

LTC15D130

Title: *Review of the Regulations for Higher Degree (Taught Programmes) – Common Masters Framework*

Author: Dr Adam Longcroft (ADTP) & Becky Fitt (LTS)

Date: 3 May 2016

Circulation: LTC – 11 May 2016

Agenda: LTC15A005

Version: Final

Status: Open

Issue

This agenda item addresses the outcomes of the review of the regulations governing taught post-graduate programmes at the University. A working group, chaired by the ADTP, was convened to explore the opportunities that the review presented to streamline and simplify the regulations, and to incorporate those elements of the UG New Academic Model (and encapsulated in the BIM Regulations) which could be usefully and appropriately adopted or integrated within the post-graduate regulations accordingly. The review group met on four occasions and was able to identify a number of revisions to the regulations which are presented here for discussion and subsequent approval by University LTC.

Recommendations

A draft, without the ‘Instructions to Examiners’, was considered by the Taught Programme Policy Group on 13 April 2016. The primary changes to the Regulations are provided in the table below and are reflected in the draft:

<p>Reassessment at the item level – replaces synoptic reassessment</p>	<p>From 2016/17 all students who fail a module will be reassessed in all failed components for the module rather than the ‘synoptic’ reassessments that currently exist. (Approved by LTC 24/6/2015)</p>
<p>Recording module marks as integers and rounding-up rules; stage marks to one decimal place.</p>	<p>From 2016/17 all PGT modules follow the BIM UG mark scheme in which marks within 0.5% of the pass mark are treated as a pass. (Approved by LTC 24/6/2015) Usually ‘Stage’ at postgraduate taught level is most comparable with the completion of the taught component.</p>
<p>Simplification of classification of borderline candidates: algorithms</p>	<p>Algorithms introduced for: Merit Distinction Borderline merit/distinction</p>

Compensation (Condoned Failure)	This has been replaced by compensation - remains at the same level as in current Regulations. The ADTP believes that LTC should monitor use of compensation closely from 2016/17 onwards, and aim to phase out use of compensation over a 5-year period so that it no longer applies by 2021/22 .
Master of Research (MRes)	No longer covered by these Regulations.
Format of the Regulations	The 'Instructions to Examiners' have been incorporated into the main text of the Regulations.
Issue of 30 UG credits in Masters awards? The ADLT in SCI has argued that UEA should adhere to the FHEQ credit requirements which allow for M level awards to include up to a max of 30 UG level 6 credits.	The FHEQ 'allows' this – but doesn't require HEIs to adhere to it. In other words this is optional. The ADTP would counsel LTC to exercise considerable caution before approving this. The CMF requires 100% Master's level modules and taking advantage of the comparatively permissive FHEQ criteria would constitute a significant shift in practice for UEA, and result in Masters students studying alongside UG students on a routine basis, on co-taught modules. The ADTP is not of the view that this is desirable or in keeping with the efforts made at UG level to 'restrict' the freedom to take modules at a lower level than the stage of study in question. Masters students are paying for a Master's level study experience and studying on UG modules hardly seems to be consistent with this.

This Draft requires further refinement as it is the first attempt at merging two documents – the Common Masters Framework 'Regulations' and 'Instructions to Examiners'. A more advanced, definitive copy of the Regulations can be brought forward to the 22 June LTC.

Resource Implications

There are minimal resource implications (e.g. in staff time) associated with the revised recommendations since substantive changes (e.g. reassessment at item level, and recording of module marks as integers, rounding-up rules etc) were previously approved by LTC in June 2015. The revisions summarised here primarily relate to the introduction of new algorithms for the classification of students, compensation arrangements (previously known as condoned failure) and the integration of Instructions to Examiners into the regulations.

Risk Implications

There are no major risk implications associated with the revised regulation as presented here - since they are focused on 'enhancing' the student experience and ensuring more consistent treatment of students (e.g. via the application of the 'algorithm' for borderline candidates. A major 'risk' – the implications of introducing a 'pass all modules' rule at PGT level – has been avoided by continuing to employ 'compensation' (condoned failure) within prescribed boundaries.

Equality and Diversity

There are no equality or diversity implications associated with the proposal. The recommendations contained in the paper are aimed at ensuring more consistent treatment of students and a more consistent student experience.

Timing of decisions

Approval by LTC will result in the revised PGT Regulations being implemented during the 2016/17 academic year.

Further Information

Contact:

Dr Adam Longcroft e mail: a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk

Becky Fitt e mail: R.Fitt@uea.ac.uk

Common Masters Framework Regulations

1 SCOPE OF THESE REGULATIONS

- 1.1 These Regulations govern the assessment, progression and awards for students studying or programmes leading to Postgraduate Certificates, Postgraduate Diplomas and Masters degrees.
- 1.2 These Regulations govern all students who commence on taught FHEQ level 7 courses leading to Postgraduate Certificates, Postgraduate Diplomas and Masters degrees from the academic year 2016/17.
- 1.3 These regulations govern the awards of:
Master of Arts (MA), Master of Business Administration (MBA), Master of Clinical Education (MClEd), Master of Fine Arts (MFA), Master of Laws (LLM), Master of Science (MSc), Master of Surgery (MS), the Postgraduate Diploma (PgDip), Postgraduate Diploma in Clinical Education (PgDipClEd), the Postgraduate Certificate (PgCert), the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and the Postgraduate Certificate in Clinical Education (PgCertClEd).
- 1.4 These Regulations apply to full-time and part-time postgraduate students. Where appropriate these regulations also apply to Visiting and Credit-Only students at postgraduate level.
- 1.5 Alterations to or concessions against these Regulations may be made only with the approval of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate, or by named persons with delegated powers to operate on behalf of the Committee.

2 GENERAL PRECONDITIONS TO AN AWARD

In order to qualify for an award of the University a student must:

- (a) satisfy the general entrance requirements of the University and any entrance requirements relevant to the course; and
- (b) satisfactorily complete a programme of study and assessment in accordance with these Regulations and any specific criteria set out in the relevant Programme Specification.

3 COURSE REQUIREMENTS

3.1 The University shall:

- (a) publish Programme Specifications specifying the content and requirements of each course including any course-specific requirements for assessment and completion;
- (b) publish Course Profiles specifying the modules to be taken, and options available, for each course;
- (c) publish Module Outlines specifying the content and assessment for each module.

- 3.2 Students may be awarded specific credit via Accredited Prior Learning, in accordance with the University's policy:

[http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs\(gen\)/apl_apel-policy](http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs(gen)/apl_apel-policy)

- 3.3 Courses shall consist of:
- (a) 60 FHEQ level 7 credits for a Postgraduate Certificate
 - (b) 90 FHEQ level 7 credits for the Postgraduate Certificate in Education (PGCE)
 - (c) 120 FHEQ level 7 credits for a Postgraduate Diploma
 - (d) 180 FHEQ level 7 credits for a Masters Degree

3.4 Dissertation

A dissertation or research project submitted for a Masters degree (where required within the programme of study) may not incorporate, whether in the same or different form, work which has been submitted to this or any other university for a degree unless the subject of the research is an extension or continuation of research begun for such a degree. In such a case the extent of the material and the degree if any obtained should be indicated.

