or a family member of personal friend;

iii. Job interviews;

iv. Expeditions, unless the expedition relates to one of the acceptable circumstances listed in
3.4.6 above;

v. Work experience;

vi. Travel arrangements, including all flights, internal, abroad or to home;

vii. Sporting activities except when representing the University or country of origin as permitted
by 3.4.6iii above.

**Approved by:**

Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012

Academic Board, 18 July 2012

**Last updated:**

Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 18 September 2013 (revisions to sections 3.4.3-3.4.8)
3.5.1 Introduction

1.1 Students who wish any form of mitigating circumstance to be taken into account in relation to their performance in an assessment must follow the Regulations for Consideration of Mitigating Circumstances.

1.2 These regulations apply to all students engaged in taught programmes that lead to an Oxford Brookes award at both undergraduate and postgraduate level. Where there is a discrepancy between these regulations and other regulations or handbooks in respect of procedures for the consideration of mitigating circumstances relating to assessments, these regulations will take precedence.

1.3 The Academic Registrar is authorised to consider and make judgement in any cases of doubt or where clarification is needed concerning these regulations.

3.5.2 Definition of mitigating circumstances

2.1 The University defines mitigating circumstance as:

*Mitigating circumstances are circumstances which are beyond the control of the student and which could not be reasonably accommodated by the student and which seriously impair performance in assessment.*

2.2 This definition covers all mitigating circumstances. All three elements of the definition must be met in order to substantiate a claim for mitigating circumstances.

2.3 On-going conditions and other disabilities that affect students do not fall within this definition of mitigating circumstances. A mechanism exists within the University for considering the impact on individuals of such on-going conditions. Where an allowance has been made for a continuing condition, a further allowance should not be made through the consideration of mitigating circumstances except as described in 2.4.

2.4 Some students affected by ‘on-going’ conditions may encounter specific difficulties related to their condition that impacts upon an assessment. Such circumstances may be legitimately considered as meeting the definition of mitigating circumstances in 2.1. For example, a student who suffers from MS, rheumatoid arthritis, or Crohn's disease, may or may not need constant ‘reasonable adjustments’ in exam or coursework situations, but if they had a ‘flare-up’ around the time of an assessment they may also need to be considered under these mitigating circumstances procedures. In such situations the decision-making body considering the claim for mitigating circumstances will need to receive information concerning any ‘reasonable adjustments’ that are in place. The important principle is that no student should receive a double compensation through both an on-going ‘reasonable adjustment’ and an allowance through mitigating circumstances.

2.5 It should be noted that a student’s performance in an assessment may have been affected by circumstances which occurred during their study, not simply during the assessment itself, e.g. on the day of an examination.
3.5.3 Consideration of mitigating circumstances

3.1 The process for considering mitigating circumstances is carried out separately from the process by which allowances are made for the impact of mitigating circumstances. This two stage process involves:

   a. a process for considering the submission of evidence concerning mitigating circumstances and deciding whether or not that evidence is sufficient to satisfy the University’s definition of mitigating circumstances (see 2.1); and
   b. a process for making suitable allowances for those students whose performance in an assessment has been confirmed to have been affected by mitigating circumstances.

3.2 The responsible group charged with the review of evidence concerning mitigating circumstance (see section 5) may only reach one of two conclusions either that the evidence as presented represents a substantial impact on the student’s performance (as defined in 2.1) or that the evidence does not present evidence of such impact (see 5.6).

3.3 Where the responsible group does not support a submission for mitigating circumstances this does not necessarily imply that the student was not affected at all by the situation for which evidence has been provided, simply that the situation did not satisfy the University’s definition of mitigating circumstances. This may be because the circumstances were within the student’s control or could have been foreseen and appropriate adjustments made in advance or that they did not seriously impair performance in assessment.

3.4 In order to reach a decision that a student has been affected by mitigating circumstances, the responsible group must be satisfied that all three elements of the definition have been proven. In addition, sufficient evidence must be provided, including documentary evidence, to support a claim for mitigating circumstances.

3.5.4 Evidential standards

4.1 To support academic standards, procedural fairness and ensure sufficient evidential standards are met all claims for mitigating circumstances must be supported by documentary evidence in English (see 4.6) from a relevant objective third party, for example, a Doctor’s certificate, counsellor’s statement or death certificate (except as described in 4.2; see also 4.7). A relevant objective third party, for the purposes of these regulations, refers to any relevant person acting in a professional capacity, providing evidence for which they are professionally accountable. Evidence from third parties should be submitted on headed paper and make clear the nature of the professional role that the third party is acting in.

4.2 The expectation is that documentary evidence should be provided in all circumstances. However, in some situations there may be clear and legitimate reasons why it is not possible to submit documentary evidence, in which case the claim for mitigating circumstances must set out the reason why no documentary evidence can be submitted. Where no documentary evidence has been provided the responsible group has discretion to decide whether or not to accept the reasons stated for the lack of documentary evidence and, hence, whether or not to accept self-certification of the mitigating circumstances. These situations are expected to be extremely rare and exceptional. The main situation where documentation may not be available or appropriate, and so self-certification may be acceptable, is to extend an assessment deadline by up to one calendar week (see also section 3.5.5). Where no evidence has been provided the responsible group has discretion to decide whether to accept the reasons stated for the lack of evidence.

4.3 At all times it is the student’s responsibility to provide sufficient documentary evidence to support a claim for mitigating circumstances.

4.4 All requests for the consideration of mitigating circumstances should be submitted using the appropriate University form.
4.5 All third-party evidence submitted in support of mitigating circumstances applications, including medical certificates, should specify the dates and time period when the student was affected by mitigating circumstances, in the view of the third party providing the evidence.

4.6 All evidence should be submitted in English. Where evidence is originally produced in a language other than English, it is the student’s responsibility to obtain a verified translation of the evidence before submitting it. In some very rare circumstances, a Mitigating Circumstances Panel or Sub-Panel may accept evidence in a language other than English, but this is entirely at Panels’ discretion.

4.7 Where a student’s mitigating circumstances application relates to bereavement, it is expected that a death certificate will be submitted as evidence. In situations where it is not possible to obtain a death certificate, students may submit other supporting evidence such as a hospital report, newspaper notice of a death, or documentation relating to a memorial service or other commemorative event. In each instance the evidence should make clear the date of the bereavement.

3.5.5 Roles and responsibilities

5.1 Mitigating circumstances, whether for events during a period of study (for example, when seeking an extension to a submission deadline), leading up to an examination or after an examination, should be submitted to the relevant individual before being forwarded to the relevant group (or individual) for consideration and then the outcome communicated back to the student.

5.2 In most circumstances a student’s evidence of mitigating circumstances will be considered by a Mitigating Circumstances Panel (MCP) or a Sub-group of the MCP. The purpose of the MCP is to ensure independence of decision making from the assessment process and to support procedural fairness. The MCP also ensures that any highly personal details contained in the evidence submitted for mitigating circumstances are not communicated beyond a larger group than strictly necessary.

5.3 The specific roles and responsibilities are as follows:

(a) Home provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Evidence submitted to...</th>
<th>Evidence considered by...</th>
<th>Allowance determined by...</th>
<th>Outcome relayed by...</th>
<th>Evidence held by...</th>
<th>Self-certification accepted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During study (to extend a deadline by up to 1 week or to request the re-arrangement of an in-class assessment event such as an in-class test or presentation)</td>
<td>Module Leader</td>
<td>Module Leader</td>
<td>Module Leader</td>
<td>Module Leader: verbal and confirmed by e-mail or letter</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During study (for extensions of more than 1 week up to 5 weeks)</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>MCP Sub-group (at least two people drawn from the MCP)</td>
<td>MCP Sub-group (at least two people drawn from the MCP)</td>
<td>Faculty (as identified by the Faculty): e-mail or letter</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>No (see 3.5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By the MCP deadline</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>MCP* Exam Committee</td>
<td>Faculty (as identified by the Faculty): e-mail or letter</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>No (see 3.5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the MCP deadline (late submissions)</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>Chair on behalf of the Exam Committee</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>Student Central</td>
<td>No (see 3.5.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Regulations/A Core Regulations/A3 Assessment of Students/A3.5 Mitigating Circumstances
(b) Collaborative provision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Evidence submitted to...</th>
<th>Evidence considered by...</th>
<th>Allowance determined by...</th>
<th>Outcome relayed by...</th>
<th>Evidence held by...</th>
<th>Self-certification accepted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>During study (to extend a deadline by up to 1 week or to request the re-</strong></td>
<td>Module Leader</td>
<td>Module Leader</td>
<td>Module Leader</td>
<td>Module Leader: verbal and confirmed by e-mail or letter</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arrangement of an in-class assessment event such as an in-class test or presentation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During study (for extensions of more than 1 week up to 5 weeks)</strong></td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>MCP Sub-group (at least two people drawn from the MCP)</td>
<td>MCP Sub-group (at least two people drawn from the MCP)</td>
<td>Partner (as identified by the School): e-mail or letter</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>No (see 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By the MCP deadline</strong></td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>MCP*</td>
<td>Exam Committee</td>
<td>Partner (as identified by the School): e-mail or letter</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>No (see 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After the MCP deadline (late submissions)</strong></td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Chair on behalf of the Exam Committee</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>No (see 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see 5.5 below for constitution of MCP

**for University-enrolled students. Registered students must use the partner's appeal process.

5.4 The length of any request for a coursework extension due to mitigating circumstances should always be calculated from the original date of submission, regardless of whether the student has already been granted an extension due to mitigating circumstances, or has an automatic entitlement to an extension provided by a Disability Equality Memo. In practice this means that, for example, a student who has an extension of one week granted by a Module Leader, and then requests a second one-week extension, is in practice requesting a two-week extension which will be considered by a Mitigating Circumstances Panel Sub-group. A student who has, for example, a two-week extension provided by a Disability Equality Memo, and who then requests a one-week extension due to mitigating circumstances, is in practice requesting a three-week extension which will be considered by a Mitigating Circumstances Panel Sub-group.

5.5 The MCP should contain staff from the Faculty concerned (including academic and support staff as appropriate) and at least one of the individuals should not be responsible for teaching the student whose position is under consideration. The MCP should consist of at least three individuals plus a secretary, but may include others up to a maximum of fifteen plus a secretary. The MCP should include at least one staff member with involvement in undergraduate programmes and one staff member with involvement in taught postgraduate programmes. A Student Support Coordinator cannot become a member of the MCP.

5.6 For a collaborative partner, the MCP should be made up of at least three named individuals up to a maximum of fifteen, plus a secretary (as in 5.4 above). This membership must include two staff members from the collaborative partner involved in the delivery of academic programmes, at least one of whom must not be responsible for teaching the student who is being considered, and one representative from the University (nominated by the PVC/Dean).
5.7 One of the members of the MCP should be appointed the Chair of the MCP. The Chair of the MCP should not be the Chair of an Examination Committee to which the MCP will submit decisions. The Chair of an Examination Committee may be a member of the MCP. The MCP should also appoint a Vice-Chair on the same terms as the Chair who is able to act in the same manner as the Chair in their absence. There should also be a Secretary to the MCP who shall not be one of the members of the MCP.

