

**Askham Bryan College
Higher Education Academic Regulations**

Section 3. Assessment and Award Regulations 2025-28

(for Askham Bryan College validated programmes)

Version: May 2026

Contents

Contents.....	1
1. Scope and Limitations	3
2. Assessment Overview	3
2.1. Assessment Methods	3
2.2.1. Summative assessment within named awards or modular study	3
2.2.2. Summative assessment on micro-credentials	3
2.2.3. Formative assessment	3
2.2. Assessment Tariffs	4
2.3. Assessment Grading	4
2.3.1. Assessment criteria	4
2.4. Changes to Assessment	4
2.5. Student Support and Reasonable Adjustments.....	5
2.6. Coursework Submission and Deadlines.....	5
2.6.1. Late submission penalties	5
2.7. Excessive Word Counts.....	5
2.8. Academic Misconduct	6
3. Assessment Moderation	6
3.1. Internal Moderation of Assessment Documentation	6
3.2. Internal Moderation of Assessment Results.....	6
3.2.1. Pre-board grade review.....	7
3.3. External Examination.....	7
3.3.1. Appointment of external examiners.....	7
3.3.2. Criteria for appointment as a module external examiner	7
3.3.3. Criteria for appointment as a programme and awards board examiner	8
3.3.5. Termination of external examiners' appointment	8
4. Module Grading, Compensation and Condonement.....	8
4.1. Module Grading.....	8
4.1.1. Pass/Fail assessment components	9
4.1.2. Mark rounding.....	9
4.2. Accreditation Failure	9
4.3. Module Compensation	9
4.4. Module Condonement	10
5. Progression and Awards	11
5.1. Progression to the Next Level of Study	11
5.1.1. Extended Foundation Degrees (ExFdSc)	11
5.1.2. Foundation Degree (FdSc)	11
5.1.3. Foundation Degree (FdSc - Veterinary Nursing)	11

5.1.4.	Progression of part-time students.....	11
5.1.5.	Progression in programmes with professional body accreditation	12
5.1.6.	Progression in programmes with professional body recognition	12
5.2.	Requirements for Awards.....	12
5.3.	Classification of Awards.....	13
5.3.1.	Classification of foundation degree or extended foundation degree.....	13
5.3.2.	Classification of students with advanced standing or ARPL outside of UK.....	13
5.3.3.	Aegrotat awards	14
5.3.4.	Posthumous awards	14
6.	Assessment and Awards Boards	14
6.1.	Module Assessment Board (MAB).....	15
6.1.1.	Constitution of module assessment boards	15
6.1.2.	Procedures of module assessment boards.....	15
6.2.	Progression and Award Boards (PAB).....	16
6.2.1.	Procedures of progression and awards boards	16
7.	Mitigating Circumstances	17
8.	Incomplete Assessment	17
8.1.	Circumstances Unknown to the Mitigating Circumstances Panel.....	17
8.2.	Incomplete or Missing Marks due to Significant Disruption	18
9.	Conflict of Interest	18
9.1.	Assessment of staff members	18
9.2.	Assessment of friends, family members, or other potential conflicts of interest	19
10.	Reassessment, Restudy and Repeat	19
10.1.	Reassessment	19
10.1.1.	Standard rules for permitting reassessment	19
10.1.2.	Rules for permitting reassessment – Veterinary Nursing Level 4.....	19
10.1.3.	Reassessment of accreditation fails	20
10.1.4.	Format and timing of reassessments	20
10.2.	Restudy of Modules.....	21
10.3.	Repeat of Modules or Programme Year	21
11.	Release of Results to Students.....	22
11.1.	Standardised process for release of results post-PAB.....	22
11.2.	Graded Transcript.....	22
12.	Academic Appeals.....	23
13.	Supporting Documents	23
	Glossary of Terms.....	24

1. Scope and Limitations

- I. All taught courses leading to a qualification awarded by Askham Bryan College are required to adhere to the Askham Bryan College Assessment and Award Regulations.
- II. These assessment and award regulations may only be varied with the agreement of the HE Academic Board.

