



Higher Education Course Regulations 2025/26

Section 3: Assessment

3.1	Membership of Exam Boards	3
3.2	External Examiners	3
3.3	Authority & Responsibilities of the Exam Board	4
3.4.	Course Requirements	4
3.5.	Maximum Registration	5
3.6.	Holistic and Element Assessment	5
3.7.	Element Compensation	6
3.8.	Progression Criteria	6
3.9.	Unit Compensation	6
3.10.	Interim Awards	6
3.11.	Award Criteria & Classification	6
3.12	Marking Scale & Assessment Criteria	7
3.13	Assessment Deadlines	7
3.14	Marking and Moderation	7
3.15	External Moderation	7
3.16.	Failure of Assessment	8
3.17.	Failure of Reassessment	9
3.18.	Failure due to Illness or other Extenuating Circumstances	9
3.19.	Exceptional Progression Decisions	10
3.20.	Exceptional Award Decisions	10
3.21.	Running-Out Courses	11

3.22.	Time-Based Examinations	12
3.23	Amending an Exam Board Decision	13
3.24	Material Irregularity	14

The following regulations apply to all taught Higher Education courses at the University of the Arts London. Further Education regulations and guidance are provided by the University of the Arts London Awarding Body.

Assessment

3.1 Exam Board Membership

3.1.1 There shall be an Exam Board, the composition of which shall be as follows:

Dean (Chair)
Programme Partnership Manager
Course Leader
Internal Examiners
External Examiner(s) for final awards

3.1.2 The range of internal examiners present as members of the Exam Board shall be sufficient to ensure that, overall, the Exam Board has the appropriate expertise to carry out its responsibilities.

3.1.3 No student may attend a meeting of the Board except as a candidate for assessment.

3.1.4 The secretary to the Board shall not be a member of the Board.

3.1.5 The External Examiner(s) must be present when a full meeting of the main Board determines that a student has qualified for a final award. Under exceptional circumstances, arrangements may be made with an External Examiner, and with the approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic, whereby the main Board discharges the above responsibilities in the absence of the External Examiner. These arrangements must include provision for the External Examiner to consider and agree the conclusions reached by the main Board.

3.2 External Examiners

3.2.2 At least one External Examiner will be appointed for the course, after approval by the Academic Standards and Development Committee of the University of the Arts London.

3.2.3 Where a course has more than one External Examiner, responsibilities for different elements of the course will be divided between them. E.g. by practice and theory, or by pathway.

3.2.4 The role and responsibility of the External Examiner is to ensure that:

- a) The academic standards appropriate to the award in question are maintained
- b) That justice is done to the students
- c) That in the processes of assessment, students are treated fairly and equitably according to the University's policies and regulations.

3.2.5 In order to carry out their primary responsibilities the External Examiner(s) for the course will:

- a) Approve proposed assessments which are to contribute to the award(s)

- b) Have access to work presented for such assessment
- c) See the work of all students proposed for the highest available category of the award and for failure, and samples of the work of students proposed for each category of award
- d) Moderate assessment grades
- e) Report on the effectiveness of the assessments and any lessons to be drawn from them

3.2.6 The External Examiner(s) will be fully briefed on the course and its assessment, and on their rights and responsibilities, including the requirements of the University of the Arts London.

3.2.7 No recommendation for the conferment of an award shall be made to the Academic Board of the University of the Arts London without the recorded consent of at least one External Examiner.

3.3 Authority & Responsibilities of the Exam Board

3.3.2 The Exam Board is accountable to the Academic Board for the fulfilment of its terms of reference.

3.3.3 The responsibilities, powers and discretion of the Board shall be those stated in the Progression and Final Examination Regulations.

3.3.4 The Exam Board, having regard to the objectives of the course and the standard of the award(s), may interpret the course regulations flexibly in the case of an individual student. The Board may, exceptionally and at its own discretion, allow a student's overall performance in relation to the course or stage learning outcomes to compensate for partial failure in a unit of the course.