4 DURATION OF STUDY

- 4.1 Students must enrol for and complete the course within the timescales published in the Programme Specification.

4.2 Extension to a period of study

- 4.2.1 The Learning and Teaching Committee of the Senate may vary or amend the requirements of these Regulations in respect of a particular student. This variation may include the extension by intercalation or repetition or extension of the time allowed, of a student's period of study to a maximum of two years beyond the specified length of the course. In such instances, it may also impose alternative conditions and requirements.
- 4.2.2 Professional, Statutory or Regulatory bodies may impose a shorter maximum period of study, details of which are published in the relevant Programme Specification.

5 MODULE ENROLMENT

- 5.1 Students shall be required to enrol for and complete modules according to the requirements set out in the Programme Specification, Course Profile and Module Outlines, by the deadline published by the Learning and Teaching Service.
- 5.2 No student shall register for more than the credit requirement of their programme as specified in their Programme Specification.
- 5.3 No student shall register for modules that have clashing teaching events.
- 5.4 Course Profiles and the availability of modules are subject to change.
- 5.5 Students are not permitted to take undergraduate level (FHEQ 6 or below) modules.
- 5.6 A student seeking a late module enrolment, or change to enrolment, after Week 4 of the Autumn or Week 2 of the Spring semester must obtain prior approval of the

Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate, on the recommendation of their Head of School or nominee.

5.7 On the recommendation of the appropriate Course Director, the Head of a student's School of Studies may vary a student's course by permitting that student to take up to 40 credits of optional modules which are not included in the specified range of modules for a Masters Degree or Postgraduate Diploma. Such a variation shall not apply to core or compulsory modules. There may be no substitution of modules for a Postgraduate Certificate.

5.8 A student may be suspended from a module which has a practice element/placement where a Professional Code of Conduct applies, pending formal investigation of the circumstances in accordance with published procedures where the Head of School decides that:

- (a) there is *prima facie* evidence that a student's behaviour has jeopardised the welfare of a subject (whether patient, pupil or client);
- (b) and/or has contravened the relevant professional code of conduct;
- (c) and/or the behaviour is incompatible with behaviour required by the relevant profession.

6 STUDY AWAY FROM THE UNIVERSITY

A student may seek approval from the Head of School to spend not more than three months of the dissertation element of the period of study at some other approved place of study or research.

7 ASSESSMENT

7.1 Each course shall have an assessment strategy, defined in its Programme Specification, linking specific modules and their assessment to the learning outcomes of the course.

7.2 The method and timings of each assessment shall be published in Module Outlines, on the students' Portal and in examination timetables as appropriate.

7.3 The assessment of each module shall generate a single mark between 0% and 100%, calculated from contributing individual component marks, weighted appropriately.

7.4 The pass mark of a numerically marked Master's module (level 7) shall be 50%.

7.5 All marks will be recorded and displayed to two decimal places. For the purposes of progression and classification (merit/distinction), module, taught component and classification marks will be treated as if rounded to the nearest integer:

- (a) module marks within 0.5% of a pass mark will be awarded a pass;
- (b) module marks within 0.5% of a higher classification grade will be awarded the higher classification;
- (c) Stage average marks within 0.5% of a progression boundary will be considered to have achieved the threshold;
- (d) classification marks within 0.5% of a higher classification will be awarded the higher classification;
- (e) classification marks within 0.5% of a borderline will be considered as being borderline.

- 7.6 The pass mark must be achieved at the module level. These modules are identified with a pass on aggregate marks scheme.
- 7.7 Where there is a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirement to do so, each individual component of the module may be required to be passed in order to pass the module; such modules are identified with a pass all components marks scheme.
- 7.8 Where appropriate individual modules, or elements within modules, may be assessed on a Pass or Fail basis.

8 THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

8.1 Membership of Boards of Examiners

- 8.1.1 The Board of Examiners shall comprise a Chair (who shall not be the Head of the School), external examiner(s) and at least two additional internal examiners, who are academic staff having a major responsibility for teaching and/or assessment of the modules or the course under consideration. The membership of Boards of Examiners and their sub-groups must be approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate.
- 8.1.2 With the exception of the Board of Examiners for the Final Assessment, a Board may delegate its functions to a sub-group of examiners which shall include the Chair (or Deputy Chair) of the Board and at least two other internal examiners.
- 8.1.3 There shall be an Extenuating Circumstances Panel which acts an advisory group to the Board of Examiners to consider students' extenuating circumstances and the related evidence.
- 8.1.4 All members of a Board of Examiners (or one of its sub-groups) are required to attend unless the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate has approved their absence in advance. In the case of reassessment for the final degree classification, the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate may approve the absence of the external examiners, if there is evidence that they have been appropriately consulted.
- 8.1.5 In order to inform its decisions, a Board of Examiners may invite the attendance or comments of other internal staff who are not members. Such an invitation will not confer rights of membership.

8.2 The Chair

The Chair of the Board of Examiners, with appropriate support and regulatory advice from the Secretary to the Board, shall have responsibility for:

- (a) seeking approval of the membership of the Board and its sub-groups;
- (b) the production of examination papers;
- (c) marking and moderation processes and other quality assurance scrutiny, in liaison with the School Director of Teaching and Learning where necessary;
- (d) the chairing of the meetings of the Board;
- (e) ensuring that any decisions on progression, classification or the award of academic qualifications are not influenced beyond the recorded marks by a student having plagiarised and/or colluded or otherwise been disciplined;
- (f) making and recording all arrangements with external examiners, including the size and nature of the sample for moderation in accordance with University guidelines, arrangements for consultation at Reassessment Boards where required and ensuring that the views of external examiners

- are given due weight in any decisions made by the Board of Examiners which are not determined by formal vote;
- (g) considering any recommendations of the Extenuating Circumstances Panel in accordance with Regulation 10;
 - (h) the recording of decisions made by the Board of Examiners and ensuring that all members of the Board of Examiners or appointed subgroup thereof have signed the appropriate results and pass lists;
 - (i) ensuring that the Board of Examiners awards prizes in accordance with the rules approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee and available at: <http://www.uea.ac.uk/prizesandscholarships> and reports the awards to the School Board;
 - (j) ensuring compliance with the relevant Regulations;
 - (k) undertaking such other tasks as the Senate shall require.

8.3 The External Examiner

8.3.1 The role of the external examiner is to ensure that:

- i) internal marking is consistent, fairly applied and of an appropriate standard; assessment has enabled learning outcomes to be achieved and demonstrated;
- ii) academic standards are appropriate for the level of the award;
- iii) recommendations for awards and for classification of awards are consistent, fair, fairly applied and of an appropriate standard.

8.3.2 The external examiner shall undertake duties as described in the Senate's Code of Practice for the External Examiner System for Awards (Taught Programmes):

<http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment/Code+of+Practice+for+External+Examiners>

including consultation with the Chair of the Board of Examiners with regards to all arrangements, e.g. size and nature of the sample for moderation.