5.8 The quorum for a meeting of an MCP is any three members, to include either the Chair or Vice-Chair.

5.9 An MCP Sub-group must consist of at least two people drawn from the membership of the MCP. These two people need not be the same two people on each occasion, and need not meet in person. An MCP Sub-group should not, however, include the Module Leader for the module in which the consideration of mitigating circumstances is being requested.

5.10 The Module Leader, an MCP Sub-group or the MCP itself should consider the evidence presented by the student and conclude either that there is evidence of mitigating circumstances or that there is not (see 3.2).

5.11 In respect of evidence considered by a Module Leader. The evidence is received by and considered by the Module Leader. The Module Leader considers the evidence presented by the student and concludes either that there is evidence of mitigating circumstances or that there is not (see 0). If the evidence is accepted, the Module Leader is authorised to and will grant an extension of up to one week or the re-arrangement of an in-class assessment event such as an in-class test or presentation where practical (see 6.1).

5.12 In respect of evidence considered by an MCP Sub-group. The evidence is forwarded to the MCP Sub-group. The MCP Sub-group considers the evidence presented by the student and concludes either that there is evidence of mitigating circumstances or that there is not (see 3.2). If the evidence is accepted, the MCP Sub-group is authorised to and will grant an extension of up to five weeks where practical (see 6.1).

5.13 The deadline for submitting a claim with evidence for an extension in respect of a coursework deadline is the same as the deadline date and time for submission of the coursework. If a student submits a claim after this deadline but within five weeks (the maximum allowable extension) the extension request is considered late and will be considered by the MCP Sub-group as described below.

5.14 The deadline for submitting a claim with evidence in respect of an in-class assessment event such as an in-class test or presentation is the date and time of the in-class assessment event. If a student submits a claim after this deadline, it is considered late and will be considered by the MCP Sub-group as described below.

5.15 If a student fails to submit evidence in support of a claim for mitigating circumstances for assessed coursework or an in-class assessment event such as an in-class test or presentation by a relevant deadline their claim is considered to be late. The student should proceed with their assessment and submit evidence as soon as possible to be considered by the MCP Sub-group. The MCP Sub-group will first consider if there were circumstances beyond the student’s control which prevented them from requesting an extension prior to the deadline for submission of coursework or prior to the date of the in-class assessment event. If the MCP Sub-group accepts that there was a valid reason for not requesting an extension the evidence is then considered and the MCP Sub-group will conclude either that there is evidence of mitigating circumstances or that there is not (see 0). If the evidence is accepted, the MCP Sub-group is authorised to and will grant an extension of up to five weeks from the original deadline where practical or allow a re-sit of the in-class assessment event. If a student submits a claim in relation to a coursework deadline more than five weeks after the original submission deadline, i.e. beyond the maximum possible extension which can be granted, then the student's late claim will be considered by the MCP in the same manner, i.e. considering first whether there was a valid reason for not requesting an extension and only if that is accepted then considering whether there were mitigating circumstances.
5.16 Where an MCP agrees a claim for mitigating circumstances this decision will be reported to the relevant Examination Committee. Only the decision will be reported to the Examination Committee: no details of the student’s circumstances will be forwarded.

5.17 Where an MCP does not agree a claim for mitigating circumstances the Examination Committee will not be notified that a request was made, considered and refused. The Examination Committee will, therefore, normally be unaware that a claim was submitted.

5.18 Notwithstanding guidance earlier in these Regulations, the Chair of the Examination Committee will be presented with a list of all the students that were considered at the MCP including the outcome, i.e. whether mitigating circumstances were agreed or not. The details of students’ situations will not be forwarded to the Chair. This list is to be used by the Chair only to clarify any queries that members of the Examination Committee may have concerning whether or not a student’s situation has been considered. An Examination Committee may not question the decision of an MCP.

5.19 When a student submits evidence of mitigating circumstances after the MCP deadline, the evidence is forwarded to Student Central. Student Central will first consider if there were circumstances beyond the student’s control which prevented them from submitting the evidence by the relevant deadline. If Student Central accepts that there was a valid reason for late submission, then Student Central will also consider the evidence against the criteria for mitigating circumstances and conclude either that there is evidence of mitigating circumstances or that there is not (see 3.2). If Student Central concludes that there is valid evidence of mitigating circumstances then the decision to approve mitigating circumstances will be forwarded to the Chair of the Examination Committee.

5.20 For students studying on the UMP, there is a common timetable for meetings of the MCP. The MCP will be held the working day before the meeting of the SEC. The deadline for receipt of claims with evidence in Student Central will be 4.30pm 3 working days prior to the MCP, i.e. there are 2 clear working days between the deadline for receipt of claims with evidence and the MCP. Claims made after this deadline are considered to be late.

5.21 For students studying on programmes outside of the UMP, the relevant Faculty is responsible for ensuring that clear deadlines for the submission of claims with evidence have been communicated in advance to students. Claims made after this deadline are considered to be late.

5.22 Summary of deadlines for submission of claims for mitigating circumstances with evidence:

- Coursework extension – the original deadline date and time for submission of the coursework
- In-class test – the date and start time of the in-class test
- Examinations – the MCP deadline

3.5.6 Allowances for students with mitigating circumstances affecting coursework

6.1 Where a student is unable to hand in summatively assessed coursework due to mitigating circumstances, the student should normally be allowed an extension equal to the period during which they were affected, up to a maximum period of five calendar weeks where five calendar weeks is practical within relevant programme constraints, such as feedback and progression requirements. Extensions cannot be granted beyond the practical limits of consideration of the assessed work at the relevant Examination Committee.

3.5.7 Allowances for students with mitigating circumstances considered at an Examination Committee

7.1 Where it is determined by an MCP that a student has been affected by mitigating circumstances, the Examination Committee (or, in certain circumstances, the Chair acting on behalf of the Examination Committee) must offer the student a re-sit opportunity in the affected module(s) or, in relevant circumstances, an opportunity to re-take the module (see 7.7). A re-sit or re-take must be offered irrespective of the original mark obtained, i.e. even when a student has already obtained a pass mark for
the affected module. No other allowance is permissible (except in limited circumstances as described in
7.8).

7.2 A re-sit may mean either re-examination or the re-submission of coursework or a combination of
both. The affected examination or submission of coursework will be disregarded (except as described in
7.6).

7.3 The rationale for allowing only a re-assessment opportunity in response to mitigating
circumstances reflects the purpose of assessment, as defined in the University’s Academic Regulations
(see C1.1), which is to enable students to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the objectives of the
programme of study and achieved the standard required for the award they seek. By presenting
students with an opportunity for re-assessment, this ensures that a student’s award is always based on
actual work submitted without hindrance.

7.4 A student should not be put in a position of unfair advantage over other candidates; the aim in
considering mitigating circumstance is to enable every student to be assessed on equal terms.
Normally, a re-assessment arising from the consideration of mitigating circumstances should be the
same form of assessment taken at the next available opportunity or after a period of time that will
compensate for the disadvantage suffered by the student but not unfairly advantage them. If it is not
possible or it is not appropriate to offer the same form of assessment the Examination Committee may
exercise discretion in deciding on the particular form any reassessment should take, options include viva
voce examination and additional assessment tasks designed to show whether the student has satisfied
the learning outcomes.

7.5 Students may decline a re-assessment opportunity but their current mark will stand and no other
allowance will be made.

7.6 If a student obtains a lower mark in their re-sit or in a module which is re-taken than in the
affected attempt at the assessment, then the mark awarded in the affected assessment will stand (i.e.
the student will be awarded the higher of the two marks).

7.7 If, through mitigating circumstances, a student is or will be unable to take a re-sit or their
performance in a re-sit is affected, whatever the reason for the re-sit, then the consideration of their
mitigating circumstances will be identical to students affected in a first-sit assessment. Where it is
determined that a student has been affected by mitigating circumstances in their re-sit (or will be unable
to take a re-sit), then the Examination Committee will agree a DR (disregard) grade for the affected
module and the student’s continuing programme will be determined at the discretion of the Examination
Committee. The DR grade will not be considered as part of the student’s programme for meeting the
requirements of the award. Where a student re-takes a module which has been disregarded they will be
required to re-take all elements of the assessment for that module irrespective of which elements of
assessment were originally affected by mitigating circumstances.

7.8 Where a student re-takes a dissertation, project or independent study module through accepted
mitigating circumstances then they are permitted to carry forward their existing topic and title. In this
situation students may still opt to select a new title should they wish to do so or should that for some
other reason be necessary, e.g. because a specific supervisor is no longer available to supervise a
specific topic.

7.9 Where an Examination Committee is considering a student who would otherwise be able to
graduate were it not for the impact of agreed mitigating circumstances then an Examination Committee
may award a limited number of MS grades. An MS grade is an ungraded ‘medical pass’, it carries no
mark and is not considered in the determination of degree classifications or grade point average (GPA).
In order to award an MS grade, an Examination Committee must be satisfied that there is sufficient
evidence to demonstrate that the student has achieved a pass mark in the learning outcomes for the
affected module(s). The maximum value of any modules awarded an MS grade must not exceed 30
credits for awards with a total credit value in excess of 180 credits or 20 credits for awards with a total
credit value up to and including 180 credits. For example, 20 credits (normally one single module) for a
Masters degree and 30 credits (normally two single modules) for a Bachelors degree. An MS grade may only be awarded for a whole module.

7.10 MS grades cannot be used at any stage of a student’s programme other than at the point at which they would otherwise be able to graduate. Prior to this point, a student should be given the opportunity for re-assessment or (as described in 7.7) to have the affected module disregarded.

7.11 A student who has not achieved a pass mark for a module following a re-sit, and is awarded a re-take due to accepted mitigating circumstances, will be entitled to re-take that module and achieve the full set of marks available, i.e. the re-take will be uncapped. A student who has achieved a pass mark at re-sit, and is therefore awarded the maximum capped mark for that module, e.g. 40P at undergraduate level, will not be entitled to re-take that module due to mitigating circumstances as the maximum possible pass mark has been achieved.

3.5.8 Communication of outcomes

8.1 The outcome of any claim for mitigating circumstances will be communicated to the student, as outlined above (5.3).

8.2 This communication of the outcome of the claim for mitigating circumstances (i.e. whether or not the claim was supported) will include:

- The factors that were taken into account when the circumstances were considered; and
- The decision; and
- The reason(s) for the decisions.

8.3 All decisions will be recorded as appropriate.

3.5.9 Review process

9.1 Students may seek a review of a decision concerning their mitigating circumstance but may not appeal that decision, i.e. the reviewing body shall not normally substitute their own judgement but would only overturn the previous decision either if it was improperly made (e.g. it did not take account of all the matters that it should or took account of things that it should not have done) or if it was one that no fair or reasonable person/body could have come to. This review request should be submitted in writing to Student Central (an e-mail will suffice). Student Central will forward all requests to the relevant review body.