3.3.5 Course-specific regulations may preclude failure in certain assessed elements central to the realisation of the course learning outcomes from being compensated for under any circumstances. Such limiting regulations will be included in the individual course Programme Specification.

Delegated Authority

3.3.6 The Exam Board may, at a full meeting of the Board, agree to delegate authority for resolving specified issues to a sub-board of itself provided that the sub-board is appropriate to those issues.

3.4. Course Requirements

3.4.1. The course requirements are the units and their assessment requirements as detailed in the Programme handbook.

3.4.2. A student shall only be considered a candidate for assessment when that student has satisfied or been formally partially exempted from the requirements of the course.

3.4.3. The student must pass in each unit, unless the Exam Board determines otherwise under the rules for compensation.

3.4.4. Under the rules for admission with academic credit, the Exam Board may consider prior learning as equivalent to all or part of the stage requirements.

3.5. Maximum Registration

3.5.1. All courses must be completed within the Maximum Registration period, which is the normal course length plus 2 years.

3.5.2. A repeat unit, year or partial year out may be refused if the student is not able to complete the course within the maximum registration.

3.6. Holistic and Element Assessment

3.6.1 The student must pass in each unit, unless the Exam Board determines otherwise under the rules for compensation.

3.6.2 Unit assessment may be conducted by Element assessment or Holistic assessment:

Element Assessment

3.6.3 Element assessment is the practice of assessing more than one component, where each component (or element) is awarded a grade. The unit grade is calculated by combining the grades for the elements, according to their relative weighting. The weighting allocated to each element must be defined before the unit is taught, and the calculation is undertaken by the student records system. The assessment method should be clearly described in the Programme Handbook and Assessment Brief.

3.6.4 Where a unit is divided into elements, the student must achieve at least an E Grade in each element, and an aggregate grade of at least D- in the overall unit.

3.6.5 Failure or non-submission in any element will result in a Fail for the unit. The student must successfully retrieve the failed element in order to pass the unit. Where a student does successfully retrieve element failure, the grade for the unit as a whole will be capped in line with regulations set out at 3.16.1a.

Holistic Assessment

3.6.6 Holistic assessment is the practice of awarding a single grade for a submission which comprises one or more component/s. One grade is submitted the student records system. Where a unit is assessed holistically, the unit descriptor and assessment brief must clearly describe what students are required to submit, and whether components are optional or mandatory.

3.6.7 The student must complete all unit assessment requirements and achieve a grade of at least D- to pass the unit, unless eligible for unit compensation.

3.6.8 Failure or non-submission in a mandatory component will result in a fail for the unit. The student must successfully retrieve the failed component in order to pass the unit. Where a student does successfully retrieve failure, the grade for the unit as a whole will be capped in line with the regulations set out at 3.16.1a.

3.7. Element Compensation

3.7.1. A student will be eligible for element compensation where they meet the following criteria:

- a) A minimum grade of E in each element of assessment AND
- b) A minimum grade of D- for the unit as a whole.

3.7.2. Where the student meets the element compensation criteria, they will be compensated for that failure, awarded the credits and progressed by the Exam Board without a requirement to retrieve that failure.

3.8. Progression Criteria

3.8.1. The progression requirements are the units and their assessment requirements as detailed in the Programme handbook.

3.8.2. In order to progress to the next stage of the course, other than by admission with academic credit, a student must satisfy (or have been formally exempted from) the course requirements of the Stage and pass in each unit unless the Exam Board determines otherwise under the rules for compensation (3.9 below).

3.8.3. Where the full range of grades for a year or stage is unavailable Exam Boards may nevertheless progress a student where, on the basis of the information on grades that is available, plus any other evidence of performance as demonstrated by grades or by the judgement of course staff, the student is deemed likely to have fulfilled the requirements for progression.

3.8.4 In exceptional circumstances the University Academic Board may allow a temporary alteration to progression rules to allow units to be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis instead of requiring a full grade to be given. This regulation may be applied even when a unit has begun and had some summative assessment already.