2. Assessment Overview

2.1. Assessment Methods

2.2.1. Summative assessment within named awards or modular study

- I. Each module will normally be assessed by the end of the academic year in which it is completed, except in the case of negotiated and/or work-based modules.
- II. The number, method, and timing of assessment employed in each module are set out in the module descriptor.
 - a) For a 20-credit module, the assessment strategy should normally be based on no more than two distinct components of assessment.
 - b) For a 40-credit module, the assessment strategy should normally be based on no more than three distinct components of assessment.
- III. When designing assessments consideration should be staff and student workload. Where possible, distinct components of assessment should have one submission deadline and not be broken down into multiple parts. If multiple parts and deadlines are required to achieve the learning outcomes this must be agreed as part of module approval and stated within the assessment information on the module descriptor.
- IV. All assessments must comply with the UCAB Principles of Assessment (**Annex 3.01**).
- V. Modules may be assessed through a combination of assessment types, with full details of the assessment strategy stated within the approved module descriptor.

2.2.2. Summative assessment on micro-credentials

- I. Each module will normally be assessed by the end of the academic year in which it is completed.
- II. For a 10-credit micro-credential the assessment strategy should normally be based on no more than two distinct components of assessment.
- III. All micro-credentials are usually pass/fail only with a pass notionally being at 40%. Where micro-credentials are planned to be used for the purposes of ARPL additional alternative evidence of assessment may be required if a student wishes to be awarded a grade higher than 40% for the module.

2.2.3. Formative assessment

- I. Each module (and micro-credit where relevant) will normally include an element of formative assessment, which develops and supports a student's learning. This

formative element may be reviewed by the tutor, or via peer assessment or online automatic feedback. Deviations from this, where appropriate to the module outcomes, will require justification.

2.2. Assessment Tariffs

- I. Under the ABC modular scheme framework (see Section 1), the nature and amount of assessment within a given module must be appropriate to the learning outcome for that module, and the total amount of assessment in a programme must be reasonable and balanced.
- II. All modules and micro-credentials are expected to adhere to the assessment tariffs stated within **Annex 3.02**.

2.3. Assessment Grading

- I. Assessments are usually fine-graded, and students must achieve a weighted aggregate mark of 40% to achieve an overall pass grade for the module, unless otherwise specified in the module descriptor (for example, where there is a minimum level of achievement required in each assessment element). It is not a requirement that both components achieve an individual pass at 40%, unless otherwise required by a PSRB.
- II. Modules or assessment components may be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis, with no marks awarded. These should be assessments that are not suitable for fine-grading, such as competency-based assessments and/or the achievement of a specific task (e.g., work placement hours).
- III. Students must normally achieve an aggregated 40% to obtain an overall pass grade for a module, unless specified in the module descriptor with regards to professional body accreditation requirements (see **Section 3 4.2** for outline of Accreditation Failure).

2.3.1. Assessment criteria

- I. Academic staff are expected to use assessment criteria as a guide to students and as a means of improving consistency of marking (**Annex 3.03**). These include both generic and assignment specific criteria.

2.4. Changes to Assessment

- I. Changes to the mode of assessment must be agreed with through the Minor Modification process before the start of the academic session in which changes are to be implemented and recommended for approval by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee. The Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee will take the recommendation for final approval from the HE Academic Board.

2.5. Student Support and Reasonable Adjustments

- I. Where specifically requested, procedures for the assessment of students with certified disabilities or specific learning difficulties should, wherever reasonable, comply with the recommendations of the needs assessment report.
- II. Refer to the HE Assessment Policy and Procedure and the HE Students Reasonable Adjustment Policy for further guidance - [Higher Education - Policies and Guidance](#).

2.6. Coursework Submission and Deadlines

- I. Arrangements for the submission of all student work will be published for each module in the Module Information Sheet (assignment brief), and the Assessment Plan.
- II. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that their assessment is submitted by the published method and the stated date/time.
- III. Students are responsible for submitting their work by the deadline and in the required format.
- IV. If students experience technical difficulties which result in them being unable to meet the required deadline they may send a copy of their assessment prior to the deadline via email to the relevant module leader with evidence of the technical issue, but it is the responsibility of the student to submit their work when technical issues have been resolved. Otherwise, a late work penalty will be applied.
- V. No staff member should be expected to upload work on behalf of the student (unless part of a reasonable adjustment plan).

