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Boards of Examiners

# Introduction

* 1. This code of practice presents all matters relating to the scope and operation of boards of examiners applying to modules and programmes classified as on-campus or collaborative.
  2. This code **should** be read in conjunction with the related codes on External Examining, Assessment Procedures and University Programme Regulations.
  3. The purpose of this code is to make explicit the University’s expectation for the conduct of boards of examiners taking into account external expectations, including defining the roles and responsibilities of all staff involved.

## Authority

* 1. The University Education Student Experience Committee is the final arbiter of the application and interpretation of this code of practice.

Applications for exemption to this Code will be determined by the Education Student Experience Committee on the advice of Quality and Standards Committee.

## Scope

* 1. This code applies to all programmes of study and modules (including those offered as ‘stand-alone’\*) classified as taught by the Education Planning Committee and leading to a University of Hull award.
  2. This code does not apply to modules when they are offered as part of degrees classified as research and falling within the scope of the Research Degrees Committee. Postgraduate taught modules which are part of research degrees **must** be considered by the relevant module board and the outcomes reported to the Doctoral College which will establish a programme board to determine eligibility for research awards.

\* where modules are ‘self-standing’ a module board **must** be held to confirm the mark and award the credit, but no programme board is required.

# Application to Collaborative Provision

* 1. This code **must** be applied in respect of boards of examiners for all modules and programmes classified as collaborative provision. Any exemptions to this code **must** be requested through Academic Services.

# Internal Examiners

* 1. The Head of Academic Unit **must** identify individuals who will be responsible for the assessment of a module, which **should** occur prior to the commencement of that module. Internal Examiners are defined as any employee of the University of Hull (including partner institution staff with recognised teacher status) that participates in the assessment of students. Where an internal examiner is employed by a partner institution and appointed to examine collaborative provision, they **must** have been granted the appropriate Recognised Teacher Status (RTS) prior to commencing examining.

# Boards of Examiners

* 1. The University requires two levels of boards of examiners, both of which have separate and distinct responsibilities:

1. Module boards verify module marks awarded to candidates for summative assessment tasks,
2. Programme boards verify progression between programme stages, to awards, and where applicable the classification of awards.
   1. Under no circumstances may module and programme boards alter any decision made by the other. Neither may impose a penalty for plagiarism or other academic misconduct. A programme board, acting on information not available to module boards, may invite the chair of a module board to consider whether the marks verified for a specified module(s) were appropriate.
   2. Before boards of examiners’ meetings, pre-boards **must** take place, including boards that are verifying module marks following reassessment.
   3. Note: only formal module boards can verify marks.
   4. Collaborative boards **should** be conducted following agreement between partner institution Higher Education (HE) managers and University moderator(s) / link person.

## Chairs of Boards of Examiners

* 1. Heads of Academic Units **must** consult with the Dean before appointing chairs of module and programme boards. In collaborative provision agreement **must** be reached between the partner institution HE manager and the University Dean.

\*Note: Appropriately qualified Professional Services Staff may chair boards, subject to the approval of the Dean.

* 1. Chairs **should** be appointed for a period of three years, a period which may be renewed. Each chair **should** attend/participate in the University briefing session provided by the University before their first board and **should** receive annual updates provided by the University unless otherwise directed by the Education Student Experience Committee.
  2. Chairs are responsible for ensuring that the board is conducted in accordance with University Programme Regulations, the requirements of this code of practice and in accordance with the principles of rigour, fairness, transparency and consistency.

## Secretaries of Boards of Examiners

* 1. Faculty Business Managers and partner institution HE managers are responsible for designating staff as secretaries to module and programme boards. Secretaries **must** undertake a briefing session provided by the University prior to attending their first board and thereafter **should** receive annual updates unless otherwise directed by the Education Student Experience Committee.
  2. Secretaries **should** be able to provide advice to the Chair on University regulations and procedures.

# Module Boards

## Membership

* 1. A module board **must** comprise:
     1. A chair appointed in accordance with 4.6 and 4.7 above,
     2. The relevant internal examiners,
     3. For collaborative provision, the designated Academic Contact or person acting on their behalf,
     4. A secretary who **mus**t not be the same person as the chair.
  2. NOTE: All relevant external examiners are expected to attend the Module Boards of Examiners.
  3. A module board may be attended by one or more observers, for example a member of the relevant University faculty or the Quality Support Service.
  4. A module board will be deemed quorate where the chair and at least 50% of the internal examiners (excluding sessional tutors), are participating in the meeting. Any decisions made by an inquorate board will remain provisional until confirmed by a board which is quorate. Where the external examiner is unable to attend, the board is still deemed quorate and may proceed.
  5. Where an external examiner is unable to attend, they **must** be provided with the opportunity to provide relevant comments prior to the board.