9.2 If a student wishes to review an overarching decision on the grounds of mitigating circumstances, for example, a decision to exclude a student on grounds of academic failure, or a restriction to an Ordinary degree, this should be done by seeking a review of the decision relevant to the individual underlying modules.

9.3 The review body for decisions made by Module Leaders should be three members of the MCP, as far as possible none of whom shall have decided a mitigating circumstances request from the student in the previous 12 months and normally including the Chair of the Panel, using the normal administrative processes of the Panel and with the student allowed 5 working days to request a review from the date that the decision of the Module Leader was sent to the student.

9.4 The review body for decisions of an MCP (including MCP Sub-groups) should be a University Panel consisting of three members of MCPs from other Faculties, administered by the Student Central and with the student allowed 10 working days to request a review from the date that the decision of the MCP was sent to the student.

9.5 The review of decisions made by Student Central on mitigating circumstances requests received after the MCP deadline will be undertaken by the Academic Registrar or their nominee and with the student allowed 10 working days to request a review from the date that the decision of Student Central was sent to the student.
9.6 If a review request is submitted past these deadlines, it shall be deemed out of time and be dismissed. The responsibility for determining whether a request is in time rests with the MCP Secretary for decisions made by Module Leaders, and with Student Central for decisions of an MCP (including MCP Sub-groups).

9.7 If a review request is dismissed as out of time the student may appeal that decision by writing to the Academic Registrar within 10 working days of the decision to dismiss the request being sent to the student. The student shall set out the reasons why they were unable to submit their review request in time, with evidence as appropriate. The Academic Registrar (or their nominee) shall then make a final decision whether the review request should be considered or whether it should be dismissed. If the Academic Registrar (or their nominee) dismisses the request finally then the student shall be issued with a Completion of Procedures letters as required by the OIA. The Academic Registrar may delegate this decision to another appropriate member of staff.

9.8 All the reviews will be carried out on the basis of documentation only.

### 3.5.10 Authorised break from studies

10.1 If the extent of disruption caused by admissible mitigating circumstances means that it is not practical for a student to continue on the programme in the current academic year, they may be advised to take a break from study. The student may be advised to suspend their studies until such time as the circumstances affecting performance have passed, provided that the maximum period of registration for the programme is not exceeded. It is assumed that the student will return to the same programme and stage of study: if a student wishes to return to a different programme, a programme transfer must be requested. See also: Regulations on Aegrotat Awards in Section A1.1.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Head of Student Central.

**Approved:** Academic Board, 14 July 2010 (for implementation from 2010-11)

**Last updated:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change made</th>
<th>Date approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and update of regulations after first year of implementation</td>
<td>Approved by Academic Enhancement &amp; Standards Committee, 25 January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorised break from studies added when updated for 2012-13</td>
<td>Approved by Academic Board, 18 July 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in maximum number of members of MCP (from nine to fifteen)</td>
<td>Approved by Academic Board, 13 February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of membership of the MCP sub-group (para. 3.5.5viii)</td>
<td>Approved by AESC, 22 May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of rules regarding re-takes following agreed mitigating circumstances (para. 3.5.7xi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 3.5.9vi amended to permit Academic Registrar to nominate another member of staff to review requests to reconsider late mitigating circumstances claims</td>
<td>Approved by Academic Board, 11 July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated to reflect new ASA structures from 2013-14;</td>
<td>Approved by AESC, 4 December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of roles and responsibilities described in section 3.5.5;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to bring forward the deadline for submission of claims by one day (para 3.5.5.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table in 5.3 - requests for the re-arrangement of in-class tests to be considered in the same way as</td>
<td>Approved by AESC 3 December 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
requests for coursework extensions of up to one week (by module leader);
New paragraph 5.4 inserted, to clarify the date from which any extension request should be calculated, i.e. from the original submission for the coursework (also reflected in 5.21, now 5.22);
New paragraph 9.5 inserted to clarify the distinction between the process for review of late and on-time claims.

Amendments to 3.5.5 and 3.5.4.1 and addition of new paragraphs 3.5.4.5-7.  

Approved by AESC, 28 October 2015
Note on Mitigating Circumstances Panels (MCPs) for collaborative provision

The University’s regulations on the consideration of mitigating circumstances (A3.5) apply equally to students on programmes of study which lead to Oxford Brookes awards but are delivered (in full or part) by a partner organisation. This note supplements regulation A3.5, and applies only to collaborative provision delivered by partners working with more than one Brookes faculty.

Detailed information on the membership of MCPs associated with specific collaborative arrangements\(^1\) is given in the Operations Manual for a partnership, confirmed through the approval process (with any subsequent changes approved via the appropriate Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee).

In most cases, the Faculty in which the Liaison Manager for the collaborative provision is located will take responsibility for overseeing the mitigating circumstances procedures and the operation of the MCP. However, a number of partner organisations deliver programmes of study which are managed by Department/Schools across more than one Faculty, and in these cases, a lead Faculty must be identified.

The current arrangements for cross-Faculty MCPs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Faculties managing provision</th>
<th>Lead Faculty (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon &amp; Witney College</td>
<td>Business, Health &amp; Life Sciences, Humanities &amp; Social Sciences, Technology, Design &amp; Environment</td>
<td>HSS (contact Nick Swarbrick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activate Learning (City of Oxford, Banbury &amp; Bicester, and Reading Colleges)</td>
<td>BUS, HLS, HSS, TDE</td>
<td>TDE (contact Joana Amorim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgwater College</td>
<td>BUS, HLS, TDE</td>
<td>HLS (contact Gail Lansdown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklands College</td>
<td>BUS, TDE</td>
<td>HLS (contact Gail Lansdown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Employers Federation (EEF Ltd), Woodland Grange</td>
<td>TDE, HLS</td>
<td>TDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilai University, Malaysia</td>
<td>BUS</td>
<td>BUS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The current collaborative provision register can be found at [http://www.brookes.ac.uk/asa/apqo/programme-specifications/collaborative-provision-register/](http://www.brookes.ac.uk/asa/apqo/programme-specifications/collaborative-provision-register/)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Faculties managing provision</th>
<th>Lead Faculty (2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solihull College</td>
<td>HLS, HSS, TDE</td>
<td>HSS (contact Nick Swarbrick)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swindon College</td>
<td>BUS, HLS, HSS, TDE</td>
<td>BUS (contact Jayne Finn)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A3.6 Marking and Moderation

A3.6.1 Introduction

i. Higher education institutions are expected to have in place transparent and fair systems for marking and moderation (UK Quality Code, chapter B6). The University needs to be assured that robust, effective and consistent internal moderation processes are being applied in all Departments across all Faculties. The details of these processes are likely to vary according to local circumstances and professional body requirements, but all Faculties should work to the definitions and minimum requirements set out below in developing their own internal moderation processes.

ii. The University recognises that one aspect of the promotion of fairness in assessment requires that the potential for bias is recognised and that systems and processes that minimise opportunities for bias are put in place. To this end, the University has an agreed policy on anonymous marking for all assessed work that can be marked anonymously, which complements explicit and rigorous second marking and/or moderation schemes.

A3.6.2 Definitions

i. Internal moderation of assessed work is the process of ensuring that assessment criteria are applied consistently by examiners, that students are being treated fairly through the assessment process, and that there is a shared understanding of the academic standards students are expected to achieve. Moderation is the process of ensuring that the marks awarded for an assessment task across a module are within reasonable limits, in the context of the criteria against which students’ work is being assessed.

ii. Moderation may be limited to sampling and second marking a representative number of pieces of assessed work across the marking range from a cohort of students; or it may involve second marking the work of the whole cohort (double marking).

iii. Second marking is the process in which a second allocation of marks is given to a piece of work by a second internal examiner. This process may either be carried out blind (where the second examiner does not have access to the marks and comments of the first marker) or sighted (where the second examiner can view the marks and comments of the first marker, and adds their own). Dissertations should always be blind second marked.

iv. Anonymous marking is the practice of concealing the identity of the student who submitted the assessment from the staff member marking their work, until a mark is agreed by the marker. Only once a mark has been agreed will the student’s identity be revealed and feedback confirmed.

A3.6.3 Principles

i. All assessed work submitted for the award of University credit must be subject to a process of internal moderation, consistent with the Faculty moderation policy. This applies to all modes of assessment in all delivery locations. Where assessment is not in written form, every effort should be made to apply an appropriate form of moderation. Practice-based assessments must also be subject to an appropriate process of internal moderation.
ii. The marking and moderation procedures to be followed for a programme and individual modules should be agreed by the relevant Subject Committee, with reference to the Faculty policy for internal moderation, and reported to the Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee for endorsement.

iii. The process by which marks for assessed work will be allocated, including details of the internal moderation process to which it will be subject, should be clearly communicated to students via programme and module handbooks, along with the criteria for assessment.

iv. Evidence that an internal moderation process has taken place must be available for scrutiny by external examiners and other interested parties.

**Collaborative Provision**

v. The requirement for establishing robust internal moderation procedures applies equally to collaborative programmes leading to Oxford Brookes awards. Arrangements for internal moderation, which must involve at least one member of University staff (usually the Liaison Manager), should be agreed with the partner organisation and clearly set out in the Operations Manual.

A3.6.4 Timing

i. Moderation of coursework marks should be completed within an appropriate timescale in order to allow for the timely return of agreed marks and feedback to students, consistent with the terms of the Assessment Compact.

ii. The internal moderation process should normally be completed prior to the upload of marks onto the system for Examination Committees. Unmoderated marks must not be entered onto eCSIS, unless permission has been granted by the Programme Lead.

iii. Marks that have not been confirmed by an Examination Committee should not be issued to students, unless permission to do so has been granted by the Programme Lead. Assessed work that has been through the internal moderation process may be returned to students prior to the Examination Committee, on condition that the feedback sheet clearly informs them that the mark/grade given remains subject to confirmation.

A3.6.5 Procedure

*First marking*

i. All completed assessments should be first marked independently by appropriately experienced members of the module delivery team. Evidence of marking and an indication of how the marks have been allocated should be shown on all assessments.

ii. For non-written forms of assessment, e.g. oral examinations, presentations, or recitals, at least two internal examiners should normally be involved in first marking the assessment and agreeing the final mark for each piece of work. The external examiner should have access to the agreed comments of the assessors, which should be provided as feedback to the student.

*Second marking*

iii. If the internal moderation process for the module is based on double marking, all assessments should then be second marked.

iv. For modules employing a sampling approach to moderation, the internal moderator for the module (a member of academic staff other than the first marker/s) should then second mark a sample of completed assessments. Samples should:

- be representative of every delivery location, and every mode of study;
- be drawn from, and reflect, the full range of marks, including borderline cases and fail grades;
- be of an appropriate size with respect to the size of the cohort (10%, minimum of 5);
- include all components of the assessment for the module.
v. If there is clear evidence from the sample selected that there are serious discrepancies in the marks being awarded, the Subject Coordinator or Programme Lead should arrange for all the assignments affected (either within a specified grade band, or the whole cohort) to be re-marked.

vi. Internal moderation policies must be clear about the procedure to be followed in order to resolve any disagreement between first and second markers and assign a final mark for a piece of work.

vii. Students should be provided with a single mark on their assessed work, as agreed by the internal examiners, and the feedback given on their performance in the assignment must be consistent with the final assigned mark.