2.6.1. Late submission penalties

- I. Any assessment component that is submitted late and without an approved extension or provisionally approved deferral request will be subject to a late submission penalty. The following penalties apply:
 - a) Work submitted up to 24 hours after the published deadline will have a 20%-mark reduction applied.
 - b) Work submitted between 24 hours and 6 days after the published deadline will be capped at a mark of 40%.
 - c) Work submitted 7 days and beyond the published deadline will not be marked and will be recorded as Non-submission (NS).
- II. If a student can make a claim of mitigating circumstances, with appropriate supporting evidence as per the Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedure, then the Mitigating Circumstances Panel can waive late penalties.

2.7. Excessive Word Counts

- I. For written work students are required to observe the maximum word limit set for each assessment component and to declare an accurate word count on the assessment cover sheet.
- II. In determining the text to be included within the maximum word limit, the following items are excluded:
 - Cover and contents page

- References list and bibliography
 - Appendices
 - For clarity, all words including headings, citations and figure legends contribute to the total word count.
- III. Students will receive a standardised penalty for exceeding the word count on any assessment as follows:
- 10-19% above will result in 10% of the grade being deducted;
 - 20-29% above will result in 20% of the grade being deducted;
 - 30-39% above will result in 30% of the grade being deducted;
 - 40-49% above will result in 40% of the grade being deducted:
 - 50% or more above of the maximum word limit will not be marked and will be graded as a non-submission.

2.8. Academic Misconduct

- I. Students are expected to be familiar with Askham Bryan College's policy, procedure, and guidance on academic misconduct to ensure their work meets expectations of acceptable Higher Education practice.
- II. Refer to Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure for details on process and possible outcomes of a confirmed breach in academic misconduct - [Higher Education - Policies and Guidance](#).

3. Assessment Moderation

- I. The moderation process is designed to audit assessment standards and develop a collective understanding of what they should be. The appropriateness of these standards is established at Module Assessment Boards.

3.1. Internal Moderation of Assessment Documentation

- II. Internal moderation of assessment documentation should take place for all assessment types prior to the release to students and recorded using the standardised moderation process.
- III. Refer to **Section 2. Quality Standards Framework** for rules, expectations, and guidance for internal moderation of assessment documentation.

3.2. Internal Moderation of Assessment Results

- IV. Internal moderation of results should take place for all assessment types prior to the release of results to students and recorded using the standardised moderation process.
- V. All assessment results should be considered provisional until they have been confirmed by the relevant Module Assessment Board.

- VI. Refer to **Section 2. Quality Standards Framework** for rules, expectations, and guidance on internal moderation of assessment results.

3.2.1. Pre-board grade review

- I. Prior to consideration of module results by the Module Assessment Board, the module leader (and module tutors where relevant) should review all aggregate marks which generate a weighted score within 2% of any grade boundary.
- II. This review should verify the reliability of a marginal failure grade, given the potentially serious consequence for student progression.
- VII. Where there is a case for revising marks, based upon a review of the assessment components, the reviewed mark should be entered into the appropriate record system, prior to the Module Assessment Board.
- VIII. Where a score of within 2% of any grade boundary is presented to the Module Assessment Board, the module leader should confirm to the board that the above procedure, for reviewing the mark, has taken place.

3.3. External Examination

- I. There are two types of external examiner:
 - a) Module External Examiners are appointed to the Module Assessment Boards where the results of all module assessments are reviewed and confirmed.
 - b) A Progression and Awards Board Examiner is appointed to the Progression and Awards board, at which the overall performance and awards are considered.
- I. Further details on the role and responsibilities of external examiners are described in **Section 2. Quality and Standards Framework**.