## Agenda

* 1. Boards **must** have a formal agenda, which **should** be circulated in advance and **must** cover the following: (exemplar template included in Appendix 1)
     1. Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting,
     2. Report of chair’s action (if any),
     3. Declaration of conflicts of interest (including personal relationships with students, involvement in complaints or disciplinary investigations),
     4. Matters arising,
     5. Confirmation of the weighting of assessment components for the module,
     6. Decisions of the Additional Consideration Committee,
     7. Report of ongoing academic misconduct investigations and any resolved cases
     8. Confirmation of the module marks,
     9. Feedback/general comments from the internal examiners,
     10. Feedback from the external examiner(s),
     11. Date of next meeting.

## Anonymity

* 1. Module boards **must** be conducted anonymously, that is referring to candidates by their student number rather than name.

## Academic Misconduct

* 1. The module board **must** be informed of all academic misconduct cases, including those currently ongoing as well as those resolved, and the penalty imposed in accordance with the Regulations for Academic Misconduct. Where the board is informed of a penalty imposed in accordance with the Regulations the board **must** apply that penalty to the module in question and confirm the mark. Under no circumstances is a module board permitted to change the outcome of the Academic Misconduct process. Where a case is ongoing the module board **must** defer decision for the candidate(s) in question.

## Confirmation of Marks

* 1. Agreement of the marks awarded, and therefore resolution of any disagreement between markers, **should** be achieved before the module board sits. The board **should** focus on confirming the marks awarded taking into account any additional consideration reports and any penalties for academic misconduct. In the event that a disagreement has not been resolved, the chair is the final arbiter of the mark to be awarded following consultation with members of the board, including the external examiner(s).
  2. In confirming the marks awarded the board’s decision **must** be informed by the relevant module results data, which includes comparing the current range of marks with those in previous years and on other modules at the same level. Boards **must** consider any anomalies which become apparent and take steps to address any unfairness, including re-scaling marks where appropriate. Mark profiles are only an indicator that there may be issues with assessment, and this will require further investigation by the module leader, ideally prior to the module board. If the module board deems there to have been unfairness it **must** take steps to mitigate the advantage or disadvantage to the students.
  3. The board **must** ensure that for all students, it is clear whether it is a first attempt or reassessment being considered, and **must** ensure that in the case of reassessment, that the mark for that component is capped at the pass mark. If the reassessment is failed, the higher of the two marks **must** be confirmed.

## Recording of marks

* 1. For on campus provision, the marks confirmed by the module board **must** be recorded on the Student Records System by a deadline specified by Academic Services. Marks cannot be amended without the agreement of Academic Services acting under Chair’s action, which **must** be reported to the next module board.
  2. For collaborative provision, partner institutions are responsible for ensuring that the marks confirmed by module boards are properly and accurately recorded, made available to the programme board, and for purposes of notification of results and official transcripts.
  3. Module marks **must** be recorded to the nearest whole number.

## Minutes

* 1. The Chair is responsible for approving the minutes of the module board. Minutes **must** be recorded in accordance with 8.5 and 8.6 below.
  2. Copies of the approved minutes **should** be stored in the relevant electronic files.

# Programme Boards

* 1. A programme board **must** comprise:
     1. A chair appointed in accordance with 4.6 and 4.7 above,
     2. The relevant programme director (including the lead from other academic units where the programme is a combined programme),
     3. For collaborative provision, the designated Academic Contact or person acting on their behalf,
     4. A secretary who **must** not be the same person as the chair.
  2. NOTE: external examiners are invited to participate in the Programme Boards of Examiners, but attendance is not a requirement.
  3. A programme board may be attended by one or more observers, for example a member of the relevant University faculty or the Quality Support Service.
  4. A programme board will be deemed quorate only where the chair and the programme directors/leads are attending the meeting. Where an external examiner is unable to attend, they **must** be provided with the opportunity to provide relevant comments prior to the board.
  5. For collaborative provision, a representative of the University **must** be present, either in person or via remote access (for example Teams).