3.9. Unit Compensation

3.9.1. A student will be eligible for unit compensation where they meet the following criteria:

- a) A Level 4 student who has a marginal fail (E grade) in units up to a total value of 30 credits in level 4.
- b) A Level 5 student who has a marginal fail (E grade) in units up to a total value of 30 credits in level 5.

3.9.2. Where the student meets the criteria, they will be compensated for that failure, awarded the credits and progressed by the Exam Board without a requirement to retrieve that failure.

3.10. Interim Awards

When a student has successfully fulfilled the requirements for Progression, but is unable to complete the next stage of the course, the student may request an Interim Award.

3.11. Award Criteria & Classification

3.11.1. A student will be considered for an award on successful completion of the assessment requirements for the course, as detailed in the Programme handbook.

3.11.2. The Exam Board shall be guided by the student's performance in the units as indicated by the letter grades awarded and weighted to the credit rating of the unit.

3.11.3. Where a candidate satisfies the Exam Board at the time of the student's first final assessment, the Board shall recommend an award and a classification.

3.12 Marking Scale & Assessment Criteria

As an indication of performance the Exam Board will receive a letter grade on the University Marking Scale for each unit, to be finally agreed at the Board. These grades will represent the judgement of the examiners on the student's performance in that unit alone. The examiners will use the University Assessment Criteria to inform their decision of what grade to allocate on each unit.

3.13 Assessment Deadlines

Failure to submit work for assessment by the due date shall normally be deemed to require a sanction reflecting the late submission of that assessment (as set out in 3.16.2). Students with approved Extenuating Circumstance applications should be advised to submit work as close to their original deadline as possible, at a time where they are satisfied with their submission up to a maximum of fourteen days beyond that original deadline.

3.14 Marking and Moderation

3.14.1 The aim of moderation is to promote fairness of treatment and parity in marking. It is either:

- a) The second-marking of a systematic sample of work (high, medium and low grades) and the resolution of differences
- b) The blind double marking of all student submissions and the resolution of differences
- c) Group marking by teams of internal examiners who then come to an agreed grade for each student.

Minimum Requirements

3.14.2 Double-blind or group marking should be applied to all final major project units (or equivalent).

3.14.3 For all other units, the minimum requirement is that at least 10% of all student submissions which count towards the allocation of credit should be sampled.

3.14.4 All moderation should be clearly recorded in writing, evidencing the grades before and after moderation and, where a student's grade is amended, providing an explanation for the change in grade.

3.14.5 Once the moderation process is complete, an assessor will complete the final assessment feedback form. An indicative grade and feedback is released to the student, indicating that it is subject to ratification at the Exam Board.

3.15 External Moderation

3.15.1 External moderation is a final check by the External Examiners that the marking is at the right level for the type and level of course. The External Examiners will consider a sample of student work to reflect a range of achievement from the top, middle and bottom of all the student grades:

- a) On Foundation Degrees and Graduate Certificate/ Diploma courses, the External Examiner will moderate all final year units.
- b) On Undergraduate Honours Courses, the External Examiner will moderate all second year and all final year units.
- c) On Postgraduate Certificate and Postgraduate Diploma stand alone courses, the External Examiner will moderate all units.
- d) On Masters courses, the External Examiner will moderate all units contributing to the final classification (normally the final major project and/ or dissertation units).
- e) On Integrated Masters courses, the External Examiner will moderate all Stage 3 units plus all Stage 4 units contributing to the final classification (normally the final major project and/ or dissertation units).
- f) On Postgraduate Continuing Professional Development Units, the External Examiner will moderate all units and final awards.