8.3.3 The external examiner shall attend the Final Assessment Board(s) and, where appropriate, participate in the Final Reassessment Board(s) where recommendations for awards are made and sign the appropriate pass lists

8.3.4 The external examiner shall monitor module marks and confirm whether marking standards are acceptable. The external examiner should review the marks awarded and report to the Board of Examiners as follows:

- i) where the marking standards are judged to be acceptable, that no further action is required;
- ii) where the marking standards are judged to be unacceptable, and the external examiner has drawn this to the attention of the Board before module marks have been confirmed, request that the Board shall review and amend as appropriate the marks of all the students who have taken the module or item in question. If the overall marking standards are acceptable but an individual mark appears to be inappropriate, the mark shall stand but it will be drawn to the attention of the Final Assessment Board;
- iii) where the marking standards are judged to be unacceptable, and the external examiner has drawn this to the attention of the Board after module marks have been confirmed, request that the Board shall not amend confirmed marks but shall take appropriate action to ensure that the classification of students is not compromised. This will normally involve considering the position of all borderline candidates who have taken the module or item in question and might also involve a

review of further samples of work to ascertain an appropriate allowance to be made in the consideration of such borderline students.

8.4 Voting

The Board of Examiners may determine its decisions by formal vote. Where a vote is taken the decision shall go with the overall majority. The Chair shall have the casting vote.

8.5 Meetings of the Boards of Examiners

The individual meetings of the Boards of Examiners shall be scheduled at the beginning of the academic year by the Learning and Teaching Service in consultation with the Chairs of the Board of Examiners.

The dates the Boards are held vary depending on the course; and are influenced by the course's start and end date, its structure (taught modules plus dissertation/research modules, or all taught modules) and its duration (up to 2 years full-time and 5 years part-time).

Dates are published on the Student Portal at:

<https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/studying/extenuating-circumstances>

8.6 Provision of Assessment Information

8.6.1 Boards of Examiners shall receive the following:

- (i) Module marks and any contributing component marks achieved by each student taking the module;
- (ii) The aggregate mark for the taught component of the course for each student, in so far as completed, expressed as a percentage and taking weightings into account;
- (iii) Where relevant, the confirmed marks from previous Board(s).

8.6.2 Results will be presented as follows:

- (i) Marks shall be displayed to two decimal places for all marks, including module and component marks, taught component and final award marks;
- (ii) Where appropriate, modules and individual components assessed without the award of a mark shall be presented as Pass/Fail.

9 STUDENT PROGRESS MEETING

9.1 Schools may opt to hold a Student Progress Meeting after the Autumn Semester or block of teaching. The appropriate Board of Examiners or sub-group of Examiners shall review each student's academic progress to date and refer students whose performance is unsatisfactory to the Head of their School for appropriate academic guidance and advice.

9.2 The Board of Examiners shall receive attendance information for those students whose attendance has fallen below the requirement set by the School.

9.3 The Board of Examiners shall receive the provisional marks for all students taking courses which fall under its jurisdiction.

9.4 The Board shall review each student's attendance record and marks achieved to date and take action as follows:

- (a) For all students who have taken only modules in which all the assessed work falls within the Semester (or equivalent) refer to the Head of the

- student's School of Study, Adviser or other delegated member of academic staff any student whose aggregate mark, expressed as a percentage and taking weighting into account is below 50.00%, for appropriate academic guidance and advice such as consideration under General Regulation 13, Attendance, Engagement and Progress;
- (b) For any student who warrants special attention in respect of their academic performance and/or attendance record: refer to the Head of School, Adviser or other delegated member of academic staff for appropriate action such as a recommendation to change degree programme or some other action detailed by the Board.

10 MODULE ASSESSMENT BOARD

- 10.1 All marks are provisional until these have been confirmed by the Board of Examiners or appropriate sub-group at a Module Assessment Board.
- 10.2 The Board of Examiners or appropriate sub-group shall receive the marks presented for each module, and contributing components, which is being assessed and for which it is responsible.
- 10.3 It is the role of the Board of Examiners or appropriate sub-group to confirm that internal and external moderation has been completed and that the marking standards for the module are appropriate.
- 10.4 Where a module is taken over two semesters, the performance of students may be reviewed at the end of the first semester and marks confirmed by the Module Assessment Board at the end of the second semester.
- 10.5 With the prior approval of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate candidates may additionally be required to achieve a mark at a minimum specified level in all elements within a module in order to obtain a pass as a whole.

10.5 Adjustment of Marks

- 10.5.1 In exceptional circumstances, the Board of Examiners may determine that marks obtained in a component of the module should be amended by scaling. Scaling may only be undertaken with the approval of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate, which must be given for each assessment item for which the Board of Examiners believes that scaling is necessary. A recommendation that scaling should occur must be informed by factors other than the standard deviation and average marks for the module relative to other modules and should seek to address factors not previously addressed by internal and external moderation. Only upward scaling will be approved and the method for scaling shall be piecewise linear scaling. Any such adjustment must be made for all students who have taken the assessment in question.
- 10.5.2 In some circumstances it may be appropriate for the assessment item to be remarked.
- 10.5.3 Marks may not be adjusted for individual students. Special factors relating to an individual student's marks and performance may only be taken into account at the relevant Intermediate or Final Assessment Board meeting.

- 10.5.4 Where a Student Progress Board acting as a Module Assessment Board has previously confirmed the marks of Autumn Semester Visiting or Exchange students, marks may not normally be subsequently amended. In the event that adjustments to module marks would have resulted in a different outcome for the Autumn Semester Visiting or Exchange students concerned, the Board of Examiners must inform the student and the home institution.
- 10.6 After completing the above process, the Board shall confirm all marks.
- 10.7 Where modules are assessed without the award of a mark the Board of Examiners shall resolve whether the student has achieved a Pass.
- 10.8 Marks thus confirmed by the Board of Examiners shall not normally be subject to further amendment except in the following instances:
- (a) to correct an error in recording or transcription;
 - (b) following a decision to change a mark as a result of an Academic Appeal by a student. In such cases and after completion of the Academic Appeal process the final mark shall be determined by the Board of Examiners, if necessary at a later date.

11 EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

- 11.1 The Extenuating Circumstances Panel advising the Board of Examiners shall consider extenuating circumstances formally reported to it, and make recommendations to the Board, in accordance with the University's Extenuating Circumstances Regulations:
- <http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment>
- 11.2 The Board of Examiners shall formally approve the compensation or other recommendation made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel. Any alternative arrangement shall only be approved by the Board if it is in the student's best interest.
- 11.3 The Extenuating Circumstances Panel advising the Board shall treat all statements of extenuating circumstances as confidential, not to be disclosed outside the meeting of the Panel. Where circumstances are particularly sensitive, students may ask that the disclosure of the information be limited.

12 DELAYED ASSESSMENT

- 12.1 A student may be granted a Delayed Assessment (including a Delayed Reassessment or Further Reassessment) in accordance with the University's Extenuating Circumstances Regulations:
- <http://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/documents/assessment>
- 12.2 Students for whom a Delayed Assessment has been approved shall normally be required to take the Delayed Assessment at the earliest possible opportunity.