## Agenda

* 1. Each programme board **must** have a formal agenda, which **should** be circulated in advance and **must** cover the following: (exemplar template included in Appendix 2)
     1. Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting,
     2. Report of chair’s action (if any),
     3. Declaration of conflicts of interest (including personal relationships with students, involvement in complaints or disciplinary investigations),
     4. Confirmation of the classification weighting for the programme (where applicable),
     5. Matters arising (including consideration of candidates referred at the previous stage),
     6. Decisions of the Additional Consideration Committee relevant to the programme board,
     7. Progression decisions for each stage of the programme,
     8. Progression to the award (for candidates on the final stage of an award) and classification (where applicable),
     9. Feedback/general comments from the internal examiners,
     10. Feedback from the external examiner(s) (where available),
     11. Date of next meeting.

## Anonymity

* 1. Programme boards are not required to be conducted anonymously.

|  |
| --- |
| *Explanatory note:*  *Where students are referred to by name in the board, the students preferred name will be used.* |

# Consideration of Cases

## Role of programme board

* 1. Programme boards are responsible for determining the progression of students between the stages of a programme and to an award including, where applicable, determining the classification of the award. Under no circumstances is a programme board permitted to change the marks of a module. A programme board, acting on information not available to module boards, may invite the chair of a module board to consider whether the marks verified for a specified module(s) were appropriate.

## Information required by the board

* 1. Before considering each candidate for progression, the board **must** have the following relevant information from the module board:
     1. the marks for all modules relevant to the programme being considered (including modules delivered by other academic units),
     2. the record of compensation, condonement and referral for each stage for each candidate (with any modules passed following referral removed from the total),
     3. the weighted average (to one decimal place) of any stage which is relevant to classification,
     4. the details of ongoing academic misconduct cases (where the module board has necessarily deferred decision on the module in question),
     5. the decisions of Academic Misconduct Panels relevant to the programme being considered (i.e., penalties relating to compensation, condonement and referral, and decisions to determinate a candidate’s programme),
     6. decisions of the Additional Consideration Committee (ACC) relevant to the programme being considered.

***\*******Academic Misconduct***

*The programme board* ***must*** *be informed of all cases where a penalty has been imposed by an Academic Misconduct Panel which relates to the application of compensation, referral or condonement. A programme board is not permitted to override the decision of an Academic Misconduct Panel (for example by granting compensation, referral or condonement where the Panel has determined that this be denied).*

## Viva Voce examinations

* 1. Unless explicitly required by the relevant Professional or Statutory Accrediting body and approved by the Education Student Experience Committee, a programme board **must** not use any form of viva voce examination to resolve a matter falling within the jurisdiction of the board. (This does not restrict the discretion for academic units to use oral forms of formative or summative assessment provided that – for summative assessment – such forms have been stated and approved as part of the module specification).

## Official Results

* 1. The decisions of the programme board, including compensation, referral and condonement, **must** be recorded on the Programme Board Report– which constitutes the official record of the University.

## Recording of results

* 1. For on campus provision, the results confirmed by the programme board will be recorded on the Student Records System.
  2. For collaborative provision, partner institutions are responsible for ensuring that the results confirmed by programme boards are properly and accurately recorded in the format specified by the University.

## Minutes

* 1. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the programme board to ensure that the meeting and decisions reached are formally recorded in the minutes.
  2. The Chair is responsible for approving the minutes of the programme board. Minutes **must** be recorded in accordance with 8.5 and 8.6 below. Copies of the approved minutes **should** be stored in the relevant electronic files.