3.3.1. Appointment of external examiners

- II. Approval of external examiner appointments or terminations are taken by HE Academic Board.
- III. The term of appointment of external examiners shall normally be four years (five years for new programmes). All appointees should remain in post until after the last assessments have been completed in that academic year.
- IV. Newly appointed examiners should take up their appointments by September or October and, ideally before the retirement of their predecessors.
- V. External examiners who are new to the examiner role should, wherever possible, take up their posts in the June before the retirement of the existing examiner.

3.3.2. Criteria for appointment as a module external examiner

- I. To ensure appropriate expertise, experience and independence, Module External Examiner appointees should normally have:
 - a) academic, professional, or industrial qualifications or experience appropriate to, and at a level matching the subject and course(s) to be examined;

- b) appropriate academic and/or professional standing, expertise and experience to maintain standards in higher education;
- c) recent experience of examining in higher education, and preferably of acting as an external examiner, or comparable recent experience which provides evidence of competence in assessing students in the subject;
- d) usually, no more than one other existing external examining appointment involving substantial examining;
- e) for RCVS accredited programmes academic and recent professional experience related to the programme of study
- f) no involvement over the last five years as a member of staff, governor, or student at Askham Bryan College (as appropriate);
- g) no personal involvement as a sponsor or industrial assessor of students;
- h) no involvement as a consultant to the course team.

3.3.3. Criteria for appointment as a programme and awards board examiner

- I. The criteria for appointment of Progression and Awards board external examiners are the same as the Module External Examiners, except for the need for qualifications or experience to match the courses under consideration.

1.3.5. Termination of external examiners' appointment

- I. Circumstances that shall lead to the premature termination of an external examiner's appointment may include:
 - a) a newly arisen or discovered conflict of interest;
 - b) failure or inability to attend boards or carry out examination duties;
 - c) behaviour inappropriate to the position of external examiner;
 - d) a loss of academic standing;
 - e) failure to submit appropriate reports.
- II. In such circumstances the Chair of the Module Assessment Board concerned, shall prepare a paper citing the circumstances and evidence for consideration by the Chair of the HE Academic Board.
- III. The decision to terminate the appointment shall rest with the HE Academic Board.

4. Module Grading, Compensation and Condonement

4.1. Module Grading

- I. Grading of students on modules (other than those assessed on a Pass/Fail basis) is determined by assessment criteria (**Annex 3.03**) and mark ranges (**Table 4.1**).

Table 4.1. Extended Foundation Degree/Foundation Degree Mark Range (%)

Grade Classification	Mark range	
Distinction	69.49-100	Pass grades
Merit	54.49-69.48	
Pass	39.49-54.48	
F	Below 39.49	Fail grades

4.1.1. Pass/Fail assessment components

- I. For modules which include pass/fail components which have not been achieved at the point of the Module Assessment Board should be graded as Fail (F) unless Mitigating Circumstances are awarded.

4.1.2. Mark rounding

- I. Where the mark for a module or integrated assessment is composed of multiple component marks which are aggregated arithmetically:
 - a) any fractional mark of 39 will be rounded up to 40;
 - b) any fractional mark of 49 will be rounded up to 50;
 - c) any fractional mark of 59 will be rounded up to 60; and
 - d) any fractional mark of 69 will be rounded up to 70.

4.2. Accreditation Failure

- I. Where a student is enrolled on a programme where a professional body requires that they must achieve a pass for each assessment component, an Accreditation Fail (AF) grade will be awarded for that module where the student achieves an overall mean module mark of 39.49% or more but achieves less than 39.49% in one or more assessment components within that module.
- II. Refer to **Section 3: 5.1** on rules regarding progression to next level.

4.3. Module Compensation

- I. The Progression and Awards Board has the discretion to compensate a module which has an overall grade of between 35-39.49%, defined as a marginal failure. Compensation:
 - a) Is permitted in a maximum of one module (maximum of 20 credits) per programme level, being assessed for the first time (first attempt).
 - b) Will only be considered if the student has obtained an overall mean mark of **at least** 50% and has failed no more than 40 credits in that level of the programme and if, in the opinion of the board, the student has achieved all the outcomes of the award at that stage.
 - c) Is **not** permitted for RCVS (Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons) accredited modules which are mapped to the Day One Skills and/or Day One Competences.
 - d) Compensation will be permitted for programmes with professional recognition if all required criteria have been met.