13 INTERMEDIATE ASSESSMENT BOARD

- 13.1 There will be an Intermediate Assessment Board of Examiners to consider the confirmed module marks and overall performance to date of students when:

- (a) full-time students have attempted all taught modules as defined in the programme specification;
- (b) full-time students on courses that extend over more than one academic year (or its equivalent) have attempted a specified set of taught modules;
- (c) part-time or credit-only students have attempted specified taught module(s) in an academic year (or its equivalent).

13.2 At this meeting the Board of Examiners shall:

- (a) receive and consider
 - i. the confirmed marks awarded by Module Assessment Boards;
 - ii. an aggregate mark for the taught component of the course for each student, or the part of the taught component so far completed, expressed as a percentage and taking weightings into account. Marks shall contribute to the aggregate in direct proportion to the number of credits associated with the module(s) in question. Where a course includes both numerically marked and pass/fail modules, the aggregate shall be calculated using only numerically marked modules;
 - iii. note that marks used for the purpose of compiling an aggregate mark may not include any mark(s) derived from Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL) unless a concession has been granted by the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate;
- (b) confirm whether students have satisfactorily completed the taught modules attempted by the time of the Board or should be referred to reassessment in failed modules;
- (c) confirm whether students have satisfactorily completed the taught component of the course where they have completed **all** taught modules or should be considered for compensation and/or referred to reassessment in failed modules;
- (d) receive any recommendations made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel

13.3 In all cases, the Board may refer to the to the Head of School, Adviser or other delegated member of academic staff, any student whose aggregate mark for the taught component is below 50.00%, for appropriate academic guidance and advice, such as consideration under General Regulation 13, Attendance, Engagement and Progress.

13.4 Satisfactory completion of the taught component

The Board of Examiners shall confirm that a student has satisfactorily completed the taught component of the course when the student has achieved the following:

(a) **For courses assessed with numerical marks:**

- i. Achieved an overall aggregate of 50%; **and**
- ii. at least the pass mark in all modules designated core for the course and where applicable a pass in any component assessment of placement learning; **and**

- iii. at least the pass mark in all taught modules, except for up to 40 credits (Masters or Postgraduate Diploma) or 20 credits (Postgraduate Certificate) of taught modules, in which the student must have obtained a mark of at least 45% (which shall be designated compensation; see 13.5 below); **and**
- iv. the minimum specified mark in such elements within the module which is required in order to obtain a pass mark in the module as a whole.

(b) For courses assessed on a pass/fail basis:

- i. A pass in all taught modules;
- ii. where applicable a pass in any component assessment of placement learning;
- iii. where the modules comprising a course are marked wholly on a pass/fail basis the Board does not have the discretion to compensate in failed modules.

13.5 Failure to complete the taught component satisfactorily

13.5.1 If a student has completed all the taught components of the course but has not done so satisfactorily, the Board of Examiners shall offer the option of reassessment in failed modules. In such circumstances, the student may:

- (a) either undertake reassessment in the failed modules;

Note: Where a student has failed a placement component and it is indicated that the student is unlikely to reach the appropriate standard of professional practice within the reassessment period (i.e. where there is evidence of continued and persistent failure to demonstrate professional competence within the placements(s)) the student will not be offered reassessment)

or

- (b) receive compensation at the discretion of the Board as detailed in 13.5.2, **or**
- (c) withdraw from the course and receive an award where appropriate as detailed in the table in 13.5.4.

13.5.2 Discretion to permit compensation

The Board of Examiners shall receive recommendations made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel and any information submitted to it by the Module Assessment Board(s).

- (a) On the basis of the evidence available, the Board shall consider whether the exercise of discretion, as distinct from a reassessment opportunity, is in the best interests of the student in terms of the outcome of the course. Where it is in the best interests of the student, it may exercise discretion to permit compensation.

(b) A fail mark cannot be compensated in more than 40 credits (Masters and Postgraduate Diploma) or 20 credits (Postgraduate Certificate) of taught modules in total.

- (c) The Intermediate Board of Examiners does not have discretion to compensate failure in failed modules where:

- i. the modules comprising a course are marked wholly on a pass/fail basis;
- ii. the modules are core to the course and must be passed for the student to obtain their award;
- iii. the modules include an element or elements which students must pass in order to satisfactorily complete the module.

13.5.3 Where an Intermediate Assessment Board is considering the marks of a student who has not yet attempted all the modules comprising the taught component (for example, a part-time student or a full-time student whose course extends over more than twelve months), the Board shall:

- (a) Either offer the option of reassessment in the failed module(s) and/or required elements within a module where the mark for that element is below the pass mark; **or**
- (b) Defer a decision on reassessment until all marks for the taught component are available for any student who has obtained an aggregate of at least 50.00% for the modules so far attempted and has failed (a) module(s) by a narrow margin when it is in the best interests of the student.

13.5.4 Where the Board has offered the option of reassessment in failed module(s), the student may either:

- (a) undertake reassessment as required by the Board of Examiners; **or**
- (b) request a transfer to a Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate course for which the requirements may still be met, subject to the agreement of the appropriate Course Director; **or**
- (c) withdraw from the course and receive an award where appropriate as in the table in below:

PGCert numerically marked 60 credits <u>Level 7</u>	An aggregate over 60 credits of FHEQ level 7 taught modules of at least 50%	<u>AND</u> pass mark or above in 40 credits of FHEQ level 7 taught modules	<u>AND</u> at least the pass mark in designated CORE modules for the PGCert	<u>AND</u> compensation may be given for up to 20 credits at the Board's discretion.	<u>AND</u> at least 30 credits towards the PGCert must have been completed at UEA
PGCert Pass/fail basis 60 credits <u>Level 7</u>	n/a	Pass in 60 credits of FHEQ level 7 taught modules	<u>n/a</u>	<u>n/a</u>	<u>AND</u> at least 30 credits towards the PGCert must have been completed at UEA
PGCert in Educational Therapy Pass/fail basis	n/a	Pass in 90 credits	n/a	n/a	_This is an alternative award for students who successfully complete 90 credits, but who do not meet the

90 credits <u>Level 7</u>					requirements for Qualified Teacher Status; it does not confer professional status.
PGDip 120 credits <u>Level 7</u>	Aggregate over 120 level 7 credits of at least 50%	<u>AND</u> pass mark or above in 80 credits of FHEQ level 7 taught modules	<u>AND</u> at least the pass mark in CORE modules	<u>AND</u> compensation may be given for up to 40 credits at the Board's discretion.	<u>AND</u> at least 60 credits towards the PGDip must have been completed at UEA