## Communication of Results

* 1. Results of the decisions of module and programme boards **must** be communicated to students via my Results in the myHullportal. Communication by telephone **must** not be used.
  2. For modules which are not end of stage (for example, non-standard and part time), students are entitled to receive the mark awarded for the element and more substantial feedback (in accordance with the code on assessment procedures) but **must** be informed in writing that the marks awarded are provisional and may be raised or lowered by the module board.
  3. Students are entitled to receive the mark awarded for assessment elements and more substantial feedback (in accordance with the code on assessment procedures) but **must** be informed in writing that the marks awarded are provisional and may be raised or lowered by the module board. Students who have failed elements **must** be informed where reassessment is by resubmission (in accordance with the code on assessment procedures and the relevant programme regulations).
  4. Students **must** not be contacted about their results, or likely results, during the period from marking at the end of the module assessment period to the approval of the programme board decisions. Specifically, students **must** not be contacted prior to, or during, boards of examiners meetings regarding such matters as their likelihood of accepting a particular decision (such as referral, Ordinary degree etc.) unless the approval of the chair of Student Cases Committee has been obtained.
  5. For on campus provision the communication of end of stage results is the responsibility of Academic Services. For students reaching the end of a programme leading to an award this will include an Official Transcript.
  6. For collaborative provision the partner institution is responsible for the communication of results, including the provision of an Official Transcript.

# Module and Programme board minutes

* 1. The minutes of module and programme boards **must** be capable of demonstrating that the board acted in a fair and impartial manner and in accordance with university regulations and codes of practice.
  2. It **should** also be borne in mind that under the General Data Protection provisions of the Data Protection Act 2018, Freedom of Information Act and the Human Rights Act, students may have a right under certain circumstances to see any minutes of discussions regarding them.
  3. Minutes **should** never be verbatim or attribute comments to individual members of staff.
  4. Minutes **must** identify each student through use of a unique identifier (such as student number).

## Module board minutes

* 1. Module board minutes **must** include the following information:
     1. Title – e.g. module board for Fundamental Nursing Skills (Module 123456)
     2. Collaborative Provision – name of partner institution,
     3. Date,
     4. Those present (names - not initials),
     5. Apologies received,
     6. Any declaration of conflict of interest,
     7. A report of any chair’s action since the previous meeting,
     8. A summary of each student case (factors/evidence considered and decision reached) involving any additional consideration(s), academic misconduct, any marking disputes, any issues relating to the learning, teaching or assessment of the module,
     9. A summary of any feedback provided by the internal and external examiners,
     10. Date of next meeting.
  2. It is not necessary to record the confirmed mark for every candidate.

## Programme board minutes

* 1. Programme board minutes **must** include the following information:
     1. Title – e.g., Programme Board for LLB Law (220001) – Honours stage,
     2. Collaborative Provision – name of partner institution,
     3. Date,
     4. Those present (names - not initials and role),
     5. Apologies received,
     6. Any declaration of conflict of interest,
     7. A report of any chair’s action since the previous meeting,
     8. A summary of each student case (factors/evidence considered and decision reached) involving referral, condonement, academic misconduct, additional consideration(s), borderlines cases,
     9. A summary of any feedback provided by the internal and external examiners.
     10. Date of next meeting.
  2. It is not necessary to record the progression/classification decision for every candidate.

# Appendix 1- Exemplar template

**Module Board Agenda**

for

[Insert ACADEMIC UNIT/subject/collaborative partner]

Trimester [1/2/3], Academic Year [2021-22]

held on

[Date] at [time]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Board Membership** | **Attendance Status** | **Deputy** |
| eg David Smith | Module Leader, Chair… | Apologies/Attending | [If apologies received] |
|  |  |  |  |

**1. Apologies for Absence**

**2. Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting**

**3. Report of Chair’s actions**

**4. Declaration of conflicts of interest**

**5. Matters arising**

**6. Decisions of the Additional Consideration Committee**

**7. Report of ongoing academic misconduct investigations and any resolved cases**

**8. Confirmation of the module marks**

* Confirmation of the weighting of module components for the module
* Feedback/general comments from the internal examiner(s)
* Feedback/general comments from the external examiner(s)

**9. Any other business**

**10. Date of next meeting**

# Appendix 2- Exemplar template

Programme Board Agenda

for

[Insert ACADEMIC UNIT/subject/collaborative partner]

Trimester [1/2/3], Academic Year [2021-22]

held on

[Date] at [time]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Board Membership** | **Attendance Status** | **Deputy** |
| eg David Smith | Programme Director, Chair… | Apologies/Attending | [If apologies received] |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Apologies for Absence**
2. **Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting**
3. **Report of Chair’s actions**
4. **Declaration of conflicts of interest**
5. **Matters arising**
6. **Decisions of the Additional Consideration Committee**
7. **Report of ongoing academic misconduct investigations and any resolved cases**
8. **Programme decisions**
   * Confirmation of the classification weighting of the programme
   * Decisions regarding progression
   * Decisions regarding classification
9. **Feedback/comments from the internal examiner(s)**
10. **Feedback/general comments from the external examiner(s)**
11. **Any other business**
12. **Date of next meeting**