**Reporting**

viii. The Faculty moderation policy should set out the requirements for reporting on the conduct and outcomes of the internal moderation process, including those applying to collaborative provision (which should be set out in individual Operations Manuals).

**A3.6.6 External moderation**

i. Where a sampling approach to internal moderation is adopted, the sample of work that is moderated may be the same sample sent to the external examiner. If the sample that is sent to the external examiner does not include any of the work that has been sampled through the internal moderation process (for example, where a random sample is selected from across the grade bands), they should be provided with additional information about the internal moderation process that has been followed.

ii. The role of the external examiner is described in section A3.7 of the Regulations.

**A3.6.7 Anonymous marking**

i. All summative assessment shall be marked anonymously, unless it is not possible for that form of assessment to be carried out anonymously. This includes all summative assessment on courses delivered with a collaborative partner.

ii. For all instances where anonymous marking is not practised particular attention must be given to ensuring that assessment processes are fair, and are seen to be fair. This may include, for example, an explanation given to students enrolled for that module in a relevant Handbook and, as a minimum, all students must be informed when an assessment will not be marked anonymously.

iii. Examples of situations where the form of assessment may not allow for work to be marked anonymously include:

   a. where the marker has closely supervised the work being marked (e.g. projects, dissertations, portfolios); and
   
   b. where assignment topics are individual or small group based (e.g. personal profiles, work placement activities, independent studies, groupwork activities); and
   
   c. where assessment is based on observation (e.g., oral presentations, video assignments, poster presentations, music recitals, exhibitions, oral language examinations, laboratory skills assessments); and
   
   d. where assessing a student's competence to practice in a professional setting.

iv. There are also certain situations in which it may not be possible to mark a student's work anonymously, for example, where a student has been granted an extension to a coursework deadline, or has a disability that entitles them to "reasonable adjustment" of the format and/or deadline for coursework submissions, or in disciplinary cases referred by an Academic Conduct Officer. These cases differ to the exceptions noted above, however, as they are personal exceptions and not variations from the expectation for anonymous marking on an assessment level. The exceptions listed above would apply to all students submitting work for a specific
assignment, whereas these ad hominem scenarios are examples where anonymous marking may not be possible for specific individual reasons.

v. Where at all possible, assessed work should be submitted electronically to facilitate anonymous marking. Where electronic submission is not possible or nor practised, then the standard University Coursework Submission Sheet should be used.

vi. Once a marker has agreed a mark, the student’s identity may be revealed to the marker. If a piece of work is double-marked, the student’s identity may not be revealed to either marker until after the second marker has completed their assessment. This is to ensure that feedback on assessed can be personalised and tailored to that student. However, a mark should not be amended once a student’s identity has been revealed.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Experience).

Approved by:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012
Academic Board, 18 July 2012

Last updated:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 3 December 2014
Academic Board, 11 February 2015
A3.7.1 Introduction

i. Universities and other institutions with degree awarding powers are responsible for the quality of their programmes of study and for the standards of the awards to which they lead. The external examining system at Oxford Brookes University is a key element of the University’s arrangements for setting, maintaining and assuring academic and professional standards, which include the programme approval, annual review and periodic review processes, and the University’s assessment policies and regulations. The University is accountable for the standards of its awards to the funding council, through QAA institutional review, and to a range of professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs). The University's approach to external examining is informed by the expectation, articulated in Chapter B7 of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (QAA, 2011), that scrupulous use should be made of external examiners in assuring the academic standards of the University’s awards.

ii. This policy provides guidance on:
- the nomination and appointment of external examiners;
- the role of the external examiner;
- the production of the external examiner’s annual report;
- the consideration of external examiners’ reports and responses to recommendations made by external examiners;
- the relationship between external examining arrangements and other quality management processes at Oxford Brookes University.

A3.7.2 Principles

i. External examiners provide evidence about how the University sets and assures the academic and professional standards of its awards, through their direct observation of student performance (assessed work) and assessment practices. On the basis of this they may also make inferences about the quality of teaching, and learning resources, but they rarely directly observe these.

ii. A confidence judgement in QAA institutional audit is crucially dependent on an institution’s “strong and scrupulous use of independent external examiners in summative assessment practices”. According to the UK Quality Code, external examiners are appointed to provide impartial and independent advice, as well as informative comment, on the standards of the University’s awards, and on student achievement in relation to those standards. Many are also asked to comment on whether or not a programme of study leading to a University award enables students to meet the relevant professional standards.

iii. The quality of the evidence produced by external examiners is dependent on their ‘externality’, i.e. their independence and their expertise. External examiners should be ‘independent witnesses’, who are not compromised by prior association with the programme team, or by any reciprocal arrangement that exists between the Oxford Brookes subject team and that of the external examiner. They should also be ‘expert witnesses’, whose authority is derived from their knowledge of the discipline they are examining and their experience of assessment. The appointment criteria for external examiners at Oxford Brookes are therefore designed to ensure
that nominees are able to exercise impartial, independent and expert judgement, and they are consistent with the criteria set out in the UK Quality Code (B7, Indicator 5).

iv. The UK Quality Code (chapter B7) expects higher education institutions to ask their external examiners to comment on:
   a. whether the University is maintaining the threshold academic standards set for its awards, in accordance with the frameworks for higher education qualifications and applicable subject benchmark statements;
   b. whether the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended learning outcomes of the programme/s and is conducted in accordance with the University’s policies and regulations;
   c. the comparability of the academic standards and achievement of students with those in other higher education institutions with which they are familiar;
   d. good practice and innovation relating to learning, teaching and assessment which they have observed;
   e. opportunities to enhance the quality of learning opportunities offered to students.

v. The template for external examiners’ reports at Oxford Brookes has therefore been designed to ensure that these areas are addressed. External examiners’ reports are an important source of direct evidence on the academic standards of awards and of indirect evidence on the quality of the University’s programmes of study leading to its awards. These reports inform the annual reports at programme and Faculty level, and provide evidence, together with responses from programme teams, which is used in the annual programme review process and considered by periodic review and revalidation panels.

vi. In line with the requirements of HEFCE 06/45, and with indicator 14 of the UK Quality Code (chapter B7), external examiners’ reports are made available to all staff and students through the Personal Information Portal. This policy, and other information about the University’s external examining system, is freely available on the University’s website, and a brief outline of the role of the external examiner is required in all programme handbooks. The name and institution of the external examiner on their programme is also made available to students via PIP.

vii. An annual overview of the institutional issues raised in external examiners’ reports forms part of the Annual Quality Review prepared by the Head of the Academic Policy & Quality Office for consideration by the University’s Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee.

A3.7.3 Nomination and appointment of External Examiners

i. The responsibility for nominating potential external examiners lies with the Programme Lead. The nomination form is available from the APQO, and link Quality Assurance Officers will provide advice on the suitability of potential nominees prior to completion of the form. The Faculty AESC is responsible for considering all nominations and ensuring that they meet the University’s criteria. The Faculty should also verify a nominee’s right to work in the UK, prior to submission of documentation to the APQO (through the Faculty’s liaison QAO), for approval by the Chair of AESC.

ii. The University’s criteria for appointment are designed to ensure that external examiners are able to exercise an impartial, independent and expert judgement on the academic standard of the University’s awards; and are based on the person specification set out in the UK Quality Code (section B7). Faculties must therefore take into account the following points in their consideration of external examiner nominations (PSRB requirements must also be taken into account, where applicable):

   - **Seniority**
     External examiners must demonstrate appropriate levels of experience within the discipline, including academic or professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification they are appointed to examine. They should have sufficient standing and breadth of experience in the discipline (as a practitioner, where appropriate) to be able to command the respect of colleagues.
within the sector.

Nominees from outside the HE sector should be appointed as part of a team of external examiners, since the University requires assurance on the standards of its awards in the context of the Framework for Higher Education and other relevant sector benchmarks, as well as in the context of industry/professional requirements.

- **Experience**
  External examiners must have a good understanding of the standard to be expected of students studying on the programme they are appointed to examine. Nominees should therefore have experience of curriculum design, teaching and internal examining in the discipline area and at the level for which they are being appointed. Examiners should also have an awareness of current developments in teaching and learning in the discipline, therefore retirees may only be considered for appointment if they are able to provide evidence of their continuing involvement in the academic/professional area concerned.

Those being nominated to cover collaborative programmes and professional doctorates should always be experienced external examiners. Nominees for other programmes with no previous external examining experience must be appointed as part of a team. Their lack of experience should be balanced against the composition of the rest of the external examining team, and the proposing Department must provide additional information to support such nominations, including an outline of the arrangements that will be put in place to ensure they are mentored by an appropriately experienced external examiner within the established team.

- **Workload**
  External examiners should not be appointed if they already hold two or more current examinerships, and such nominations should not be approved by the Faculty AESC. If a team of external examiners is large, a chief external examiner may be appointed: the chief external examiner must have sufficient expertise to be able to make a judgement of the standards achieved across the programme as a whole, and will be paid an additional fee for the production of an overview report.

- **Previous involvement with the programme**
  Nominees should not have been involved in the delivery of the programme at Oxford Brookes - as lecturer, consultant, or placement provider - nor should they have been an external adviser through the programme approval process (i.e. a member of the PDT). The Faculty AESC should not approve such nominations.

To avoid potential conflicts of interest, nominees should not be appointed as external examiners if they are:
- closely associated with the sponsorship of students on the programme;
- in a position to significantly influence the future of students on the programme;
- involved in collaborative research activities with a member of staff in the Department.
- are a near relation of a member of staff or student associated with the programme

External members of programme approval panels are required to meet criteria to ensure their objectivity and independence from the design of the programme, and their appointment as external examiners at a later stage is therefore not considered to present a conflict of interest.

- **Reciprocity**
  No member of the proposing academic department should be an external examiner in the same institution as the nominee. The Faculty AESC should not approve such nominations.

- **Colleagues**
  The external examining team must not contain two external examiners who are or who were recently colleagues, nor should colleagues from the same department in the same institution be appointed to take over from each other.
- **Association with the University**
  A nominee who has been a student or member of staff at Oxford Brookes University within the previous five years is not eligible for appointment as an external examiner, and such nominations should not be approved by the Faculty AESC. They may, however, be considered for appointment after a period of at least five years has elapsed.

Members of the Board of Governors are not eligible for appointment as external examiners.

- **Right to work in the UK**
  To meet UK Border Agency requirements on the prevention of illegal working, nomination forms must be accompanied by a photocopy of the nominee’s passport page showing their photograph and passport number. Any subsequent appointment will be conditional upon the Faculty or APQO having sight of the original document.

