

## **LTC09D025 - Draft notes of meeting of the CCS review**

The first meeting of the 2009/10 academic year was held on 7 October. The position at the end of the 2008/9 academic year was that agreement in principle had been reached on increasing academic requirements for progression but agreement on the detail had not been achieved. To achieve this the University would need an acceptable scheme for condoned failure (a procedure to allow a student to progress carrying forward a module mark below 40%) which would allow sensible decisions on student progression to be made by examination boards.

The phrase "condoned failure" was raised as being undesirable given the principle of rewarding student success. It was suggested that "condoned progression" might be a phrase that better represents the principles of the framework under discussion.

The possibility of establishing pathways was also mentioned.

Course profiles must define which modules students can take. A change in regulations that would allow condoned progression when a failed module is an one that does not contain the key learning outcomes of the award (e.g. as defined in the Programme Specification and reflecting relevant QAA Benchmark Statements) might result in students prioritising modules. This might be mitigated if the regulations require every item of assessment to be submitted or attempted to a minimum mark that signifies engagement, including reassessment if applicable, in order for examination boards to be able to consider condoned progression for a candidate. There might be need for further discussion on the possibility of examination boards making decisions relating to progression on a course or progression on a pathway.

It was noted that there are generally two groups of students referred to reassessment, and those falling into the category of having not put in enough effort during the academic year are of particular concern, and this raised the question of the purpose of reassessment.

It was questioned whether or not other more creative models for reassessment had been explored. It was mentioned that Schools such as Pharmacy as well as other institutions reassess items of assessment and each item is capped at 40% (or the pass mark) which allows modules to be passed at higher than 40%. Reassessment at the level of the module and having module marks capped at 40% was not a great incentive for some students, and the situation needed more attention. It was also mentioned during discussions last year that some Schools would find it desirable to set reassessment appropriate to students, not reassessment at the level of the module.

The issue of student engagement also needs to be considered with disciplinary regulations in mind. There is currently a regulation on attendance and progress and disciplinary procedures can be evoked if a student is found in breach of the regulation. Disciplinary matters must be separated from regulations on awarding degrees; however, engagement is evident when students achieve learning outcomes so the natural link must be enshrined in the regulations. Once again the suggestion that attempting every assessment item was mentioned alongside reaching a minimum mark.

There was also mention of how examination boards apply discretion. This point should receive attention when there is more clarity about the revised regulations and what discretion will be available to examination boards.

### **Proposed actions**

The majority of the major issues sought by the CCS Review Group to underpin the revised regulations have now been clarified by LTC and/or discussed in the review group. We now suggest that a sub-group meets comprising the DTP and LTQO staff to set down the top-level regulations incorporating the points flowing from the LTC and Review group discussions and to circulate these to the Review Group for its consideration with a view to having key features of the revised regulations ready for LTC in March 2010.