14 REASSESSMENT OF TAUGHT COMPONENT

- 14.1 Students will, if not eligible for compensation and if compensation is not in the student's best interests, be offered a reassessment opportunity in all failed components of the failed module in the form of the original assessment. Any exceptions to this may be made only with the approval of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate.
- 14.2 Where students are registered on courses that lead to professional registration reassessment may be offered in any component of a module where the mark in that element is below the pass mark acceptable to the professional/statutory/regulatory body.
- 14.3 Students are required to pay the appropriate reassessment fee by the deadline published by the University:
- [http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs\(gen\)/fees-and-charges](http://www.uea.ac.uk/calendar/section3/regs(gen)/fees-and-charges)
- 14.4 Reassessment will normally be offered on one occasion only.
- 14.5 Reassessment for each module shall be completed:
- (a) if by examination or course test, at the next scheduled sitting of examinations or course test in that module, or during the designated reassessment periods as specified by the University;
 - (b) if by coursework or project, the deadline for submission of the reassessment shall be agreed by the Board of Examiners and shall be no later than three months from the date of the relevant Assessment Board;
 - (c) if by assessment of practice, in accordance with arrangements agreed by the Board of Examiners (which may require the Board of Examiners to seek a concession from the Learning and Teaching Committee to extend the period of registration or to intercalate the student.
- (Note: Reassessment of the Dissertation is covered in Regulation 17.3)
- 14.6 Module marks following reassessment are calculated as follows:
- (a) All marks achieved at reassessment are stored on the Student Record System;

- (b) for 'Pass on Aggregate' mark schemes, the highest mark achieved for each component, whether achieved at first attempt or reassessment, is used, weighted appropriately, to calculate the overall module mark. Where the overall module mark is at or above the pass mark, following reassessment, the mark will be capped back to the pass mark. This capped mark will be the mark used for completion of the taught component and classification purposes;
- (c) for 'Pass all Components' mark scheme modules, component marks at or above the pass mark achieved at reassessment will be capped at the pass mark.

15 MODULE REASSESSMENT BOARD

A Module Reassessment meeting shall be carried out prior to the Intermediate Reassessment meeting, in accordance with Regulation 10 governing the conduct of Module Assessment Boards.

16 INTERMEDIATE REASSESSMENT BOARD

16.1 There shall be an Intermediate Reassessment Board at which the appropriate Board of Examiners or a sub-group of that Board shall:

- (a) Consider the confirmed module marks achieved for each student following their reassessment of modules forming part of the taught component;
- (b) consider whether students who have attempted all taught modules as defined in the programme specification have now satisfactorily completed the taught component of the course as set out in Regulation 13;
- (c) act as an Intermediate Assessment Board or Final Assessment Board for students who have undertaken a delayed assessment and/or who have had an approved extension for the submission of work;
- (d) consider, where the programme specification requires a student to pass all modules, whether a student has satisfactorily completed reassessment and should continue to the next component of the course, or be required to withdraw.

16.2 Confirmed marks will be presented as follows:

- (a) the original mark achieved in each module or component that was reassessed;
- (b) the actual mark achieved at Reassessment;
- (c) the overall module mark calculated following Reassessment; the capped mark will be recorded against the module (for 'Pass on Aggregate' modules) or component (for 'Pass all components' modules) for use in consideration of satisfactory completion of the taught component and classification (pass/merit/distinction) purposes.

16.3 Consideration of extenuating circumstances at the Reassessment Board

16.3.1 The Board of Examiners shall receive recommendations from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel in accordance with Regulation 11 and information from the Module Assessment Board and Intermediate Assessment Board as appropriate.

16.3.2 Where a student has been granted a delayed assessment, in accordance with the Extenuating Circumstances Regulations the Board of Examiners shall:

(a) for any other student, require the student to intercalate and return to undergo the delayed assessment at the next available opportunity;

(b) for all other students with extenuating circumstances the Board of Examiners shall formally approve the recommendation made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel. Any alternative arrangement shall only be approved by the Board if it is in the student's best interest.

16.4 Satisfactory Completion of the Taught Component following Reassessment

16.4.1 The Board of Examiners shall use the actual mark(s) obtained from the reassessment(s) where the mark is a pass mark, or the higher of the marks obtained for the module where the student has not achieved the pass mark, for the purposes of determining whether the student has satisfactorily completed the taught component, with reference to Regulation 13.4.

16.4.2 Where an Intermediate Reassessment Board is reviewing the mark(s) of a student who has not yet attempted all the modules comprising the taught component (for example, part-time students and full-time students on courses lasting two years), or a credit-only student, the Board of Examiners shall confirm that a student has satisfactorily completed the module(s) so far undertaken where the student has obtained a pass mark at reassessment.

16.5 Discretion to permit compensation following reassessment

16.5.1 The Board shall consider the record of each reassessed student and take into account recommendations received from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel. For students who have attempted all modules comprising the taught component and have failed to complete the taught component satisfactorily after the Reassessment, the Board shall determine whether to permit compensation at its discretion as set out in Regulation 13.5.2

16.5.2 The Board of Examiners may only permit compensation in up to 40 credits (20 credits for the Postgraduate Certificate) of taught modules across assessment and reassessment combined.

16.5.3 **Discretion to permit compensation may only be exercised where a student has completed all the modules comprising the taught component of the course as set out in the programme specification.**

16.6 Failure to complete the Taught Component Satisfactorily

16.6.1 Where a student has neither completed the taught component satisfactorily nor been permitted compensation through the discretion of the Board of Examiners, the Board shall:

(a) recommend the award of the Postgraduate Certificate in accordance with Regulation 13.5.4 where the student would pass insufficient modules from the taught component and (where applicable) the dissertation component to qualify for the award of a Postgraduate Diploma

OR

- (b) require the student to transfer to a Postgraduate Diploma where the student could pass sufficient modules from the taught and (where applicable) dissertation components to qualify for the award

OR

- (c) where neither of the above is available, require the student to withdraw from the University.

16.6.2 Where the Intermediate Reassessment Board is considering the mark(s) of a student who has not yet attempted all modules comprising the taught component and who has not achieved the pass mark in (a) module(s) following reassessment, the Intermediate Reassessment Board shall:

- (a) Require the student to transfer to the Postgraduate Diploma, where the student could pass sufficient modules from the taught and (where applicable) dissertation components to qualify for the award; **or**
- (b) Require the student to transfer to the Postgraduate Certificate where the student could not pass sufficient modules from the taught and (where applicable) dissertation components to qualify for a Postgraduate Diploma, but could pass sufficient modules from the taught component to qualify for a Postgraduate Certificate; **or**
- (c) In the case of courses leading to professional registration and which comprise core modules, either require the student to transfer to a Postgraduate Certificate or Postgraduate Diploma course where one exists, or require the student to withdraw from the University and recommend an award where appropriate.

17 FINAL ASSESSMENT BOARD

17.1 There shall be a Final Assessment Board at which the Board of Examiners, including the External Examiner(s), shall consider the results of all students at the end of their period of study.

17.2.1 The Board of Examiners shall receive the results of all Assessments, and any Reassessment of the taught component modules, which count towards the award and shall:

- (a) consider the confirmed marks awarded by the Module Assessment Board for the dissertation module (where applicable) and determine whether students have satisfactorily completed the dissertation module as set out below in 17.3;
- (b) receive any recommendations made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel;
- (c) recommend to Senate the conferment of awards to all students who have met the requirements of their course as specified in the Programme Specification and as laid out in these Regulations;
- (d) in respect of Masters Degree students who have met the requirements of their course as well as any other requirements specified in the programme specification, recommend that students have:
 - (i) **passed**; or
 - (ii) **passed with Distinction**; or
 - (iii) **passed with Merit**.