- **Collaborative provision**
  External examiners have a key role to play in assuring the University of the academic standards of awards delivered through collaborative arrangements, either in the UK or overseas. The University retains responsibility for the academic standards of any awards made in its name and is therefore responsible for the appointment of external examiners for collaborative provision, who must meet the criteria above. Additional notes and requirements relating to examiners appointed to collaborative programmes are set out below:

  The university retains responsibility for the appointment of external examiners for collaborative provision, although the partner may nominate appropriate candidates. The examiner must be independent of both the partner and the University, and is primarily acting on behalf of the University in enabling it to maintain oversight of the standards of its awards. For programmes of study leading to joint awards, the arrangements for external examining should be agreed and specified at the point of approval.

  In order to enable the University to make a comparison of the standards of its awards delivered at home and through collaborative arrangements, the same external examiner should be appointed to oversee both the on-campus and the collaborative programmes. If, for logistical reasons, an examiner only examines on a collaborative programme, efforts should be made to provide a sample of work by home students to enable them to make a comparison of standards of achievement. Where there is no matching home programme, an external examiner for a programme within a cognate discipline area should be asked to examine the collaborative programme, if possible.

  For provision delivered and/or assessed in a language other than English, the external examiner must be able to work fluently in both English and the language of delivery/assessment.

  Non-UK based external examiners must have experience of delivering and assessing in a UK HEI and be familiar with the current standards required of a UK award in the discipline concerned, but a non-UK subject specialist may be paired with an examiner from a UK HEI where a nominee lacks such experience. Advice should be sought from the APQO when considering such an arrangement.

- iii. External examiner nominees who meet the stated criteria are appointed for a period of four years, after which they cannot be re-appointed until a period of at least five years has elapsed. Re-appointment of a previous external examiner should only be considered in exceptional circumstances - where it can be shown that it is not possible to secure the services of any other suitable examiner - and an external examiner should never be re-appointed more than once. Similarly, an extension to an examiner's period of office will only be granted in exceptional circumstances: for example, if the programme is due to terminate within the next year, or if an extension is required to enable them to assess four successive cohorts of students. Such extensions will never be granted for longer than one year. Applications for extension either to the period of office or to an external examiner’s duties must be completed on the relevant forms available from the APQO. Advice should be sought from the APQO (via the Faculty link QAO) on the eligibility of an examiner for an extension.
iv. The Faculty AESC is responsible for monitoring external examining arrangements within the Faculty and for ensuring that appropriate external examiners are appointed for all provision in good time to enable them to carry out their duties effectively. External examiners must be nominated for all new programmes as soon as possible after approval.

v. Once the Chair of AESC has approved a nomination, the APQO sends out a letter of appointment (copied to the Programme Lead/Subject Coordinator, Liaison Manager, Faculty Quality Team members and link QAO) with an acceptance form which must be signed and returned by the external examiner. They will then be provided with a staff number so they can access PIP and other online University information. Once approved, the Faculty will arrange to provide the external examiner with relevant programme and module information, marking schemes, examination committee dates and a copy of the previous external examiner’s report.

vi. The APQO coordinates an annual external examiners’ briefing/induction day to ensure examiners are fully prepared to take on their duties within the context of Oxford Brookes University, and are kept up to date with changes to University systems and practices relevant to their role.

vii. External examiners may resign from their post for a number of reasons, and should notify the APQO in writing if they choose to do so. The University reserves the right to terminate an examiner’s contract where the examiner is unable or unwilling to fulfil their duties (set out in section 4 below) to a satisfactory level, including the non-submission of an annual report within the specified timescale or failure to attend examination committees without good reason.

A3.7.4 Role of the External Examiner

i. The external examiner’s principal role is to provide a judgement on the rigour of the University’s processes for maintaining academic standards, and on the comparability of the standards achieved by students on Oxford Brookes awards with those on similar programmes in other UK higher education institutions. The external examiner may also provide advice on other aspects of the provision, such as course content or teaching and learning strategies.

ii. The primary formal roles of external examiners are to:
- Assure academic rigour and equity of treatment in assessment which contributes to final awards;
- Monitor and provide assurance that the agreed assessment process has taken place, in accordance with the approved regulations governing the programme, and see evidence that the requisite internal moderation procedures have been complied with;
- Monitor and provide assurance that students have fulfilled the stated programme learning outcomes in their submission for conferment of the award;
- Approve proposed examination papers and draft coursework assessment briefs which count towards final awards, to ensure that students will be assessed fairly in relation to approved syllabuses and regulations, and in such a way that external examiners will be able to judge whether they have fulfilled the objectives of the programme and reached the required standard;
- See and agree samples of work from all students proposed for both the highest category of the award and for failure, and samples of the work of other students in order to satisfy themselves that each student is fairly classified;
- Provide advisory comments on the standard of marking for the internal examiners to act upon during the following year.

Approval of draft examination papers and other assessment material

iii. The form of assessment for each module or programme component is specified in the definitive programme documentation as agreed through the programme approval process and modified from time to time with the approval of AESC. Drafts of final examination papers and other assessment material that counts towards the final award must be sent to external examiners for their approval. External examiners on collaborative programmes must approve the assignment briefs and examination papers in the same way as for home provision, and an explanation for any
variation in assessment for the home and collaborative programmes should be provided to the external examiner by the Liaison Manager.

**External moderation of standards of assessment**

iv. External examiners maintain an oversight of the processes for the assessment of all work that counts towards the final award by sampling assessed work. Normally, unless the number of assessment items is sufficiently small for all to be scrutinised, subject or programme teams will reach an agreement with external examiners on the size and scope of the sample of assessed work to be submitted for inspection. This should include representative samples of each grade or class of degree, borderline cases, cases of failure, malpractice or those affected by illness etc. External examiners should be sent copies of the relevant grading schemes and assessment criteria together with a record of marks for each assessment item. It is expected that any significant differences between first and second markers should have been resolved through the internal moderation process before submission to the external examiner. However, in exceptional circumstances external examiners may also be asked to:

- contribute to decisions on borderline cases;
- comment on the marking standards of internal examiners and, if a problem is identified, recommend changes to marks, taking due account of the effect of any changes on the rest of the cohort.

**Attendance at examination committees**

v. At least one external examiner for the provision under consideration must be present at every examination committee, either in person or via telephone/video-conference. An examination committee which does not include an approved external examiner is not authorised to recommend the conferment of awards. Failure to attend such meetings without good reason will be seen as a breach of contract for which the University has the right to terminate the examiner’s appointment. In order to facilitate attendance, the Programme Portfolio Manager should provide the external examiners with the dates of the relevant examination committee meetings at the start of each academic year. Within the Undergraduate Modular Programme, a Chief Examiner must always be present at the MEC which agrees awards. The responsibility for confirming marks and awards is the collective responsibility of the examination committee, but the external examiner must endorse the recommendations of the committee. In the event of a dispute between internal and external examiners which cannot be resolved, the matter should be referred to the Chair of Academic Board or their nominee.

**Involvement in oral and viva voce examinations.**

vi. Where an oral examination is compulsory for all students, this will be stated in the approved assessment strategy for a programme or module. If a viva voce examination is required, the external examiner should be present.

**Meeting students**

vii. This is not a requirement of the external examiner’s role, but they may, by arrangement with the Faculty, meet students in order to assist them to judge the overall quality and standards of the programme/s. These meetings should be conducted in accordance with the definition of the external examiner’s role.

viii. The secondary roles of external examiners are to:

- Be consulted about and agree to any proposed changes in the approved progression and assessment requirements which will directly affect students currently on the programme;
- Comment and give advice on the content and structure of the curriculum, assessment practices, and on teaching and learning strategies on the programme;

**Involvement in modification of provision**

ix. External examiners will also be consulted on changes to programmes where these lead to alterations to learning outcomes and assessment. The external examiner may be requested to act on occasion as a ‘critical friend’ giving advice on curriculum development to ensure the maintenance of quality and standards in new and revised programmes. The external examiner must be informed of major changes to programmes and may be consulted in advance about
proposed changes, particularly where they affect programme titles, learning outcomes, assessment criteria or the assessment process.

x. External examiners’ powers may extend to:
   • obtaining reasonable access to any assessed parts of the programme/s offered by the University - it will be normal practice for the external examiner to review scripts and other assessed work for the whole academic year at the time of the final exam committee meeting at the end of the academic year. However, the external examiner may agree with the Head of Department to receive assessed work at other appropriate times throughout the year, as appropriate to the nature of the provision.
   • commenting on work other than that submitted towards final awards.
   • requesting additional sampling of students’ work where an equity issue is highlighted by the normal external examining procedures;
   • assisting in the selection of candidates for individual interview.

UMP Chief External Examiner
xi. The appointment of Chief External Examiner to the Undergraduate Modular Programme carries the following particular duties and responsibilities:
   • to ensure fair and consistent application of assessment processes across all programmes within the UMP;
   • to confirm awards at the Modular Examination Committee;
   • to act as a ‘critical friend’ in developing guidelines and regulations for the Undergraduate Modular Programme.

A3.7.5 External Examiners’ reports
i. As the annual reports are key documents in assuring the academic standards of the University’s awards, it is essential that external examiners’ reports are comprehensive and that they cite the evidence upon which their judgements and comments are based. Reports for collaborative programmes are, where appropriate, expected to distinguish between issues that relate to the home programme and those that relate to the provision delivered by different partners. If, in the judgement of the University, a report is inadequate the external examiner may be asked by the APQO to resubmit it. Failure to submit reports in a timely fashion, or to provide them to an adequate standard in the required format, will be regarded as grounds upon which to terminate an external examiner’s contract.

ii. An external examiner has the right to report directly to the Vice Chancellor on matters which they consider to pose a serious risk to the academic standards of an Oxford Brookes award. They are provided with guidance on how to do this in the External Examiner’s Handbook, along with information about how to make use of the QAA’s causes for concern procedure in the event that an issue cannot be satisfactorily addressed through internal procedures.

Processing of external examiners' reports
iii. Annual reports should be submitted by email on an electronic template to the External Examiners Administrator (via the registry-externals@brookes.ac.uk email address). Receipt will be acknowledged by the Academic Policy and Quality Office, who will then make arrangements for payment of the examiner’s fee. The APQO will also identify late reports and send out reminders to external examiners.

iv. Once received, the report is sent to the Subject Coordinator or Programme Lead, and/or the Liaison Manager (for collaborative provision) and Faculty staff responsible for academic quality and standards: namely, the Associate Dean (Student Experience), the Principal Lecturer for QA, and the Faculty Quality Officer. The report will then be reviewed by the Faculty link Quality Assurance Officer, in order to ensure that no student or staff names are mentioned, and then published on PIP to enable access by other members of the programme team and students on the programme. For collaborative provision, the Liaison Manager is responsible for ensuring that reports are copied to the programme manager at the partner organisation.
v. Responses are prepared by the Subject Coordinator or Programme Lead, liaising as necessary with the Associate Dean (Student Experience) and Directorates to incorporate responses to any institutional issues that have been raised. Responses should be approved by the Faculty AESC Chair and sent out to the external examiner within six weeks of the report, copied to the APQO through the liaison QAO.

vi. The report will also form part of the evidence considered during the annual review process at both programme and Faculty level. Any issues identified for action by the external examiner should be included in the annual review action plan at the appropriate level, and this should also be sent to the external examiner. An annual summary of institutional issues, identified good practice and areas of concern (that are serious, or common across a number of reports) is prepared by APQO for AESC. External examiners’ reports, together with responses from programme teams, also provide direct evidence on the quality and standards of provision which is considered by periodic review panels and revalidation panels.