3.15.2 The External Examiners have the right to moderate the whole cohort of grades if they feel the marking is out of line with national norms. They may do this in a number of ways, including:

- a) Raising or lowering the letter grades of all students in a unit, or only some students (e.g. all 2.2s);
- b) Moving a grade boundary, in which case they may say that all students on a specific letter grade should be moved up to the next grade (e.g. all students on B be moved to B+)

3.15.3 External Examiners do not have the right to change the letter grades of individual students.

3.16 Failure of Assessment

3.16.1 Where the Exam Board determines that a candidate has not satisfied the conditions for assessment and there are no extenuating circumstances material to that failure the Board will adopt one of the following options:

Resubmission

- a) Normally the Exam Board will specify the unit assessment that will be resubmitted and the period within which the resubmission is to be made. The grades for units passed at the second attempt will incur a penalty of one full letter grade (ie: a resubmission that achieves an A would be reduced to a B grade). Resubmission work that is assessed as a pass grade cannot fall below the minimum pass grade of D- from having a resubmission penalty included.

Retake

- b) In exceptional circumstances, usually after sizeable failure, the Exam Board may decide that the candidate should move directly to retake either the entire course stage or specified units depending on the extent of the failure. The Exam Board will specify the units which must be retaken. The grades for all retaken units, whether specified individually or retaken as a complete stage, will not be capped at the first attempt. Retake resubmissions would be capped in line with the policy set out above (3.16.1a).

Failure

- c) In very exceptional circumstances, the Exam Board may, at its discretion and for reasonable cause which could include extreme failure, decide that a candidate who has failed to satisfy the Board may not be reassessed.

Failure to Meet an Assessment Deadline and Non Submissions

3.16.2 If a student fails to hand in work for assessment at the agreed deadline, and no extenuating circumstances have been accepted, the Exam Board will impose a sanction to reflect the lateness.

1. Work submitted for assessment by the deadline will receive the full, uncapped grade.
2. Work submitted for assessment within 24 hours of the deadline, will incur a penalty of one increment (for instance a B- grade would become a C+)
3. Work marked as a pass standard when assessed will not fall below the pass grade when capped (i.e: work achieving a D- would remain a D-).
4. Work submitted for assessment more than 24 hours after the deadline, without valid Extenuating Circumstances, will be considered as a non-submission.

3.16.3 For units assessed on a pass or fail basis, it is not possible to apply the incremental and grade sanctions imposed on units with standard assessment set out in 3.16.2. Work submitted within 24 hours of an assessment deadline can still achieve a pass grade.

3.16.4 If a student submits work beyond 24 hours of a deadline, they will be marked as a non-submission and deemed to have failed that attempt. The student will be offered the opportunity to resubmit or retake as appropriate. Units successfully completed on reassessment will be capped in line with the detail set out in 3.16.1a.

3.16.5 If a student hands in work for assessment after deadlines set out in 3.16.2, the Exam Board may consider the late work as equivalent to re-assessment. Units successfully completed on reassessment will be capped in line with the detail set out in 3.16.1a

3.16.6 For assessment that is conducted by a scheduled presentation or performance it is not possible to apply the incremental and grade sanctions imposed on units with standard assessment set out in 3.16.2. Therefore failure to meet the stated deadline, without validated Extenuating Circumstances, will be marked as a non-submission.

3.17 Failure of Reassessment**Failure of Resubmission**

3.17.1 In the event that a candidate does not satisfy the conditions of assessment after being given an opportunity to resubmit, the Exam Board will adopt one of the following two options:

- a) The Exam Board may allow a student who has failed a unit assessment at the second attempt an opportunity to retake either the entire course stage or specified units. The grades for all retaken units, whether specified individually or retaken as a complete stage, will not be capped. The Exam Board will only offer a student the opportunity to retake a unit or stage once.

- b) The Exam Board may decide that the student should not be reassessed.

Failure of Retake

3.17.2 If the student fails to retrieve failure on retake, the Exam Board will decide that the student should not be reassessed.

3.18 Failure due to Illness or other Extenuating Circumstances

3.18.1 Where an Extenuating Circumstances Panel has validated a student's EC application, the Exam Board may choose from the following options:

- a) To offer the student another opportunity to submit the work as if for the first time and without penalty.
- b) To condone the late submission of work and offer the student the choice of either:
The uncapped unit Letter Grade their submission received OR another opportunity to submit the work as if for the first time and without penalty.