- II. The original mark achieved in compensated modules will be used in the classification of awards and the corresponding grade.

4.4. Module Condonement

- I. Where mitigating circumstances are demonstrated to have affected student performance, the Progression and Award Board has discretion to condone marginal failure (35-39%), excluding the individual major project.
- II. No more than 40 combined credits or 15% of the total credit requirements, (whichever is the lesser), from compensated and/or condoned modules can contribute to award requirements.
- III. The original mark achieved in a condoned module will be used in the classification of awards, and the corresponding grade will be included in the transcript, with reference to the condonement.
- IV. Condonement requests based on illness affecting examination performance would not normally be considered, unless there is written evidence to suggest that the student could not have reasonably known that their performance would be affected before entering the examination room or submitting an assessment. It is not possible for the assessment board to speculate on how a student might have performed had the mitigating circumstances not impeded performance therefore condonement requests will only be considered if a student's overall performance or classification is borderline.
- V. Where a module condonement request is approved, the original mark achieved in the condoned module will remain unchanged. Where a student attempts the assessment again through a permitted re-take, then the mark achieved in the retake assessment will represent the final, definitive mark for that assessment component.
- VI. The relevant assessment board will consider the condonement request and the outcome will be reflected in the results notified to students.
- VII. Condonement is not permitted for modules which are mapped to the RCVS Day One Skills and Competences.

5. Progression and Awards

5.1. Progression to the Next Level of Study

5.1.1. Extended Foundation Degrees (ExFdSc)

Progress to Level 4/Year 2	Progress to Level 4/Year 2, but with a restudy requirement	Cannot Progress
Pass 120 credits (at 1st attempt or after permitted reassessments)	Pass minimum of 100 credits (after 1st attempt or permitted reassessments)	Less than 100 credits passed (after 1 st attempt and permitted reassessments)

Progress to Level 5/Year 3	Progress to Level 5/Year 3, but with a restudy requirement	Cannot Progress
Pass 240 credits (at 1st attempt or after permitted reassessments) [120 credits at Year 0 and 120 at Level 4]	Pass 120 credits at year 0 and a minimum of 100 credits at Level 4 (after 1st attempt or permitted reassessments)	Less than 100 credits passed at either Year 0 or Level 4 (after 1 st attempt and permitted reassessments)

5.1.2. Foundation Degree (FdSc)

Progress to Level 5/Year 2	Progress to Level 5/Year 2, but with a restudy requirement	Cannot Progress
Pass 120 credits (at 1st attempt or after permitted reassessments)	Pass minimum of 100 credits (after 1st attempt or permitted reassessments)	Less than 100 credits passed (after 1 st attempt and permitted reassessments)

5.1.3. Foundation Degree (FdSc - Veterinary Nursing)

Progress to Level 5/Year 3	Progress to Level 5/Year 3, but with a restudy requirement	Cannot Progress
Pass 120 credits (at 1st attempt or after permitted reassessments)	Pass minimum of 100 credits (after 1st attempt or permitted reassessments) May include modules with AF	Less than 100 credits passed (after 1 st attempt and permitted reassessments)

5.1.4. Progression of part-time students

- I. The Progression and Awards Board has the discretion to vary the required progression requirements for part-time students and students who have entered with advance standing, to consider individual circumstances and the appropriateness of studying related modules from other parts of the course before having accumulated the total number of credits for each part.

5.1.5. Progression in programmes with professional body accreditation

- I. For the purposes of progression to the next level of study, modules graded with an Accreditation Fail (AF) (see **Section 3: 10.1.3**) are considered pass grades and should be counted within the accumulated credit.
- II. Reassessment of assessments within AF graded modules is permitted as per the guidance in **Section 3: 10.1.3**.
- III. Where a student has exhausted their AF reassessment opportunities and cannot proceed to the professionally accredited final award, they will be transferred to the associated programme that is not in receipt of professional accreditation.
- IV. Transfer from a programme not in receipt of professional accreditation to one that requires consideration of AF grades, a student may be required to complete additional assessment submissions. Where AF grades exist, the student will be required to submit/re-submit relevant assessments.