Freedom of Information

vii. The University does not place the full reports received from external examiners in the public domain, but under the Freedom of Information Act it may be asked to release them on request. The information released in response to requests for the personal details of external examiners will be limited to name, job title and the name and address of the examiner’s employer as this concerns an examiner’s professional and working life and such information is considered to be already in the public domain. If an examiner is retired, they will be described as ‘independent’.

A3.7.6 Players

i. Academic staff

It is the responsibility of academic teams to nominate external examiners for their provision, ensuring nominees meet the University’s criteria for appointment and providing additional information to support nominations where necessary.

Academic teams are also responsible for providing external examiners with sufficient evidence to enable them to make their judgements. They should send, on an annual basis, information about the programme, including the aims, intended learning outcomes, curriculum content, teaching, learning and assessment strategies, and assessment modes and weighting (these details will be held in programme and module handbooks). They should also provide information about the regulations that apply to the programme and the assessment processes, including dates of examination committees.

Academic teams are also responsible for agreeing the sample size for moderation by the external examiner, and for sending scripts, marksheets, and documentation relating to the marking and internal moderation process in good time to enable the external examiner to carry out their duties effectively.

Academic teams are also responsible for preparing timely responses to comments made by external examiners in their annual reports, and for putting in place action to address any shortcomings or to build on good practice identified.

ii. Academic Policy & Quality Office

The APQO is responsible for maintaining an overview of the University’s external examining arrangements. The Office maintains a database of all external examiners across the University and provides Faculties with regular updates on the status of external examiners for their provision. Information relating to external examiner arrangements is maintained on the APQO website.

The APQO is responsible for receiving external examiner nominations following consideration by the relevant Faculty AESC, and submitting them to the Chair of AESC for approval. The APQO issues appointment letters on completion of the appropriate approval process.
The APQO receives external examiners’ reports and processes the payment of fees and expenses. The APQO is also responsible for analysing reports for the production of an annual report to AESC on institutional issues and good practice identified by external examiners across the University.

iii. Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committees
The Faculty AESCs are responsible for considering nominations for external examiners, ensuring that the University’s criteria for appointment are upheld and that nominations are rigorously and consistently assessed. The committees should also monitor nominations to ensure that University guidelines on equality and diversity are adhered to. The Faculty AESCs make recommendations for approval to the University AESC, via the APQO.

The Faculty AESCs are also responsible for ensuring that timely responses are made to external examiners’ comments in their reports, and for monitoring action taken by programme teams to address any issues identified.

iv. Faculty Academic Administration Teams
Faculty Academic Administration teams are responsible, together with the Associate Deans (Student Experience), Principal Lecturers (Quality Assurance) and the APQO, for managing the faculty’s external examining arrangements; for example, coordinating nominations and responses to reports, and ensuring external examiners are provided with the information they require.

v. University Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee
The Chair of AESC is responsible for conferring final approval on external examiner nominations submitted by Faculty AESCs, on the advice of the APQO. The Chair’s decisions are reported to the Committee for ratification.

The University AESC is responsible for monitoring institutional themes arising from external examiners’ reports, and for ensuring that appropriate action is taken at institutional level to address any issues and/or to disseminate good practice.

vi. Examination Committees
The academic regulations relating to the operation of examination committees can be found at (A3.8)

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Head of Academic Policy & Quality Office.

Approved:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 15th September 2010

Last updated: August 2014
A3.8.1 Purpose of Examination Committees
The purpose of Examination Committees is – on behalf of the Academic Board - to assess students in accordance with the regulations applying to the programme/s under consideration, and make recommendations for progression or the conferment of academic awards on students who have demonstrated they have met the requirements of the award. They are also responsible for confirming the award of University prizes (see A1.1.14). Examination Committees are a key element in the University’s framework for safeguarding the academic standards of its awards.

Key reference points:
- UK Quality Code (Section B6: Assessment of students and the accreditation of prior learning)
- UK Quality Code (Section B7: External examining)
- Student Central: Guidance on Examination Committees

A3.8.2 Appointment of Examination Committees
For every approved programme of study leading to an award of the University there must be an Examination Committee, whose constitution and terms of reference accord with the approved regulations for the programme, and which includes the external examiner/s approved by the University. A single Examination Committee may be responsible for more than one programme of study, and the constitution of the Committee may include provision for the appointment of subsidiary examination committees.

The Examination Committee is appointed by the Academic Board, or a body authorised by it (the Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee), and is accountable to that body for the fulfilment of its terms of reference.

A3.8.3 Jurisdiction of Examination Committees
When a module and its assessment may contribute to more than one award, the Examination Committee responsible for one of these shall be designated as the one responsible for the assessment concerned and shall award marks or otherwise make judgements about individual candidates' performance. The consequence of these results for the purposes of progression and the award shall be matters for the Examination Committee responsible for the award for which the candidate is registered and subject to the regulations governing that award.

A3.8.4 Membership of Examination Committees
An Examination Committee should, as a minimum, consist of:
- Chair;
- Secretary;
- at least one serving external examiner;
- at least two other members of staff responsible for examining on the programme/s under consideration (the module leaders of all modules being considered by the Examination Committee should be present, if possible).
For collaborative provision, the constitution of the Examination Committee must be set out in the Operations Manual governing the arrangements.

Chairs and Secretaries
Chairs of Examination Committees must be suitably senior and experienced members of University staff. Examination Committee chairs are appointed by the relevant Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, acting through delegated authority from the Academic Board. The Chair will normally be the Programme Lead; or other suitable individual, as agreed by the Faculty AESC.

All staff appointed as Examination Committee Chairs and Secretaries must attend one of the compulsory training sessions coordinated by the Directorate of Academic and Student Affairs prior to chairing or acting as secretary at an Examination Committee meeting. All staff are then required to attend the training again within 3 years of their first/last attendance at the training in order to continue to serve as Chair or Secretary. While not compulsory, all Chairs and Secretaries are still expected to attend the bi-annual Examination Committee Briefing in order to remain up to date with ongoing changes to regulations and procedures.

The appointed Liaison Manager must be present at Examination Committees convened to consider students on collaborative programmes. The Liaison Manager may chair the Examination Committee if they are suitably qualified to do so (as stated above).

The Secretary of the Examination Committee will normally be the Programme Administrator for one of the programmes under consideration, as approved by the Faculty Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee. The Secretary is responsible for ensuring that comprehensive and accurate documentation is prepared for consideration by the Committee, and for preparing minutes of the meeting which provide a detailed and accurate record of the Committee’s proceedings.

Together, the Examination Committee Chair and Secretary are responsible for managing proceedings, and ensuring due process is followed.

External Examiners
According to the UK Quality Code (chapter B7) published by the Quality Assurance Agency, attendance at Examination Committees is a fundamental aspect of the external examiner’s role. An external examiner must be present at all Examination Committees making recommendations for awards (including those convened to consider re-assessments), and no recommendation for the conferment of an award of the University may be made without the written consent (the signing of the awards list) of an approved external examiner.

Students
No student may be a member of an Examination Committee, or attend an examiners’ meeting other than as a candidate for assessment. Internal or external examiners for the programme/s under consideration, who are currently students on a different programme, are not considered as students in this context.

A3.8.5 Authority of Examination Committees
The Examination Committee is authorised to assess students in accordance with the assessment regulations, including any professional standards, applying to the programme/s of study for which it is responsible, and to recommend the conferment of an award of the University upon a student who, in the judgement of the Committee, has fulfilled the objectives of the approved programme of study and achieved the academic and, where relevant, professional, standard required for the award. An Examination Committee may not award academic credit or recommend awards unless it has evidence of the candidate’s achievement of the requirements for the award.

An Examination Committee is responsible for the approval of recommendations for the award of credit for prior learning against the requirements of the programme/s for which it is responsible. See also section A2.5 on Accreditation of Prior Learning.

The approved Examination Committee or its formally constituted subsidiary examination committees (see A3.8.6 below) must be responsible for all assessments that contribute to the recommendation of an award.
award within its jurisdiction (see above). No other body has authority to recommend conferment of an award, nor to amend the decision of an approved and properly constituted Examination Committee acting within its terms of reference and in accordance with the regulations for the programme of study. ‘Pre-exam committee’ meetings may be held in order to ensure that documentation is accurate and complete prior to the formal meeting, but they do not have any formal status (nor do any minutes that may be taken during the pre-meetings) and no decisions can be made by them.

An Examination Committee shall, however, accept a penalty relating to a student’s marks or award imposed by a Disciplinary Officer or Misconduct Committee in accordance with the Student Conduct Regulations and Procedure. Any remaining consequences of such a penalty for a student’s progression and/or award shall then be determined by an Examination Committee in accordance with the assessment regulations for the programme of study and relevant provisions of these Academic Regulations. An Examination Committee may also be required to review a decision or may have that decision annulled (see section on appeals) and matters referred to it as a result of disagreements with or between external examiners may be decided by the Academic Board.

An Examination Committee has no power to redress a grievance relating to teaching, supervision or guidance unless recommended to do so as consequent upon the substantiation of a complaint under the Student Complaint Procedure.

Any disagreement between internal and external examiners which cannot be resolved by an Examination Committee should be referred to the Chair of the Academic Board for resolution.

A3.8.6 Subsidiary Examination Committees

A subsidiary Examination Committee must include at least one approved external examiner and all such external examiners must be informed that they have the right to attend the meeting of the Examination Committee at which decisions on recommendations for award are made. The rights and duties of such external examiners are the same as those of external examiners on the main Committee except that the subsidiary examination committee makes recommendations to the main Committee only. The approved Examination Committee retains responsibility for judging each student’s performance as a whole and deciding, in the light of the objectives of the programme and its assessment regulations, whether any compensation may be allowed for failure in elements of the assessment.

A3.8.7 Delegation of responsibility for assessments

The approved Examination Committee, including external examiners, is also responsible for the reassessment or deferred assessment of students. The Committee may, at the time when it first meets to decide on its recommendations, agree arrangements for delegating that responsibility to a sub-group of itself, which must include at least one external examiner. Such delegation will not be appropriate for all reassessments or deferred assessments; the Committee must be satisfied that it is appropriate in the particular circumstances before agreeing to delegate responsibility.

Chair’s Action may be taken to correct an administrative error made by an Examination Committee, but should not be used in other circumstances unless the scope of the delegation to the Chair has been agreed (and minuted) in advance by the committee as a whole.

