

# The Academic Regulations Appendix 12: Assessment Boards Operation of Discretion

2021-2022



Edge Hill  
University

# The Academic Regulations

## Appendix 12: Assessment Boards Operation of Discretion

### Contents

Summary.....	3
Glossary of Terms.....	3
Purpose.....	3
Regulations.....	4
1.    Second Reassessment Opportunity.....	4
2.    Progression with outstanding referral.....	4
3.    Students not recommended for progression.....	5
4.    Condonement.....	5
5.    Finalists: Honours Degrees, Diplomas of Higher Education & Foundation Degrees.....	6
Key to Relevant Documents.....	9
Annexes.....	10
Endmatter.....	13

## Summary

Assessment boards operate with guided discretion and are responsible for operating such discretion equitably and without favour. This appendix details the regulations in relation to the operation of discretion by assessment boards.

## Glossary of Terms

Term	Meaning
Assessment Board	The name given to the meeting that confirms student's results and overall progression.

## Purpose

Assessment boards operate with delegated authority from Academic Board in confirming progression and award results. Progression and award boards will confirm awards through the application of the academic and relevant programme regulations using academic judgement to operate discretion within the limits defined in these regulations and the guidelines detailed in this appendix. In the interests of consistency, it is important that these guidelines are followed across all programme areas as they are affected.

## Regulations

The operation of discretion in Assessment Boards requires the application of academic judgement. As such, it is not possible, or desirable, to legislate for every individual case. However, consistency and equity must be maintained which leads us to the development of guidelines. In the interests of consistency, it is important that these guidelines are followed across all programme areas as they are affected unless there are **exceptional** and **compelling** reasons in an individual case for an alternative course of action. Any such case must be the subject of discussion and agreement at the appropriate Assessment Board, agreed by external examiners present where relevant, and fully documented.

### 1. Second Reassessment Opportunity

The decision to offer a second reassessment opportunity is a Progression/Award Board discretion, informed by any recommendations from Module/block year Boards and the overall student profile. There is a restriction on the number of reassessment opportunities available to students and Boards must be cognisant that the second reassessment opportunity is also the final one. The guideline here is that students who have failed at the first reassessment should be offered a second reassessment opportunity unless there are compelling reasons why not (refusal to refer at this stage will inevitably cause the student to fail). Such reasons might include:

- professional practice modules where it may be inappropriate to offer a further attempt;
- instances where the student has a failing profile overall with no attempt made at the first reassessment.

It is essential that students who are offered a second (final) reassessment opportunity receive appropriate academic counselling and are fully supported. Boards may wish to consider alternative forms of assessment in these instances.

Where a student fails in their second attempt at reassessment, it may be possible for them to continue on course for an Ordinary Degree (I4.3) or to transfer to another course subject to Recognition of Prior Learning regulations and standard entry requirements (I4.4).

### 2. Progression with outstanding referral

The regulations allow for a student to proceed with up to 40 credits of outstanding failure (I2.6). The decision to allow this is a Progression Board discretion which will be exercised in the light of the overall student profile and academic judgement in terms of the student's preparedness for study at the next level. It is important to remember

that the permissive regulation to allow progression with outstanding referrals and/or deferrals is to ensure that students are not unnecessarily impeded in their studies. The guideline here is to allow progression with 40 credits of outstanding failure except where any programme specific constraints have been approved at validation.

Progression with more than 40 credits outstanding is not permitted whether by referral or deferral.

### 3. Students not recommended for progression

Students who are not recommended for progression at the Reassessment Board, or who have failures (after reassessment) in more than 40 credits, may be referred to part-time study to access their final reassessment opportunity if it is considered they have potential to progress in the future. Such students may re-register for the outstanding failed modules **as part-time students**.

It is essential that all students who are allowed to progress with modules outstanding or to intermit their full-time studies to retake modules with/without attendance, receive proper guidance. This is to ensure a full understanding of the implications of the Assessment Board decision and the options available. All such students will be required to meet with their Programme Leader/personal tutor to complete a Learning Agreement prior to registration for the following year.

It is accepted that, in a small number of cases, discussion with the student may lead to an amended decision through Chair's Action where, for example, a student seeks a part-time registration having identified that progression with modules outstanding would be too burdensome.

*A flowchart to guide Progression Boards in making decisions on progression is included under Appendix A to this document.*

### 4. Condonement

The guidelines are as follows:

- Condonement for non-core modules may be operated after the first sitting in the following circumstances:
  - o In the case of marginal failure (35-39%) or single module failure down to 30% (Level Five) or 25% (Level Four).
  - o Finalists who would otherwise be prevented from graduating<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that these students may choose to take reassessment rather than accept condonement where they may be able to improve their classification.

The first line for any other failed student is normally reassessment.

- Condonement after reassessment is a Progression/Award Board discretion which will be based on the higher of the two marks obtained. Given that condonement cannot be applied to core modules/blocks of study, it is expected that the provisions will be otherwise applied unless there are exceptional or compelling reasons for why not. Such reasons might include:
  - A failing profile which does not allow the student to progress even with condonements
  - A weak overall profile where, in the Board's judgement, the student's study at the next level would be seriously undermined by the application of condonement. In such cases a further (final) reassessment will be offered.
- Exceptionally, condonement may be offered against a deferral. In such cases the student will have the right to decline the condonement and take reassessment.
- Students can only have 40 credits condoned overall for levels 5 and 6. To remove or alleviate the burden of level 5 reassessment to be completed alongside level 6, it is recommended that the full amount of condonable credit is applied at level 5 where possible.
- Students offered condonement for any module/blocks of study which contributes to their overall classification will have the right to decline the condonement and take reassessment provided the University is notified by the published deadline.
- Where a student is exiting the University due to academic failure, condonement should not be used simply to improve a profile. However, condonement should be applied where this will directly result in the award of the highest exit qualification possible.