# Appendix 3- Exemplar template

Minutes of the Module Board

for

[Insert ACADEMIC UNIT/subject/collaborative partner]

Trimester [1/2/3], Academic Year [2021-22]

held on

[Date] at [time]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Board Membership** | **Attendance Status** | **Deputy** |
| eg David Smith | Module Director, Chair… | Apologies/Attending | [If apologies received] |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting**
2. **Report of Chair’s actions**
3. **Declaration of conflicts of interest**
4. **Matters arising**
5. **Confirmation of module marks**

[Level]

[Module Code and Name]

[Module marks **should** be confirmed by cohort (It is not necessary to record the confirmed mark for every candidate) i.e. ‘All Marks Agreed’ is sufficient. Individual student cases **should** only be reported by exception, for example, where there are outstanding reassessments, extensions or additional consideration.]

1. **External examiners’ comments**
2. **Any other business**
3. **Date of next meeting**

# Appendix 4 – Exemplar template

Minutes of the programme Board

for

[Insert ACADEMIC UNIT/subject/collaborative partner]

Trimester [1/2/3], Academic Year [2021-22]

held on

[Date] at [time]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Board Membership** | **Attendance Status** | **Deputy** |
| eg David Smith | Programme Director, Chair… | Apologies/Attending | [If apologies received] |
|  |  |  |  |

1. **Confirmation of minutes of the previous meeting**
2. **Report of Chair’s actions**
3. **Declaration of conflicts of interest**
4. **Matters arising**
5. **Confirmation of programme marks**

[Programme code, name and stage]

[Programme marks **should** be confirmed by cohort (it is not necessary to record the progression/classification decision for every candidate), i.e. ‘All marks were agreed and all students qualified for progression or award of the degree, with the exception of’……... Individual student cases **should** only be reported by exception, for example, where there are outstanding reassessments, extensions or additional consideration.]

1. **External examiners’ comments**
2. **Any other business**
3. **Date of next meeting**

# Appendix 5 – Scaling policy and procedure

* 1. The following Policy and Procedure sets out the key principles that ***must*** inform the scaling of marks by Module Boards of Examiners. They **must** be applied only by Module Boards of Examiners and so can apply only when minimum thresholds for modules to be considered at such Boards have been met.
  2. The application of scaling by a Module Board of Examiners **should**:
     1. be exceptional and only applied where other approaches (e.g. use of additional markers and/or moderation processes) do not resolve the issue;
     2. correct an unanticipated cohort-wide issue with an assessment and would normally require a review of the relevant assessment strategy and grading criteria ahead of any subsequent running of the module; and
     3. allow for scaling of a cohort’s marks downward as well as upward.
  3. In circumstances where substantial issues have impacted on student performance in a cohort or across institutional cohorts then the application of scaling **must** be considered for all modules (e.g., widespread illness, substantial staff changes, other substantial event) with such consideration recorded by the board and may be applied with a focus of ‘no detriment’ e.g., only allow for scaling of a cohorts marks upwards.
  4. The following key principles underlie our scaling approach:
     1. Only marks for individual assessment elements, not whole modules, can be adjusted by scaling.
     2. Scaling ***must not*** reverse the rank order of students on any element to which it is applied.
     3. Scaling is applied to whole cohort and not to individual students or to sub-sets of the module cohort.
     4. Scaling ***must*** encompass the full range of marks for the element being scaled but can have increased or decreased impact at differing ends of that range - for example, while scaling **must** encompass the full range of raw marks for an element from 0 to 100, it can be calculated so as to lift lower marks more than higher marks so long as the requirement to not reverse the rank order of any pair of students is met.
     5. External Examiners ***must*** always be informed of, and have a chance to comment on, decisions otherwise taken by the Module Board of Examiners to scale marks;
     6. Any scaling applied in the consideration of results by Module Boards of Examiners prior to any reassessment ***must*** then continue to be applied consistently in subsequent Module Boards of Examiners where any remaining marks for extended submissions for that assessment element (i.e. those submitted at a later date) are being finalised.
     7. Only where substantial issues have arisen (e.g., Covid-19) and the assessment of students bridges such substantial issues occurring (e.g. some students were assessed prior to and then some students were assessed post the issues, or in the case of students who complete the assessment as a first sit post the event) can scaling be considered for individual students or smaller groups of students. In these cases, scaling **should** be considered in relation to the students’ or group of students’ wider module performance.