A3.8.8 Examination Committee minutes

The Examination Committee Chair and Secretary are responsible for producing detailed and accurate records of the Committee’s proceedings. Exam committee minutes are the formal record of the University’s deliberations and decisions about student progression and awards, and should therefore provide a clear and accurate account of the decisions that have been made by the committee and the reasons behind those decisions. Any prizes awarded to students on the programme/s covered by the Examination Committee should also be recorded in the minutes.

Examination Committee minutes are confidential, and should therefore refer to students by their student numbers and not their names. The minutes are not part of the University’s published information, but may be referred to in the case of an appeal against an Examination Committee decision. Minutes and associated documentation should be stored by the Faculty in a secure, but accessible, location for a
period of ten years, after which they should be archived. The retention of awards lists and Chair’s Action forms is the responsibility of Student Central.

Further guidance on the production of Examination Committee minutes can be found in the template.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

Approved by:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012
Academic Board, 18 July 2012

Last updated:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 5 December 2012 (revisions to 3.8.4)
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 5 March 2014 (revisions to 3.8.4)

Information about the review of and appeal against a decision of an examination committee can be found in Section C.
A3.9.1 Assessment is a matter of judgement, not simply of computation. In assessing a student's work, the examiner is required to judge the standard attained, in accordance with the approved assessment criteria. 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 objectives may be based. If the student's work demonstrates that the learning outcomes have been achieved, a pass grade is assigned on the basis of the grade and level descriptors for the programme; and if the learning outcomes have not been met, an appropriate fail grade is given.

A3.9.2 It is particularly important for students to understand the nature of examiners' discretion and judgement when details of individual marks are made available to them. However, it must be clear to students how their mark has been arrived at, and this should be indicated on the feedback sheet.

**Passing modules**

A3.9.3 The marks for each assessment task are recorded in the student record system with the appropriate weighting, and are used to calculate the overall grade for a module.

A3.9.4 If a student passes a module, by achieving an overall grade of at least the approved pass mark for the module, the credit is awarded by the Examination Committee. It is not possible to re-take a module that has been passed, unless there is an allowance made by a body associated with the programme, which should be explicitly stated in the Programme Specification and approved by the Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee.

A3.9.5 Pass marks for individual modules will be approved by a programme approval panel, and stated in the module handbook and in the module description on PIP. The standard pass marks are 40% for undergraduate modules and 50% for postgraduate modules; however, variations may be approved for modules which relate to professional competences as required by accrediting bodies.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

**Approved by:**
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012
Academic Board, 18 July 2012
A3.10.1 A module is failed if:
   i. the work submitted for assessment is not of a high enough standard to gain an overall pass mark for the module;
   ii. no work has been submitted by the module deadlines, and no application has been made for an extension on the basis of mitigating circumstances;
   iii. the student has committed academic offences and a penalty of failing the module has been imposed.

A3.10.2 The University believes that students should have opportunities to study at their own pace and to redeem an initial failure. However, the University also considers it necessary to limit these opportunities in order to protect the standard of its awards. Programmes of study should therefore be designed for students to complete their studies (including any resits) within a certain standard length of time. Where appropriate, further provision may then be made, in accordance with the regulations governing the programme, for individual students to complete their studies in a shorter time, or to suspend, transfer, or defer completion of their studies.

A3.10.3 Entitlements and regulations for re-sitting assessment tasks or re-taking modules, governing particular types of University awards, are set out in the specific regulations governing the award scheme (UMP, postgraduate taught programmes, postgraduate research programmes, foundation degrees, etc). If not specified in the award scheme regulations, or if a programme does not fall within the scope of one of the University’s specific award schemes, the programme regulations should specify:
   i. the number of re-sit opportunities to which students are entitled for failure on an individual assessment task, and the circumstances under which a re-sit will be permitted (e.g. attainment of a minimum grade at the first attempt);
   ii. the period of time within which work must be submitted for re-assessment (i.e. whether students must re-sit assessments at one level before progressing to the next level of the programme, or whether they are permitted to progress to the next stage of the programme carrying a failed module);
   iii. whether marks awarded for re-assessed work will be capped (e.g. at the minimum pass mark for students passing at re-sit);
   iv. whether students who fail the re-sit opportunity are permitted to re-take the failed module, and the maximum number of times students are permitted to attempt a module;
   v. the requirements to be satisfied when a student is to retake a failed module, including whether marks or grades for successfully completed assignments will be carried forward;
   vi. the maximum credit value for which failure may be condoned for the award (see also 3.11 below).

General requirements

A3.10.4 Programme assessment regulations must specify which or how many elements must be passed for the award and make provision for a student to make good an initial failure. Examination Committees have discretion to interpret these regulations flexibly in the case of individual candidates, subject to the requirements of the principle that an award should only be made when a candidate has fulfilled the objectives of the programme and achieved the required
standard. The Examination Committee shall not unreasonably withhold permission for a student to be reassessed in accordance with course regulations.

A3.10.5 The reassessment of a candidate for an award shall normally take place within the maximum permitted length of the course. The Examination Committee shall specify, in accordance with the regulations applying to the programme, which elements of assessment must be retaken, the form of reassessment and when it is to take place. A student may be required to study certain course components again before reassessment.

A3.10.6 A candidate for reassessment may not demand reassessment in elements which are no longer current in the course. The Examination Committee may, at its discretion, make such special arrangements as it deems appropriate in cases where it is not practicable for students to be reassessed in the same elements and by the same methods as at the first attempt.

Reassessment for other awards

A3.10.7 Candidates who have failed in their first attempt to satisfy the Examination Committee in the assessment for any other award of the University may, where course regulations permit, be reassessed for the award at the discretion of the Board of Examiners on more than one occasion within the maximum planned length of the course. Where course regulations permit, the Examination Committee may alternatively determine that the candidate has achieved the level required for a lower award or permit reassessment for a lower award.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

Approved by:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27th June 2012
Academic Board, 18th July 2012
A3.11.1 Course assessment regulations may provide for an Examination Committee, having due regard to the standard of the award and the course objectives exceptionally and at its discretion, to allow a student's overall performance to compensate for partial failure in the assessment for an award. Course regulations should not provide for the application of compensation to an element that forms a substantial proportion of the assessment for the award, nor to an element that is central to the fulfilment of course objectives.

Approved by:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012
Academic Board, 18 July 2012
A3.12.1 Programme handbooks should describe the arrangements for marking and moderation of assessment tasks, and how marks will be confirmed. Results are published on PIP: they may be released prior to ratification by Examination Committees, and, where this is the case, it should be made clear to students that the marks are provisional. Students should make themselves aware of publication dates for results, as this may affect their rights in respect of making an appeal.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

**Approved by:**
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012
Academic Board, 18 July 2012
A3.13.1 All assessments are intended to determine the skills, abilities, understanding and knowledge of each of the individual students undertaking the assessment. Cheating is defined as conduct (whether successful or not) aimed at deceiving the University into acknowledging a false level of attainment by a student. Cheating including assisting someone else to cheat (including attempting to assist someone else to cheat) may be subject to disciplinary action in accordance with the University’s Disciplinary Procedure. The University takes this issue very seriously and students have been expelled or had their degrees withheld for cheating in assessments. It is important that students having difficulties with their work should seek help from their tutors rather than be tempted to use unfair means to gain marks. Students should not risk losing their degree and undermining all the work they have done towards it.

A3.13.2 Any form of cheating is strictly forbidden under this regulation but, in order to assist understanding, a number of specific forms of cheating are described. These include but are not limited to the following examples:

i. **Submitting other people’s work as your own** – either with or without their knowledge. This includes copying in examinations; using notes or unauthorised materials in examinations; submitting work you have paid for as your own; impersonation – taking an assessment on behalf of or pretending to be another student, or allowing another person to take an assessment on your behalf or pretend to be you.

ii. **Plagiarism** – taking or using another person’s thoughts, writings or inventions as your own. To avoid plagiarism you must make sure that quotations from whatever source are clearly identified and attributed at the point where they occur in the text of your work by using one of the standard conventions for referencing. The Library has a leaflet about how to reference your work correctly and your tutor can also help you. It is not enough just to list sources in a bibliography at the end of your essay or dissertation if you do not acknowledge the actual quotations in the text. Neither is it acceptable to change some of the words or the order of sentences if, by failing to acknowledge the source properly, you give the impression that it is your own work.

iii. **Collusion** – except where written instructions specify that work for assessment may be produced jointly and submitted as the work of more than one student, you must not collude with others to produce a piece of work jointly, copy or share another student’s work or lend your work to another student when it is likely that some or all of it will be copied.

iv. **Duplication** – submitting work for assessment that is the same as, or broadly similar to, work submitted earlier for academic credit, without acknowledgement of the previous submission.

v. **Falsification** – the invention of data, its alteration, its copying from any other source, or otherwise obtaining it by unfair means, or inventing quotations and/or references.

vi. **Custom writing services** – this includes the use of any service which produces custom materials. The University may consider any request placed with any form of custom writing service to be a form of cheating, whatever use is then made of the material produced, and therefore to be an offence under the Student Conduct Regulations. This extends to include
any request for any piece of work (either formative or summative assessment or work which is not linked to any form of assessment or credit-bearing element of your programme) including, but not limited to, essays and dissertations (including outlines and guides), reports, exam notes, proposals, posters, presentations, the editing or improvement of existing work, statistical services and computing services including programme and code development.

vii. **Assisting others to cheat** – The University considers assisting others to cheat (including attempting to assist someone else to cheat) as a form of cheating for which the individual student providing assistance is culpable.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

**Approved by:**
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 27 June 2012
Academic Board, 18 July 2012

**Last updated:**
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 31 October 2012 (revisions to sections 3.3.7 and 3.13)

i. The University adopts a core Grading Scheme for all its taught provision except where a specific exemption has been considered and agreed. This section of the University Regulations sets out the core Grading Scheme. Variations to the core Grading Scheme may be considered at the University Academic Enhancement and Standards Committee (AESC) upon the recommendation of a Faculty AESC.

ii. The core Grading Scheme includes both Final Grades and Provisional Grades. Except where explicitly stated otherwise in these Regulations, Provisional Grades must be resolved to a Final Grade by no later than the last meeting of an Examination Committee for a given take of a module.

iii. The final summative judgement of a student’s performance in an attempt at a module is expressed first as a percentage. Grades and Grade Points where applicable, are derived automatically for each attempt at a module according to the percentage.