## 5. Finalists: Honours Degrees, Diplomas of Higher Education & Foundation Degrees

Section J3 to the Academic Regulations sets out the criteria for award classification across the range of award types offered by the University. These regulations are absolute and where a student qualifies for a classification, no lesser class can be awarded aside from where malpractice is proven subsequent to the award being made.

However, where a student profile is considered to be borderline, Award Boards may look to use discretion to improve the classification awarded where specific measures for consideration are met. The measures for consideration are:

- Compensation within the Profile which supports a higher class

- A final year Average Percentage Mark (APM) in the higher class

The following examples demonstrate the two discretionary powers:

**i. Compensation within the profile**

The requirement for 50% of the module marks to be in or above the class awarded can also be achieved by compensating higher band marks against lower band marks eg:

76 66 65 64 63 63 63 59 | 59 58 58 57 54 50 45 45

APM = 59. In this example the 76 (first class) compensates for the 59 (lower second) and the student may be awarded a 2.1.

ii. **Final Year APM**

*Where the average of final year module marks lies in the higher classification band eg:*

Level 5  
60 60 57 56 55 54

Level 6  
63 61 60 60 60 59

Overall APM = 59%\*

Level 6 APM = 61%

Student may be awarded a 2.1

*\*inc lowest mark discard and exit velocity*

**When neither of these two criteria are met, a higher class cannot be considered**

If a student meets either of these measures, and the overall APM is within 2% of that class, it is standard practice to make the award of a higher class unless the Award Board accepts that there is a strong and justifiable academic argument against this.

Occasionally, a student may meet the requirements of either or both of the discretionary measures but be more than 2% away from the overall APM for the higher class. In these cases, the discretionary measures cannot be applied and the lower classification will stand.



## Key to Relevant Documents

This policy refers to the following documents, which you may find useful.

- The academic regulations:

<https://www.edgehill.ac.uk/documents/collection/academic-regulations/>

## Annexes

### Appendix A:

#### Reassessment Board Guidance (Level Four)

- i) Apply condonement in up to 40 credits (down to a mark of 25%) where possible unless there is a compelling reason for why not do so\*;
- ii) Subsequent to the application of condonement, follow the guidance outlined below unless there is a strong justification for why not to do so;

Total Credits Passed	Recommendation
80+	Progress to Level Five <sup>2</sup> - to complete Level Four reassessments alongside Level Five
50-75	Refer to Part Time study
0-45	Fail and Withdraw

\*Given that condonement cannot be applied to core modules, it is expected that the provision will be applied to non-core modules unless there is an exceptional reason for why not to do so. Such reasons might include:

- o A failing profile which does not allow the student to progress even with condonements
- o A weak overall profile where, in the Board's judgement, the student's study at the next level would be seriously undermined by the application of condonement.

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that progression will be for an Ordinary Degree where an eligible candidate has irredeemable failure (i.e. module recommendation = FF).

### Reassessment Board Guidance (Level Five)

- i) Apply condonement in up to 40 credits (down to a mark of 30%) where possible unless there is a compelling reason for why not do so\*;
- ii) Subsequent to the application of condonement, follow the guidance outlined below unless there is a strong justification for why not to do so;

Total Credits Passed	Recommendation
200+	Progress to Level Six <sup>3</sup> - to complete Level Four/Five reassessments alongside Level Six
170-195	Refer to Part Time study
90-165	Fail and Withdraw

\* Students can only have 40 credits condoned overall for levels 5 and 6. To remove or alleviate the burden of level 5 reassessment to be completed alongside level 6, it is recommended that the full amount of condonable credit is applied at level 5 where possible.

Given that condonement cannot be applied to core modules, it is expected that the provision will be applied to non-core modules unless there is an exceptional reason for why not to do so. Such reasons might include:

- o A failing profile which does not allow the student to progress even with condonements
- o A weak overall profile where, in the Board's judgement, the student's study at the next level would be seriously undermined by the application of condonement.

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that progression will be for an Ordinary Degree where an eligible candidate has irredeemable Failure (i.e. module recommendation = FF).

**Level Six (Award):**

- i) Apply condonement where appropriate in up to 40 credits at Level Four (mark down to 25%) and 40 credits across either Level Five or Level Six (mark down to 30%);
  
- ii) Subsequent to the application of condonement, the Board should follow the guidance outlined below unless there are compelling reasons for why not to do so;

<b>Total Credits Passed</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
360	Make Award
290- <360	<p>Refer/Defer</p> <p><b>Nb</b> Refer for Ordinary Degree if carrying irretrievable failure unless the APM for completed Level Six study is 50% or more in which case recommend Qualification to Study for Honours</p> <p><i>Only in cases where the department can confirm that the student has not engaged with study for a significant period would a Fail and Withdraw be recommended.</i></p>
200 - 285	<p>Fail and Withdraw - make Exit Award</p> <p><i>In exceptional cases, where a strong argument is made that the student is engaged with the programme and [in the view of the Department] there is a reasonable prospect of successful completion, candidates may be recommended for continuation.</i></p>

## Endmatter

Title	Appendix 12: Assessment Boards Operation of Discretion
Policy Owner	Head of Academic Registry
Lead for Updates	Senior Registrar: Assessment and Awards
Policy Contributor	None
Approved by	Regulations Review Sub-Committee
Date of Approval	September 2017
Date for Review	July 2022 (last reviewed June 2021)