## Triggers and Criteria for Scaling

* 1. The following is an indicative (not exhaustive) list of triggers for scaling to be considered. The occurrence of a trigger on this list does not require that scaling be undertaken but does require that it be considered. In cases where there is unresolved disagreement among the Module Board of Examiners about whether to re-scale the Chair of the Board will be the final arbiter.
     1. A range of marks that is significantly out of line with previous cohorts (i.e., over three previous years or up to that number where applicable – see ‘Determining Whether to Re-scale’, below) on the assessment element or module in question.
     2. A range of marks that is significantly out of keeping with the marks achieved by the same students on other modules at the same level.
     3. A distribution of marks out of keeping with previous cohorts or with the typical expectations for the module or assessment elements – e.g., an unusual concentration of marks or a bimodal curve where a bell curve might have been expected (or the reverse). (*Nb*. scaling ***must*** be applied only to assessment elements and not to overall module marks).
     4. Reasoned evidence of a problem with the relevant assessment element (e.g., where the problem is thought to have arisen from that element having converted to an online assessment element from a non-online original).
  2. The rationale for any decision *not* to re-scale despite the presence of one or more of the triggers above, and likewise the rationale for any decision *to* re-scale for triggers other than those listed above, ***must*** be approved by the Chair of the Module Board of Examiners and explicitly recorded in the minutes. Where scaling is applied the scaling method (see below) ***must*** also be clearly and explicitly recorded in the minutes.

## Determining Whether to Re-scale

* 1. The Module Board of Examiners **must** first establish whether there has been a ‘meaningful’ change (of more than one integer or rounded mark) in the mean assessment mark between the current year and the mean of the previous three years.
  2. Secondly establish whether there has been a substantial change to the distribution of marks. Simply checking whether there has been a change to the mean, in comparison with the previous three years, will not identify whether marks have been either concentrated or dispersed in a different pattern to previous years.
  3. Is there compelling evidence of a substantial change in the mean mark or in the grade distribution compared to the previous three years? If:

**Yes**: scaling is appropriate.

* + 1. Examine the data to determine whether there is evidence of heteroscedasticity, and therefore a disproportionate effect on certain ranges.
    2. If there is no evidence of heteroscedasticity then scale all marks equally.
    3. If there is evidence of heteroscedasticity then mitigate as appropriate by applying a scaling method such as one of those outlined below.

**No**: scaling is not appropriate.

***Explanatory note:***

Heteroscedasticity refers to the circumstance in which the variability of a variable is unequal across the range of values of a second variable that predicts it.

Heteroscedasticity - scedastic means 'the variance of (statistical) errors', and where that variance is stable or linear when monitored over a period of time it is homoscedastic but when the standard error is non-constant (again when monitored over a period of time) it is heteroscedastic (i.e. the standard error is non-constant when monitored over a period of time).  Calculating student marks and potential advantage or disadvantage over time is typically going to involve heteroscedastic variables.

## Scaling Methods

* 1. There is no single, correct scaling method that would be the most appropriate in every case. Four different methods are outlined below but Module Boards of Examiners can employ variations on these so long as the proposed scaling method is in line with the principles already set out, is approved by the Chair of the Board and is explicitly recorded in the minutes.
     1. A simple adjustment is to add or subtract a number of marks from each assessment for example adding 5 marks to all students for results deemed to be low (capping marks at a maximum of 100 if necessary). This method is simple but can be effective in correcting an anomaly.
     2. An alternative, to be used in order to raise low marks, reduce high marks and leave a mark of 50 unchanged, is to convert mark X to a revised mark aX+b, e.g., use the conversion revised mark = 0.8 X + 10.
     3. An alternative adjustment that can lift lower marks proportionately while having decreasing effect on higher grades (and lifting no marks over 100) requires that a percentage of the difference between the original mark and a mark of 100 is added to the original mark. This, then, is to convert mark X to a revised mark of X+((100-X) x Y%). If Y is 10%, for example, a mark of 40 would be raised to 46 (40+((100-40) x 10%) while a mark of 90 would increase to 91 and a mark of 99 would be unchanged (as it would increase to only 99.1).
     4. An alternative sophisticated adjustment that lifts marks in the middle band, especially around the pass-fail boundary, while having a decreasing effect on very high grades or very low grades (which are too far from the pass fail boundary) is Revised mark= 100×(X/100)^Y where X is the original mark (out of 100) and Y is a scaling exponent. Specifically, Y<1 scales the marks up, Y>1 scales the marks down and Y=1 leaves the marks unchanged. The application of this measure can be a strategy to help achieve a desired average mark or proportion of passes for an assessment component.