5.1.6. Progression in programmes with professional body recognition

- V. For the purposes of progression to the next level of study, any modules mapped to professional recognised programmes (e.g. Animal Behaviour Training Council) for which students have not achieved 40% in all components, but have achieved 40% for the module overall, should be considered pass grades and should be counted within the accumulated credit.
- VI. Where a student has exhausted their reassessment opportunities and have not met the criteria for professional recognition at final award, their transcript will state that professional recognition was not achieved (see **5.2.3b** for further details).
- VII. Transfer from a programme not in receipt of professional recognition to one that requires completion of additional criteria, a student may be required to complete additional assessment submissions.

5.2. Requirements for Awards

- I. To qualify for an **Extended Foundation Degree**, students must have acquired a minimum of 340 credits at levels 3, 4 and 5, with no more than 120 credits at Year 0, no more than 120 at level 4, at least 120 credits at level 5 (passed at 1st attempt or after permitted reassessment, compensation or condonement).
- II. To qualify for a **Foundation Degree**, students must have acquired a minimum of 240 credits at levels 4 and 5, with no more than 120 at level 4 and with no less than 120 at level 5 (passed at 1st attempt or after permitted reassessment, compensation or condonement).
- III. For programmes that are accredited or recognised by a professional body requirements additional requirements for awarding these programmes may apply.

- a) FdSc Veterinary Nursing – A student must have passed all accredited assessment components at 40% or above and have passed the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) to be awarded the FdSc in Veterinary Nursing and to permit student to gain Registered Veterinary Nursing status with the Royal College and Veterinary Surgeons. Students who have been unable to pass all modules and assessments after permitted reassessment, may then be transferred to a non-accredited programme where appropriate.
 - b) FdSc Canine and Feline Behaviour and Training (including Extended FdSc) - A student must have met all Knowledge and Understanding (KU) criteria mapped across the programme to be provided with an award that has ABTC (Animal Behaviour Training Council) recognition. Students who have been unable to meet all ABTC KU's will not receive this recognition. The status of this professional recognition will be reported in a student's final transcript.
- IV. Modules which have been compensated or condoned are included in the achieved credits.
- a) No more than 60 credits or 15% of the total required credits for a programme, (whichever is the lesser), from compensated and/or condoned modules can contribute to overall award.

5.3. Classification of Awards

5.3.1. Classification of foundation degree or extended foundation degree

- I. The overall grade for a Foundation Degree or Extended Foundation Degree is normally based upon a mean mark derived from all Level 5 credits.
- II. Award classification is determined based on the overall grade boundary achieved at Level 5 (**Table 4.2**).

Table 4.2. Award classification and grade boundaries

Award Classification	Grade Boundaries
Distinction	69.49-100
Merit	54.49-69.48
Pass	39.49-54.48
Fail	39.48 and below

5.3.2. Classification of students with advanced standing or ARPL outside of UK.

- I. The equivalence of credit value of modules studied in countries outside the UK will be based upon the approach adopted in the Course Accumulation and Transfer System (CATS) in which credits are awarded by proportion of year of study rather than for study hours.

- II. Each year of study on a standard degree in each institution will thus carry 120 UK credits. The number of credits awarded per module will therefore depend on the proportion of the year represented by each module.
- III. The equivalence of grades derived from degree modules delivered in partner institutions will be determined by aligning marking and assessment criteria within the CATS system.
- IV. Whilst it shall be normal practice to accept the module grades determined by overseas institutions, with which there are approved student exchange arrangements, in determining award classification, course assessments boards shall in all cases consider whether the results achieved in overseas study are significantly different from those achieved in the rest of the programme and use discretion in determining the classification agreed because of individual experience of the student.