17.3 The Dissertation Module

17.3.1 The Board of Examiners shall confirm that a student has satisfactorily completed the dissertation module (where applicable) where the student has achieved at least the pass mark (50.00%) in the module as a whole.

17.3.2 In the event that a student has not completed the dissertation module satisfactorily, but has achieved a mark of at least 40.00% in the dissertation module, the Board of Examiners shall offer the option of reassessment in the dissertation module. In such circumstances, the student may:

- (a) Either undertake reassessment, where the deadline for resubmission shall be no later than three months from the date of the relevant Assessment Board; or
- (b) Withdraw from the course and receive a compensatory award where appropriate.

17.3.3 In the event that a student has not completed the dissertation module satisfactorily and has not achieved a mark of at least 40.00%, the Board of Examiners may exercise discretion to offer the option of reassessment in the dissertation module or shall require the student to withdraw from the course and receive an award where appropriate.

17.4 Consideration of the Award

17.4.1 Recommendation of awards shall be made as follows:

Masters 180 credits <u>Level 7</u>	Overall aggregate of at least 50% for whole course	<u>AND</u> the pass mark in dissertation (where taken)	<u>AND</u> at least the pass mark in CORE modules	<u>AND</u> , at the discretion of the Board of Examiners, compensation may be given for up to 40 credits.	<u>AND</u> at least 90 credits, including any dissertation, must have been completed at UEA <u>AND</u> , where relevant, the student must also meet the requirements of the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body(ies)
PGDip 120 credits <u>Level 7</u>	Aggregate over 120 level 7 credits of at least 50%		<u>AND</u> at least the pass mark in CORE modules	<u>AND</u> , at the discretion of the Board of Examiners, compensation may be given for up to 40 credits	<u>AND</u> at least 60 credits (including any dissertation) towards the PGDip must have been completed at UEA <u>AND</u> , where relevant, the student must also meet the requirements of the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body(ies)

PGCert in Education (PGCE) 90 credits <u>Level 7</u>	Must achieve a pass in 90 level 7 credits		Must achieve a pass in all modules		<u>Must demonstrate achievement of the Qualified Teacher Standards (QTS)</u>
PGCert 60 credits <u>Level 7</u> (not PGCE)	Aggregate over 60 level 7 credits of at least 50% (not including any marks or credit from a dissertation or project)		<u>AND</u> at least the pass mark in CORE modules	<u>AND</u> , at the discretion of the Board of Examiners, compensation for up to 20 credits as above	<u>AND</u> at least 30 credits towards the PGCert must have been completed at UEA <u>AND</u> , where relevant, the student must also meet the requirements of the relevant professional, statutory or regulatory body(ies)

17.4.2 Recommendation for Masters Awards with merit and with distinction shall be made as follows:

DISTINCTION	Overall aggregate over 180 credits of at least 70% for the whole course
MERIT	Overall aggregate over 180 credits of between 60% – 69% for the whole course

17.4.3 Consideration of students for Masters Awards within 2% of merit and distinction categories shall be as follows:

Overall aggregate over 180 credits within 2% of the borderline of the higher	PLUS	Credits	Outcome
68% - 69%		At least 50% of credits at 70% or above	Distinction
58% - 59%		At least 50% of credits at 60% or above	Merit

18 FINAL REASSESSMENT

18.1 There shall be a Final Reassessment Board at which the appropriate Board of Examiners shall review the marks achieved at reassessment of the dissertation and (where appropriate) reassessment of the taught component. At least one External Examiner shall be part of the consideration of awards. The Board shall:

- (a) determine whether students have satisfactorily completed the course as a whole following the reassessment (including any placement requirements for the course);

- (b) recommend to Senate the conferment of awards to students who have met the requirements of their course as specified in the programme specification and as laid out in these Regulations;
- (c) perform all the duties of a Final Assessment Board in respect of students who have undertaken a delayed assessment;
- (d) receive any recommendations made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel;
- (e) where applicable, recommend a compensatory award.

18.2 The Final Reassessment Board may also act as the Intermediate and/or the Final Assessment Board for students with a delayed assessment or approved extensions to the submission deadline for coursework, projects and/or the dissertation.

18.3 Consideration of extenuating circumstances at the Final Reassessment Board

The Board of Examiners shall receive recommendations from the Extenuating Circumstances Panel in accordance with Regulation 11 and 16.3.

19 DISCLOSURE OF RESULTS

- 19.1 The deliberations of Boards of Examiners are confidential except where a student requests information about their own award via an Academic Appeal or Academic Complaint (see Regulation 15.4 below);
- 19.2 Examiners are required to make academic decisions about students' performance, and marks are a guide to examiners in making those decisions. However, other factors may be taken into account in accordance with these Regulations and students should be aware that a particular number of patterns or marks does not lead necessarily to a given result;
- 19.3 Students will be formally advised of the outcome of the consideration of their academic performance by a Board of Examiners in accordance with procedures approved by the Registrar and Secretary;
- 19.4 As part of an informal or formal Academic Appeal or Complaint the Head of School, Chair of Examiners or Secretary to the Board of Examiners, may advise an individual student of the discussions of the Board of Examiners as they relate solely to the individual student's academic performance. In this context, minutes of the relevant Board of Examiners with appropriate redactions can be released by the School to the student who has submitted an Academic Appeal or Academic Complaint without recourse to the Data Protection Act.

REVIEW OF PGT REGULATIONS WORKING GROUP 2015/16 - MEMBERSHIP

Role	Name
Chair	Adam Longcroft
Support	Becky Fitt (LTS)
HUM ADLT	Clive Matthews (HUM)
FMH ADLT	Emma Sutton (FMH)
SCI ADLT	Dave Stevens (SCI)
SSF ADLT	Ratula Chakraborty (SSF)
HUM REP x1	Helen Warner (PPL)
HUM REP x2	Francisco Costa (HUM)
FMH REP x1	Kelly Walker (HSC)
FMH REP x2	Kevin Tyler (MED)
SCI REP x1	Paul Dolman (ENV)
SCI REP x1	Gary Rowley (BIO)
SSF REP x1	Rob Grant (DEV)
SSF REP x2	Sue Long (ECO)
SU REP	Liam Mccafferty
Planning Office	Ant Griffiths/Andrew Watson
LTS	Carole Bull/Lorraine Newark
HUM Student rep	TBC
FMH Student rep	Sarah Ayton (intercalating MB BS student undertaking MClin Ed)
SCI Student rep	John Worthington-Hill (BIO) (November & December meetings) Max Fancourt (BIO) (January & February meetings)
SSF Student rep	Annette Gibbons-Warren (DEV)

**Review of Postgraduate Taught Programmes (PGT) Regulations Working Group
10.30-12.00, 24 November 2015, ZICER Rm 02.02**

Attendees: Adam Longcroft, Ratula Chakraborty, Becky Fitt, Rob Grant, Ant Griffiths, Sue Long, Liam Mccafferty, Clive Matthews, Lorraine Newark, David Stevens, Emma Sutton, Kevin Tyler, Kelly Walker, Helen Warner, John Worthington-Hill

Apologies: Sarah Ayton, Paul Dolman, Gary Rowley, Andrew Watson

1. To receive Terms of Reference and Working Group membership

The PVC Academic has approved the Terms of Reference and Working Group membership. These were circulated to members.