# Version control

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Author** | **Date approved** | **Relevant sections** |
| 2 26 | Educational Operations Forum | 22 October 2024, ESEC | Para 6.7 – amended to confirm that programme boards are not required to be anonymous. |
| V2 25 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Housekeeping | Error missed in v2 24 revisions:  6.2 NOTE: external examiners are invited to participate in the Programme Boards of Examiners, but attendance is not a requirement. |
| V2 24 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | July 2023, Education Committee | * Replaces Education Committee with Education Student Experience Committee. * Replaces Registry Services with Academic Services. * Removes reference to EE’s confirming decisions made at exam boards where credit is awarded, progression issues are determined, and degrees are awarded. |
| V2 23 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | March 2022, Housekeeping | * Housekeeping changes. * Confirms that only formal boards can verify results (4.4). * Changes to quoracy at boards. The requirement for the Chair and at least 50% of internal examiners are participating in the meeting (5.4 and 6.4). * Changes to communication of results (7.11). * Replaces Mitigating Circumstances with Requests for Extensions and Additional Consideration. * Removes the need for an independent chair (4.6, 5.1, 6.1). |
| V2 22 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Jan 2022, Covid amend | * Housekeeping – re-introduced Covid-19 temporary amendment to para 5.4 and 6.4: * Members of the board may participate remotely, and no member need be physically present. |
| V2 21 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Aug 2021, Education Committee | Reinstates the re-scaling of marks where appropriate (para 24). |
| V2 20 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Feb 2021, Education Committee | Introduces the following temporary amendments in response to the Covid-19 pandemic:   * Establishes the University Oversight Board to verify No Detriment ‘21 outcomes (paras 8 & 9). * Confirms the circumstances in which classification outcomes must be referred to the Oversight Board (para 37). * Removes the opportunity for boards to downscale impacted marks (para 24). |
| V2 19 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Sept 2020, Education Committee | Removes temporary amendments in response to the Covid-19 pandemic with the exception of:   * Extends the range of staff who can chair boards to include appropriately qualified members of Professional Support Services (para 12). This practice will continue. * Removes the requirement for members of boards to be physically present, allowing Boards to be held remotely (paras 18 & 33). This practice will continue where necessary. |
| V2 18 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | May 2020, Education Committee | Introduces the following temporary amendments in response to the Covid-19 pandemic:   * Extends the range of staff who can chair boards to include appropriately qualified members of Professional Support Services (para 12). * Amends the quoracy requirements for Module and Programme Boards (paras 18 & 33). * Removes the requirement for members of boards to be physically present, allowing Boards to be held remotely (paras 18 & 33). * Removes the opportunity for boards to downscale impacted marks (para 24). * Removes the requirement for external examiners to approve Programme Board decisions (para 39). * Introduces Appendix 5 – UoH Scaling Policy and Procedure. |
| V2 17 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Governance | Dec 2019, Education Committee | Removes the requirement for module boards to take place at the end of each trimester and clarifies that where module boards do take place, these must be formal boards (para 30). |
| V2 16 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Governance | Sept 2019, Education Committee | * To clarify arrangements for collaborative provision, that:   + Collaborative partners service their own boards (para 15).   + A representative of the University must be present, either in person or via remote access (for example Skype) (para 34).   + Partner institutions are responsible for ensuring that the results confirmed by programme boards are properly and accurately recorded in the format specified by the University (para 41). * Replaces Student Progress Committee with Student Cases Committee. * Replaces Programme Management Committee with Education Planning Committee. * Replaces University Learning and Teaching Committee with Education Committee. |
| V2 15 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Governance | Sept 2019, University Learning and Teaching Committee | Clarifies that where partner colleges hold module boards at the end of a trimester, these must be formal boards (para 31). |