3.18.2 Where the student chooses the deferral opportunity, the student should notify the College of their decision within 2 weeks of the publication of results. The student will be set a deferral brief and a new submission deadline. Where the student requests a deferral, the submission will be marked without penalty.

3.18.3 Where a student fails or fails to resubmit after requesting a deferral opportunity under 3.18.2 above, the grade from the student's first attempt will be included in the calculation of the student's progression/ classification.

3.19 Exceptional Progression Decisions

3.19.1 The following regulations may only be used in exceptional circumstances and with the advance approval of the Academic Registrar. While the normal course of action should be to expect a student to retrieve failure these rules for compensation may be used where this is not possible or practical. This would be the case where assessment is affected by industrial action and a full range of grades is not available. It might also be the case that the time between stages is insufficient to retrieve failure.

3.19.2 In exceptional circumstances a student who fails in units up to the value of 30 credits in any one stage may be progressed without a requirement to retrieve that failure where the Exam Board is satisfied that the overall performance in the rest of the stage is sufficient to compensate for the failure to the extent that the student is deemed capable of undertaking the next stage.

3.19.3 In exceptional circumstances a student who fails in units to the value of more than 30 credits may be allowed to progress and carry forward that failure. The student must be required to retrieve the failure during the following stage. The completion of the following stage, including the award of any degree, is conditional on the retrieval of the failure. The Exam Board must determine which units must be retrieved and may allow for compensation of failure of up to 30 credits under the rules above. In allowing a student to carry forward failure the Exam Board will need to consider whether the student is deemed capable of undertaking the next stage.

3.20 Exceptional Award Decisions

3.20.1 The following regulations may only be used in exceptional circumstances and with the advance approval of the Academic Registrar.

Aegrotat Degrees

3.20.2 Exceptionally, where the Exam Board does not have sufficient evidence of the student's achievement to make an award, and there are good reasons why reassessment is difficult or impossible, a recommendation may be made for the award of an Aegrotat degree if it is the view of the Exam Board that the candidate nevertheless merits an award. The candidate may refuse such an award and exercise the right to be assessed, as if for the first time, in the affected units.

Unclassified Degrees

3.20.3 Where the full set of grades contributing to the award is unavailable or the Exam Board is unable to come to a judgement about classification, the Exam Board may consider the award of an Unclassified degree where, on the basis of the information on grades that is available, plus any other evidence of performance as demonstrated by grades or by the judgement of Programme staff, the student is deemed likely to have fulfilled the requirements for the award. Unclassified awards are given always on the expectation that it will become possible to make a judgement on a classification in the future.

3.21 Running-Out Courses

3.21.2 Where a course is terminating, it will not be possible to offer the final cohort of students the opportunity to repeat units or to defer assessment due to extenuating circumstances, in the next academic year. Students will also not be able to take a Year or Partial Year Out and return to the same course. The Exam Board will need to take this into consideration when making its decisions.

Failure of Final Assessment on Running-Out Courses

3.21.2 Where the Exam Board determines that a candidate has not satisfied the conditions for progression/ the award and there are no extenuating circumstances material to that failure the Board will adopt one of the following options:

- a) Normally the Exam Board will specify the unit assessment that will be resubmitted and the period within which the resubmission is to be made. The grades for units passed at the second attempt will be capped in line with the policy set out at 3.16.1a.
- b) In very exceptional circumstances, the Exam Board may, at its discretion and for reasonable cause which could include extreme failure, decide that a candidate who has failed to satisfy the Board may not be reassessed.

Failure of Reassessment on Running-Out Courses

3.21.3 In the event that a candidate does not satisfy the conditions of the award after being given an opportunity to resubmit, the Exam Board can decide that a candidate may not be reassessed. Candidates that fail to retrieve failure after retaking specified units or a full stage may not be reassessed.