Action: Clive Matthews to recommend a 2nd HUM representative and student representative to Becky Fitt.

2. Statements from the Chair

Adam Longcroft explained that a Working Group first met to consider the New Academic Model (NAM) and its implications for PGT regulations in 2011/12, however, it was put on hold in 2012/13. There are two wider contextual points: i) that there are too many small PGT modules/programmes, and ii) academic support for PGT students. The latter is particularly important for this Working Group.

International students are overrepresented in failure and plagiarism statistics. The QAA, in its recent review of UEA, has pointed out that the University was over-reliant on advisers, and this was not sufficient on its own for students with difficulties.

3. The key elements of the New Academic Model (NAM) (Document A)

Document A was circulated to members before the meeting.

4. The implications of the key elements of NAM for the existing PGT regulations

Adam Longcroft introduced the red/amber/green (RAG) coding – red indicating difficult issues, green non-controversial, and amber minimum controversy. He pointed out that only issues that had not been agreed at LTC could be reviewed.

Some members felt that this Working Group should be able to look at all aspects of the NAM – for example, it is difficult for students doing a dissertation to also concentrate on reassessment of other pieces of work that they have failed.

Action: Adam Longcroft to update the RAG coding to show those elements that have already been agreed at LTC as green.

Action: Adam Longcroft to convey the concerns of some members of the Working Group that they should be able to look at all aspects of the NAM to PVC Academic.

David Stevens stated that the NAM needs to fit in with the QAA UK Quality Code for HE, *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications for UK Degree-Awarding Bodies*, published in

October 2014. The minimum requirement for QAA is to achieve 150 credits at level 7. SCI would like to follow that QAA requirement, which could lead to increased efficiencies.

Action: Adam Longcroft to put this on the agenda of a future meeting of this Working Group.

5. Elements of NAM to be applied to PGT from 2016/17, approved by LTC 24 June 2015 (Document D)

Document D had been circulated to members before the meeting.

6. Pass all modules – the existence of ‘condoned fails’ in the PGT Regulations and its application

Adam Longcroft emphasised that the issue of ‘condoned failure’ was controversial. UEA is not alone in condoning failure: 24 out of 31 HE institutions studied for the 2011/12 Report to LTC condoned

failure in some way – usually between 20 to 40 credits worth; a few universities require students to pass all modules. He pointed out the online Higher Education Achievement Report (HEAR) records all modules for UGs, therefore, it would show where a student has failed a module. Whilst there is still no HEAR for PGTs, this is likely to happen soon. A summary document showing the number of Condoned Fails by academic year, School, module type (e.g. compulsory/optional) and period (semester/year-long) since 2011/12 was circulated.

Various issues were raised in the discussion:

- ☒ Some want consistency between UG and PGT.
- ☒ Many felt consistency between UG and PGT was difficult to achieve: the UG mark scheme has a 40% pass mark, whereas for PGT it is 50%; UG students have three years to adapt and international students have time to develop, whereas PGT students only have two taught semesters, in which they often have to adapt to a new culture, language, and sometimes a new discipline.
- ☒ Integrated Masters come under BIM; 120 credits at level 7 in Year 4 as compared to 180 credits at level 7 for Masters programmes under the Common Masters Framework regulations.
- ☒ Condoned failure is only possible when the student has an overall aggregate of at least 50% for the whole of the course, and can be applied to up to 40 credits of modules (Masters and Postgraduate Diplomas).
- ☒ Different Schools have different views. SCI felt 20 credits of condoned failure was preferable; NBS has a large proportion of international students who could be affected by any move from 40 credits (the majority of cases of condoned failure come from NBS and ECO); FMH requires a pass in all modules.
- ☒ Exam Board conventions vary between Boards; the best interests of the individual student are usually considered when deciding whether to offer a reassessment opportunity or condone failure.
- ☒ Extenuating Circumstance Panels need to operate consistently so that Boards can take consistent decisions. The Regulations need to be clear.
- ☒ There was some discussion on condoning fails in optional modules and not in compulsory modules. It was felt that skills and knowledge were equally important, and that there should be no differentiation between compulsory and optional modules.
- ☒ The importance of formative assessment was stressed, as this should help to strengthen the position of those students who currently sought additional support.

It was agreed that:

- ☒ There was a need for flexibility between Schools.
- ☒ Condoned failure should be allowed for both compulsory and optional modules.
- ☒ Students are required to achieve a 50% average overall to be considered for condoned failure, therefore it was not necessary to create a minimum threshold (e.g. 40%) at the module level.
- ☒ The Regulations need to be simplified, to be transparent for the student, and with a consistent set of principles applied.
- ☒ There should be a right to reassessment, and reassessment should take place as early as possible so as to allow for work not yet submitted (e.g., dissertations).
- ☒ Further thought to be given to students having the option of reassessment or condoned failure – this would require a process to be set up so any preference could be declared in advance of the meeting of the Board of Examiners.
- ☒ The term '**compensation**' should replace that of 'condoned fail'.

Action: Becky Fitt to provide some further detailed figures on Condoned Fails, including a student head count.

Action: Becky Fitt to look into the possibility of setting up a mechanism (systems and process) for students to declare their preference for reassessment or condoned fail before the Exam Board meets.

**Review of Postgraduate Taught Programmes (PGT) Regulations Working Group
15.30-17.00 on Wednesday 16 December 2015, ARTS Rm 0.28**

Attendees: Adam Longcroft (ADTP), Sarah Ayton, Carole Bull, Becky Fitt, Rob Grant, Sue Long, Liam Mccafferty, Clive Matthews, Lorraine Newark, David Stevens, Emma Sutton, Kevin Tyler, John Worthington-Hill

Apologies: Ratula Chakraborty, Ant Griffiths, Helen Warner, Andrew Watson

1. Notes of the last meeting (24 November 2015)

The notes of the meeting held on 24 November 2015 were agreed.

2. Statements from the Chair

ADTP informed the meeting that he had passed on to PVC Academic the Working Group's request that they should be able to look at all aspects of the NAM. PVC Academic advised that the Working Group should not look at areas that have already been agreed at LTC.

3. A copy of the March 2012 report to LTC re New Academic Model for Postgraduate Taught Programmes (Document A)

Document A was circulated to members. ADTP explained that this provides detail on many issues relevant for this Working Group that had been discussed in 2011/12. After this report was submitted in March 2012, all developments concerning a new academic model for PGT programmes were put on hold.

4. The existence of condoned fail in the PGT Regulations

Some contextual information (Document B) was circulated before the meeting, and Statistics on Condoned Fails were circulated at the meeting.

The issue of condoned fail/compensation was discussed. The statistics, which covered the period 2010/11 to 2014/15, showed that the number of condoned fails was reducing, and that there were few condoned fails below 39.99%. The possibility of introducing a cut-off point of 40% for eligibility for a condoned fail was discussed. The meeting agreed that a cut-off point was not necessary, as it only happens very rarely and when there are exceptional Extenuating Circumstances.