| V2 14 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Learning Teaching and Enhancement (LTE) | July 2018, University Learning and Teaching Committee (ULTC) | * Changes Student Information System to Student Records System. * Introduces the requirement that Chairs must be independent members of academic staff. * Introduces the requirement for all boards to be conducted anonymously. * Removes the requirement for Deans to be notified if a board is to run without an external examiner. * Amends programme board membership. * Removes reference to progression and borderline candidates. * Requires all boards run in trimester one to be formal. * Removes reference to Official Candidate List for module boards. * Replaces Official Candidate List with Programme Board Report, removes the requirement for chair and external examiner signature. * Clarifies requirements of board agendas and provides exemplar templates. * Removes requirement for Chairs to ‘sign’ minutes to approve. * Other minor amendments |
| V2 13 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Learning Teaching and Enhancement (LTE) | Nov 2017, (ULTC) | * Changes LEAP to Learning and Teaching Enhancement. * Removes reference to Mitigating Circumstances and signposts users to the University Code of Practice: Mitigating Circumstances. * Clarifies the use of borderline within the classification of top up degrees. |
| V2 12 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Learning, Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP) | June 2017, (ULTC) | * Clarifies reassessment, para 33. * Replaces Head of Registry with Student Services Directorate. * Other minor amendments. |
| V2 11 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Learning, Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP) | Aug 2016, (ULTAC) | * Replaces department with school. * Replaces unfair means with academic misconduct. * Other minor amendments. |
| V2 10 | Jane Iddon, Quality Manager, Learning, Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP) | Feb 2016, (ULTAC) | * Amendments to paragraphs 20-21 for clarity. * Updates paragraph 17 in accordance with amendments to UCP: Disability Liaison Officers (QH: K3). * Replaces Programme Approvals Committee with Programme Management Committee (para. 5). |
| V2 09 | Jane Iddon, Quality Manager, Learning, Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP) | Aug 2015, (ULTAC) | Removes an inaccurate statement “University regulations specify that three degrees only may be awarded with classification: Honours and Integrated Masters (UPR Chapter IV) Taught Masters (UPR Chapter VIII)” [paragraph 55]. |
| V2 08 | Quality Officer, Learning, Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP) | May 2014, (ULTAC) | Removes the discretion of Boards of Examiners to deny reassessment on the grounds of attendance (para. 33). |
| V2 07 | Quality Officer | May 2012, (ULTAC) | * Extends the scope of programme board responsibilities (paras. 9 and 49). * Mandatory requirement for decision making at module boards to be informed by the relevant module results data (para. 31). |
| V2 06 | Quality Officer | Sept 2011, Senate | * References to University Learning, Teaching, and Assessment Committee inserted. * Membership of programme board amended to relevant programme director / leader including lead from other departments where the programme is joint or with, plus at least two other internal examiners responsible for modules from the programme (para.43).   Clarifies that the 50% examiner quorum in programme boards excludes sessional tutors (para.45). |
| V2 05 | Quality Officer | March 2011, Senate | Clarifies the scope of borderline cases. |
| V2 04 | Quality Officer | March 2010, Senate | Revised Committee structure. |
| V2 03 | Quality Officer | Oct 2009, Senate | * Clarifies training and annual updating requirements for chairs and secretaries of boards of examiners. * Aligns the code with revised regulations (Oct 09) and removes duplication in relation to the responsibilities of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee. * Provides the published definition of ‘good cause’ as stipulated in the relevant regulation. |
| V2 02 | Quality Officer | May 2009, Academic Board | Extended the explanatory note relating to borderline cases to include a reminder of the borderline rules applicable to transitional cases; there is no substantive change to the code. |
| V2 01 | Quality Officer | Sept 2008, Academic Board | * Replacement of policy on treatment of borderline cases with revised single University approach. * Explanatory note indicates transitional arrangements for students registered at the time the change was approved (07/08). |
| V2 00 | Quality Officer | Nov 2007, Academic Board | * Mandatory requirement to establish Mitigating Circumstances Committees. * Pass with mitigation for defined mitigating circumstances cases. * Module and Programme Boards no longer inquorate if the external examiner cannot attend. * Prohibition on the use of viva voce to determine degree classification |
| V1 00 | Quality Officer | Oct 2001, ULTC | This Code of Practice applies to all examination boards at taught level - module and programme level. |