Failure due to Illness or other Extenuating Circumstances on Running-Out Courses

3.21.4. If an Exam Board is asked to consider a successful Extenuating Circumstances application, it may choose from the following options:

- a) To offer the student the opportunity to submit the work as if for the first time and without penalty.
- b) To condone the late submission of work and offer the student the choice of either:
The uncapped unit Letter Grade their submission received OR another opportunity to submit the work as if for the first time and without penalty.

3.21.5. Where the student is given a deferral opportunity, they will be set a deferral brief and a new submission deadline. The submission will be marked without penalty.

3.21.7. Where a student fails or fails to resubmit after requesting a deferral opportunity the grade from the student's first attempt will be included in the calculation of the student's progression/classification.

3.22. Time-Based Examinations

3.22.1. The following regulations apply to assessments conducted under timed examination conditions.

Assessment Briefing

3.22.2. Details of the examination, including the date, location, start and end time, permitted materials (such as calculators) and examination regulations will be given to students in writing in advance of the examination.

Attendance

3.22.3. It is the responsibility of the student to be aware of the details of the examination timetable. Students are strongly advised to arrive at least 15 minutes before the published start time. Students arriving after the published start time will not be admitted to the examination room.

3.22.4. If a student fails to attend at the published time, and no extenuating circumstances have been accepted, the Exam Board will fail the student for that element or unit. The student will be offered the opportunity to resubmit or retake as appropriate. Units successfully completed on reassessment will be capped in line with regulations set out at 3.16 a.

Failure & Retrieval

3.22.5. If a student fails to attend at the published time, but has validated extenuating circumstances, they will be offered another opportunity to resit the examination, as if for the first time and without penalty. The student will be advised of the new examination date in writing.

3.22.6. In order to avoid disturbing other candidates, students may not leave the examination room early, save in exceptional circumstances, and with the permission of the invigilator.

3.22.7. No candidate may leave and return to the examination room during an examination unless supervised by an invigilator.

Conduct

3.22.8. Students may not communicate with any other person but the invigilator during the course of the examination, unless the invigilator has given permission otherwise.

3.22.9. Candidates may only take permitted items and texts into the examination room. It is the responsibility of the Programme team to provide guidance to students about items, such as calculators or dictionaries, they may take into the examination and the responsibility of the student to establish which items and texts are permitted.

3.22.10. All bags, mobile phones, personal organisers and similar electronic devices must not be taken to the examination desk, but must be deposited elsewhere, as instructed by the invigilator.

3.22.11. It is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure that all his or her scripts are appropriately marked with an identifying name and number.

Academic Misconduct

3.22.12. Cheating in an examination will be dealt with as academic misconduct. In particular it is an offence for a candidate to:

- a) Have unauthorised items or texts at his or her desk in the examination room during the examination
- b) Make use of unauthorised items or texts during the examination
- c) Copy from the script of another candidate during the examination
- d) Dishonestly receive help from another person during the examination
- e) Dishonestly give help to another person during the examination
- f) Act dishonestly in any way, whether before, during or after the examination, so as to obtain an unfair advantage in the examination
- g) Act dishonestly in any way, whether before, during or after the examination, so as to assist another candidate to obtain an unfair advantage in the examination.

3.22.13. Should a candidate be suspected of cheating during the examination, the invigilator will confiscate any unauthorised material, indicate on the candidate's script that it has been confiscated due to suspected cheating, and remove the script. The candidate will then be given further examination papers and permitted to complete the examination. The invigilator will seek an explanation from the candidate at the end of the examination, and submit an Academic Misconduct Report Form to the Chair of the College Academic Misconduct Panel.

3.23 Amending an Exam Board Decision

3.23.1 An Exam Board decision can only be changed in one of two ways:

- a) Via the University Appeals Procedures (Request for Review of Exam Board Decision)

- b) In cases not related to academic judgement, by request to the Academic Registrar on behalf of Academic Board.

Request for Review of Exam Board Decision

3.23.2 The full Board delegates responsibility to the Chair to consider a student's request for a review of an Exam Board decision. The Exam Board Chair is responsible for investigating and reviewing the original Exam Board decision, in consultation with the full Exam Board and the University Academic Registrar where appropriate.