A3.14.2. Final Grades

i. Final Grades at level 6 or below for students outside the Grade Point Average (GPA) scheme (see Regulation A3.14.5.ii below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pass / Fail</th>
<th>Classification Equivalent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 – 100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>First Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Upper Second Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Lower Second Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 49</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
<td>Capped pass at resit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 39</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Fail at resit. Where the marks at the initial assessment and at resit differ, the higher mark will be awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 39</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Fail grade showing that either the student was withdrawn from the programme and thereby not entitled to resit or the student did not attempt the resit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Fail. Not entitled to re-assessment without retaking the module.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. Final Grades at level 6 or below for students within the Grade Point Average (GPA) scheme (see Regulation A3.14.5.ii below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Point</th>
<th>Pass / Fail</th>
<th>Classification Equivalent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75 – 100</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>First Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 – 74</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>First Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 69</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Upper Second Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 64</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Upper Second Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 59</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Lower Second Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 54</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Lower Second Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 49</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
<td>Where a capped resit has been granted the maximum mark which can be achieved is 40D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Third Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 39</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Fail at resit. Where the marks at the initial assessment and at resit differ, the higher mark will be awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 39</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Fail grade showing that either the student was withdrawn from the programme and thereby not entitled to resit or the student did not attempt the resit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Fail. Not entitled to re-assessment without retaking the module.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Final Grades at level 7 or above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Pass / Fail</th>
<th>Classification Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 – 100</td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>MERT</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 49</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 49</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv. Final Grades at any level. Attempts at any module which result in one of the Final Grades listed in this table are excluded from the GPA calculation (see A3.14.5.v below), with the exception of credit grades with marks CR, CF and CE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>An Ungraded Pass when assessment based on pass/fail only. On acceptable modules Honours classification will be taken over fewer modules.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Exemption, the module does not have to be passed to satisfy the requirements of an award but neither will it count towards the requirements of an award if taken.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Transferred certificated credit. Equivalent learning has been achieved elsewhere. The module (and marks if any) may be used to satisfy the requirements of an award. A CR grade without marks is an ungraded credit.</td>
<td>0 – 100 or Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Transferred certificated credit failed. Equivalent learning has been failed elsewhere. The credit will count against total number of modules taken.</td>
<td>0 – 39 or Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Credit for experiential learning which has been assessed. The module may be used to satisfy the requirements of an award. A CE grade without marks is an ungraded credit.</td>
<td>0 – 100 or Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>An Ungraded pass arising from mitigating circumstances. This grade can only be awarded in the final semester of a graduating programme.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Module take disregarded through mitigation: a grade showing that the subsequent take of the module will stand and this take will not count toward the requirements of an award.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>Module take withdrawn through mitigation: a grade showing that the previous take of the module will stand and this take will not count toward the requirements of an award</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT</td>
<td>Administrative Extension Final: a grade showing that the Examination Committee has been unable to finalise the grade/mark for technical/procedural reasons, including problems with placement providers. This grade is not used in relation to mitigating circumstances. This grade can be used at the first Exam Committee if it is not appropriate to use the EXR grade. This grade will remain on the student record against the appropriate take of the module and will not count towards the requirements of an award. The subsequent take of the module will stand.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZR</td>
<td>Module take disregarded through approved changed assessment arrangements: a grade showing that the subsequent take of the module will stand and this take will not count toward the requirements of an award.</td>
<td>0 - 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A3.14.3. Provisional Grades**

i. All Provisional Grades may be used for modules at any level of study.

ii. The following are Provisional Grades that must be resolved to one of the final grades by the Examination Committee following the resit opportunity, i.e. by the final Examination Committee within the take of a module.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Resit of coursework only: if passed at resit, the mark obtained will be capped.</td>
<td>30 – 39 (30 – 49 at level 7 or above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>Resit of examination only: if passed at resit, the mark resit obtained will be capped.</td>
<td>30 – 39 (30 – 49 at level 7 or above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Resit of both coursework and examination: if passed, the mark obtained will be capped.</td>
<td>30 – 39 (30 – 49 at level 7 or above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Resit through mitigation of coursework only: the mark obtained at resit will be un-capped.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Resit through mitigation of examination only: the mark resit obtained at resit will be un-capped.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>Resit through mitigation of coursework and examination: the mark obtained at resit will be un-capped.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>Deferred Administrative: a grade showing that the Examination Committee has yet to finalise the grade/mark for technical/procedural reasons, including problems with placement providers. This grade is not used in relation to mitigating circumstances.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXR</td>
<td>Administrative Extension Resit: a temporary grade showing that the first Examination Committee has been unable to finalise the grade / mark for technical/procedural reasons, including problems with placement providers. This grade is not used in relation to mitigating circumstances. This grade will allow students extra time to complete the requirements for a module up until the resit submission deadlines.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZC</td>
<td>Resit through approved changed assessment arrangements of coursework only: the mark obtained at resit will be un-capped.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZE</td>
<td>Resit through approved changed assessment arrangements of examination only: the mark obtained at resit will be un-capped.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB</td>
<td>Resit through approved changed assessment arrangements of coursework and examination: the mark obtained at resit will be un-capped.</td>
<td>0 – 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. The following Provisional Grade must be resolved to one of the Final Grades by a date set by the Examination Committee at which the grade is awarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>Deferred Disciplinary: the module grade and all further Examination Committee decisions are deferred pending the outcome of the disciplinary process.</td>
<td>Ungraded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A3.14.4. ECTS Grade Equivalence**

i. When a European transfer is agreed the other institution should provide a transcript in which the study is specified as ECTS credits. These units are twice the size of the units used in the UK so that 7.5 ECTS credits correspond to one module credit at Brookes. If the results are reported as ECTS grades (A, B, C, D, E) then a mark should also be transferred as specified on form M8 Euro using Schedule 4 below. Institutional grades may only be transferred with marks if a complete schedule has been recommended by the relevant Faculty Academic Enhancement and Standards Committee and approved by the Combined Studies Examination Committee.
ii. This column labelled “Incoming ECTS Grade Percentage Equivalence” shows the mark that will be awarded at Brookes when a student has been awarded a grade within the range specified at another institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Range</th>
<th>ECTS Grade</th>
<th>Incoming ECTS Grade Percentage Equivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70 – 100</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 69</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 59</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 – 54</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 46</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>FX</td>
<td>30 – 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0 – 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A3.14.5. Grade Point Average

i. The Grade Point Average (GPA) is the mean average of a student’s performance over a group of modules. This group of modules may vary, e.g. it may be all the modules taken by a student during their time at Brookes, all modules taken to date, or only those modules taken in a given academic year. The rules for deriving the GPA, however, remain the same in all cases. Unless otherwise qualified, the GPA refers to a student’s performance on all the modules taken as part of their programme according to the rules herein described.

ii. Students included within the GPA scheme (whether full- or part-time) are those on a programme leading to an award at Level 6 or below with a commencement date as follows:

- entering Stage 1 (year 1) of their programmes on or after 1 September 2013; or
- entering Stage 2 (year 2) of their programmes on or after 1 September 2014 provided no credit will be counted towards their programme which was awarded before 1 September 2013; or
- entering Stage 2 (year 3) of their programmes on or after 1 September 2015 provided no credit will be counted towards their programme which was awarded before 1 September 2013.

All students who started Stage 1 before 1 September 2013 will continue under the grading scheme in force at the time they entered their programme and will be outside the GPA.

iii. The calculation of the degree classification is entirely independent of the calculation of the GPA. Rules concerning the classification of degrees are contained in the relevant Specific Regulations for the programme concerned.

iv. The GPA is a mean average with each module counting equally according to its credit value, i.e. 1 credit carries equal weighting irrespective of level, subject, when taken etc. This means that, for example, at level 4, 5, or 6 a single module (15 credits) counts once in the calculation of the GPA, a double module (30 credits) counts twice and so on.

v. Unless specifically exempted, all attempts at a module count in the classification of the GPA. Only attempts at a module which result in the award of one of the Final Grades listed in the table at A5.2iv above are specifically excluded from the GPA calculation.

vi. All repeated attempts at a module will count towards the GPA each time the module is attempted (unless exempted for one of the reasons specified in A3.14.5.v above). Failed attempts, for example, count as a zero in the GPA calculation; they are not excluded from the calculation.
vii. The GPA is calculated to two decimal places and although a simple mean average, the maximum GPA is capped at 4.00. Eligibility to receive an award is not dependent in any way upon a student’s GPA and a student may therefore graduate with any GPA up to and including 4.00.

viii. The GPA is printed on a student’s degree certificate along with their degree classification.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Academic Registrar.

Approved by: Academic Board, 11 July 2013

Last updated:
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 4th Dec 2013 (update to 3.14.2.iv and 3.14.3.ii)
Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 28th Jan 2015 (update to 3.14.2.iv and 3.14.3.ii)
Mitigation for errors on examination papers, or disturbances during examination sittings, will be given in accordance with the tariffs set out in the table below. Where a re-sit of the examination is offered, in any of the situations detailed below, this will be an uncapped re-sit, marked as a first sitting of the affected assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Exam</th>
<th>Error/issue*</th>
<th>Example/s*</th>
<th>Mitigation Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Exam room evacuation</td>
<td>Fire alarm</td>
<td>Resit offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Exam room significant disturbance or medical emergency</td>
<td>Student suffering a fit in the exam room, mass technical failure in a PC exam</td>
<td>Resit offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Spelling, grammar, punctuation or numbering problem that does not change the meaning of the question</td>
<td>Missing comma, jumping from question 1 to 3</td>
<td>No additional mitigation required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Duplicate question</td>
<td>The same question is included in two places on the paper</td>
<td>One question should be removed from the total marks available. If the student got the question right on either occurrence then they should get the mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Duplicate answers</td>
<td>Option A and option C have the same answer against them</td>
<td>The question should be removed from the total marks available. This must not be more than 10% of the marks available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Ambiguous question/s worth up to 10% of the marks of the exam</td>
<td>Question has 2 different answers which are both correct</td>
<td>Question is discounted from the marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Question has different interpretations not represented in the answers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Ambiguous question/s worth over 10% of the marks of the exam</td>
<td>Question has 2 different answers which are both correct</td>
<td>Resit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Issue Description</td>
<td>Mitigation Required</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Choice</td>
<td>Confusing or impossible question</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Question has no correct answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations based paper</td>
<td>Punctuation or numbering problem that does not change the meaning of the question</td>
<td>No additional mitigation required</td>
<td>Missing comma, jumping from question 1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculations based paper</td>
<td>Confusing or impossible question</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Question gives an incorrect formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long or short prose answers</td>
<td>Spelling, grammar, punctuation or numbering problem that does not change the meaning of the question</td>
<td>No additional mitigation required</td>
<td>Missing comma, jumping from question 1 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long or short prose answers</td>
<td>Ambiguous questions where there is more than one correct interpretation</td>
<td>Marking should be adjusted so all reasonable interpretations of the question can gain full marks</td>
<td>Not being clear whether a student should give one factor affecting a decision or multiple factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long or short prose answers</td>
<td>Ambiguous question/s worth up to 10% of the marks of the exam</td>
<td>Question is discounted from the marking</td>
<td>Question has 2 different answers which are both correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long or short prose answers</td>
<td>Ambiguous question/s worth over 10% of the marks of the exam</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Question has 2 different answers which are both correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long or short prose answers</td>
<td>Ambiguous or confusing questions where the meaning is substantially lost</td>
<td>Resit</td>
<td>Question has different interpretations not represented in the answers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note that the above list is not exhaustive as issues may arise which do not easily fit in any of the categories and examples given.

For further information about these regulations, please contact the Head of Examinations.

**Approved by:** Academic Enhancement & Standards Committee, 2 December 2015