The statistics showed that the largest number of condoned fails were in Economics and NBS, many for students on conversion Masters programmes; the cohorts for these programmes have a high proportion of international students. It was felt that there was too high a percentage of international students failing modules. There was discussion on the reasons for this: areas raised included admissions criteria, academic support/support from central services, pedagogical methods, and/or assessment. It was suggested that not allowing condoned fails could reduce the likelihood of students taking risks with their choice of modules, i.e. they would be more likely to choose options they would expect to pass. As a principle, it was agreed that condoned failure should continue to be allowed, but the number of condoned fails should be managed down over the next five years (2016/17–2020/21).

It was pointed out that this would lead to different treatment for PGT and Integrated Masters students; the latter will not be allowed condoned fails under the BIM Regulations from 2016/17.

Action: ADTP to raise the issue of treating students consistently with LTC.

5. Automatic right to reassessment

ADTP pointed out that there was only automatic right to reassessment for Year 1 students under BIM regulations; otherwise students must obtain a module mark of at least 20%. The possibility of introducing this for PGT students was discussed. It was generally felt that the situation was different for students on a one-year course to those on a three-year course, and that some PGT students are able to pass at reassessment even after getting below 20% on their first attempt.

It was agreed that PGT students are in a different situation: the programmes are intense with a condensed pattern of learning, and there are also visa implications to consider for international students. The use of condoned fails helps to address such issues.

It was agreed that the possibility of bringing forward the timing of exams and assessment for taught modules to before the dissertation should be looked into. The re-introduction of January exams would bring exams closer to what had been taught; likewise reassessment should be brought as

close as possible to the exams. This would also help to increase students' awareness of their progress during the year.

Action: ADTP to request LTC to consider the timing of exams and reassessment, and to look at other models.

6. Minimum module size

This discussion focussed on the credit loading of modules – under BIM all modules must have a minimum of 20 credits. PGT is already largely compliant with this, but there are a few 10/15 credit modules; there is a need for some flexibility due to PSRB requirements.

It was agreed that the number of 10/15 credit modules should not increase, and PGT should also follow the principle of a minimum of 20 credit modules. The Academic Director Taught Programmes could authorise concessions where these might be justified.

7. Decrease in summative assessment and increase in formative assessment

ADTP explained that there was a strong drive with UG courses to move to more formative assessment (aiming for a ratio of 1:1 formative/summative), and raised whether this would also be justified for PGT.

It was agreed that increased formative assessment is very valuable for students, particularly at the beginning of the academic year; it also helps to identify those students who are struggling with their studies. It is necessary to know how many exams/course tests there are before deciding whether it is appropriate to aim for a ratio of 1:1 formative/summative assessment.

Action: Becky Fitt to find out how many exams and course tests there are in PGT.

Date of next meeting: Monday 25 January, 1400-1530, REG CR2.

**Review of Postgraduate Taught Programmes (PGT) Regulations Working Group
2.00-3.30 on Monday 25 January 2016, REG CR2 (notes amended 4.2.16)**

Attendees: Adam Longcroft (ADTP), Sarah Ayton, Carole Bull, Ratula Chakraborty, Francisco Costa, Paul Dolman, Becky Fitt, Annette Gibbons-Warren, Rob Grant, Ant Griffiths, Sue Long, Liam Mccafferty, Clive Matthews, Lorraine Newark, David Stevens, Emma Sutton, Kevin Tyler, Helen Warner

Apologies: Kelly Walker

Notes: Nicky Bastian

1. Notes of the last meeting (16 December 2015)

The notes of the meeting held on 16 December 2015 were agreed.

2. Report on actions arising from the notes of the last meeting

Becky Fitt tabled draft figures showing the number of exams and course tests sat by PGT students in 2014/15, and thanked Ant Griffiths for his help in compiling these. A further set of figures will be provided for 2015/16, following discussion that there had been some significant revisions to assessment strategies across PGT programmes for the 2015/16 academic year. This will help inform discussion on the possibility of re-introducing a January examination period for PGT students with earlier reassessment opportunities, as well as the move towards a ratio of 1:1 formative/summative assessment.

Sue Long pointed out that M019 had had an exam, not a course test (Becky Fitt to check).

David Stevens stated that the Faculty of Science was interested in the possibility of having 30 credits available at level 6 to students studying for a Masters degree (level 7) as permitted by the QAA's Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications (published in October 2014). The ADTP will include this option in the Report that goes to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

Action: ADTP to suggest LTC invest resources in assessing the implications for students, academics and administration of bringing forward the dates of exams/reassessments for PGT programmes for academic year 2017/18.

Action: All Working Group members are requested to inform Becky Fitt of any error in the figures, such as that raised by Sue Long, so that these can be checked and amended as required.

Action: ADTP to include possibility of having 30 credits available at level 6 in Masters degree programmes in the Report that goes to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

3. To consider: Monitoring attendance (Document A)

Existing policy and procedures on Attendance, Engagement and Progress (Document A) had been circulated before the meeting. ADTP highlighted two key reasons for regular attendance monitoring: Tier 4 obligations for international students, and pastoral issues – we need to know when students are not able to attend academic engagements due to extenuating circumstances, in order to help them. The perception is that monitoring is carried out less regularly for PGT students than for UG students.

It was agreed that no changes were required to the existing policy. However, implementation of the current policy should be more robustly applied, and the monitoring of PGT students should be more systematic.

4. To consider: Proposals for Final Assessment Board for i) recommendation of awards, and ii) for awards with merit and with distinction (Document B)

Document B had been circulated before the meeting, summarising existing regulations and offering a number of alternatives. ADTP emphasised the need to simplify the regulations, and for equitable, consistent treatment of students. The distinction between core and compulsory modules was explained: core modules were modules students had to take and pass; compulsory modules were modules students had to take but do not have to pass (could have a condoned fail).

The Working Group members expressed a preference for the following:

i) Recommendation of Awards

Option 1 of the choices for consideration of the award (Final Board) which focussed on the overall aggregate:

Masters 180 credits Level 7	Overall aggregate of at least 50% for whole course	AND pass mark in dissertation (where taken)	AND at least the pass mark in CORE modules	AND up to 40 credits may be designated condoned failure (CF). BoE exercises discretion in student's best interests i.e. CF or reassessment . NB: If possible that student will not obtain award with CF then student sent to reassessment *	AND at least 90 credits, including any dissertation, must have been completed at UEA AND where relevant the student must also meet any PSRB requirements
PGDip 120 credits Level 7	Aggregate over 120 level 7 credits of at least 50%	AND at least the pass mark in CORE modules	AND up to 40 credits CF as above.	AND at least 60 credits (including any dissertation) towards the PGDip must have been completed at UEA	
PGCert 60 credits Level 7 (not PGCE)	Aggregate over 60 level 7 credits of at least 50% (not including any marks or credit from a dissertation or project)	AND at least the pass mark in CORE modules	AND up to 20 credits CF as above	AND at least 30 credits towards the PGCert must have been completed at UEA	