Overturning a Decision

3.23.3 The Chair of the Board may propose to overturn a previous decision in matters not related to academic judgement and where new information is made available to the Board (e.g. where a grade has been recorded incorrectly).

3.23.4 The Chair should make a proposal to the Academic Registrar, who authorises the decision on behalf of Academic Board. The Chair must consult with all members of the full Exam Board including all External Examiners before a decision can be overturned.

3.23.5 Where an overturned decision requires a grade adjustment, either as a result of an Appeal against an Exam Board decision or a reported Material Irregularity, it will only be altered by one grade increment.

3.24 Material Irregularity

3.24.1 A Material Irregularity is an administrative or procedural error which has a significant, negative impact on a student's performance at summative assessment. A Material Irregularity may affect one student or a group of students. The investigation process must establish whether the circumstances are material, which students have been affected and how the College will address the irregularity.

Student Complaints and Appeals Processes

3.24.2 Where a student has a concern about a Material Irregularity, the University's Student Complaints Procedure sets out what a student needs to do to make a complaint about their college or a UAL department.

3.24.3 If a student has a concern about a Material Irregularity in the assessment of their work, they may submit a Stage 1 Appeal under the University Appeals Procedures. Stage 1 Appeals must be submitted within 15 working days of the publication of results, and must meet the criteria for review.

Material Irregularity Procedures

3.24.4 Where a member of staff is aware of a potential irregularity that could have a significant impact on a student's performance at summative assessment, they should raise the issue with their Programme Leader (or equivalent). Where appropriate, the Programme Leader will complete a Material Irregularity Report Form and forward it to the Chair of the Exam Board as soon as possible.

3.24.5 The Exam Board Chair will appoint an independent member of staff to act as Investigating Officer. The investigation will be carried out following the prompts on the Material Irregularity Report Form. The Exam Board Chair will consider the investigation's recommendations and determine an appropriate course of action.

Material Irregularity in Course Delivery

3.24.6 Material Irregularity in Course Delivery covers instances where the University or College fails to deliver the approved programme of study, resulting in a significant, negative impact on the student's performance at summative assessment.

3.24.7 In such circumstances, the Exam Board Chair will aim to put measures in place to compensate for any disruption caused and ensure that students are not disadvantaged at assessment. Where a resolution is agreed, the Exam Board will not normally make any further adjustments to student grades.

Material Irregularity in the Assessment Process

3.24.8 Material Irregularity in the Assessment Process covers errors in the conduct of a student's summative assessment or in the application of the University's academic regulations.

3.24.9 In such circumstances the Exam Board Chair will first consider whether measures can be put in place to ensure that the student is not disadvantaged at assessment. However, due to the timing of such irregularities, it will not always be possible to put an effective resolution in place. In these cases, the Material Irregularity investigation report will be received at the next meeting of the Exam Board.

3.24.10 Where a Material Irregularity is confirmed, the Exam Board may choose from one of the following options:

- a) To offer the student another opportunity to submit the work as if for the first time and without penalty.
- b) To condone the late submission of work and award the student an uncapped unit Letter Grade.
- c) To adjust the unit Letter Grade by a maximum of 1 increment i.e. B to B+ or C+ to B-.
- d) To confirm the original unit Letter Grade.

3.24.11 Where a Material Irregularity affects a group of students, the Exam Board will consider the impact of the Material Irregularity on each individual student. Grades must not be adjusted en masse for groups of students.

3.24.12 The External Examiner must approve any decisions affecting final awards or classifications.

Appeals against Material Irregularity Decisions

- 3.24.13 If the student is unhappy with any decision made by an Exam Board, they may request a review of the Exam Board decision under the University Appeals Procedures. The University Appeals Unit will not consider appeals against the academic judgement of the Exam Board or any cases which provide no new evidence other than that already considered by the Exam Board under the Material Irregularities procedure.