5.3.3. Aegrotat awards

- I. Where a student is prevented by illness, or other valid cause, from completing the final assessments of a programme, the College may confer an aegrotat award. In such cases, the Progression and Award Board should be satisfied that, on balance of probability, the student would have achieved the standard required, as supported by appropriate evidence. The Progression and Awards Board must be satisfied that the student is unlikely to be able to resume their studies within a reasonable period.
- II. Any aegrotat award will be unclassified and ungraded and may not entitle the student to gain recognition from any professional body associated with the programme.
- III. An aegrotat classification may be awarded for any level of an undergraduate programme.

5.3.4. Posthumous awards

- I. Any award of Askham Bryan College may be conferred posthumously and accepted on the deceased's behalf by a parent, partner, or other appropriate person. The Progression and Award Board will exercise discretion in determining the deceased's academic achievement against award requirements.

6. Assessment and Awards Boards

- I. Final moderation of results and decisions on student progression and awards are the responsibility of the Module Assessment Board (MAB) and the Progression and Award Board (PAB). These have the constitution, authority and responsibilities ascribed to them as per **Section 3: 6.1** and **6.2** and **Annex 4.06**.

6.1. Module Assessment Board (MAB)

6.1.1. Constitution of module assessment boards

- I. Where appropriate, each subject area shall have an associated MAB that is empowered to act on behalf of the HE Academic Board, following procedures laid down by the Board or by the Academic Quality and Standards Committee, acting on behalf of HE Academic Board.
- II. Refer to Terms of Reference for Assessment and Awards Boards for further details (**Annex 4.06**).

6.1.2. Procedures of module assessment boards

- I. The module assessment boards (MABs) alone are responsible for establishing the standards of assessed work in a subject. Standards are established by:
 - a) comparing the analysis of module marks and grades with those of previous occasions and identify any modules which are atypical;
 - b) considering the implications of the results of sample double marking by internal and external examiners;
 - c) considering the views of external examiners who have reviewed the assessment methods and carried out *viva voce* examinations of individual students;
 - d) reviewing the profile of marks and grades of modules in other Module Assessment Boards, for that assessment stage.
- II. MABs will be presented with students' marks and grades in each module studied for consideration.
- III. Where the module leader, internal moderator or second marker, Course manager, Curriculum HoD and/or Head of HE Academic Services and Quality Assurance have, as a consequence of the moderation process, decided to recommend that marks be modified, they will additionally present the board with a comparison of un-moderated marks and an explanation of the rationale for the modification.
- III. The MAB considers the results for all students (irrespective of programme, or award) who have been assessed in modules for that subject. It is not the responsibility of the Module Assessment Board to consider the overall performance of individual students or extenuating circumstances relating to individual performance.
- IV. It is the responsibility of the module leader to report to the board the accuracy of incomplete or zero grades and to ensure that non-submission or non-attendance of an individual student has been verified by a medical note or other valid, written evidence.
- IV. Once the grades have been confirmed by the Module Assessment Board, they shall be made definitive in the student record system ready for consideration by the Progression and Award Boards (**Section 3: 6.2 and Annex 4.06**).

- V. All incomplete grades should be ratified by the Module Assessments Board in considering the mitigating circumstances of individual students as per mitigating circumstances policy and procedure.

6.2. Progression and Award Boards (PAB)

- I. Each programme has an associated PAB that is empowered to act on behalf of HE Academic Board, following procedures laid down by Academic Board or the Academic Quality and Standards Committee, acting on behalf of HE Academic Board.
- II. Refer to Terms of Reference for Assessment and Awards Boards for further details (**Annex 4.06**).

6.2.1. Procedures of progression and awards boards

- I. The focus of the Progression and Awards boards is the student outcome.
- II. Progression or Award classification decisions made by the PAB are normally determined by the mathematical rules contained within the assessment regulations.
- III. The PAB **cannot alter any module grades** moderated by Module Assessment Boards unless an error in transcription or an omission is discovered.
- IV. The PAB can decide to compensate or condone a marginal failure in a module under the conditions prescribed in these assessment regulations (see **Section 3: 4.3 and 4.4**).
- V. The overall performance of the student is indicated by:
 - a) module grades which have been confirmed by the appropriate Module Assessment Boards at each level or year of the programme;
 - b) documented evidence of mitigating circumstances relating to the student;
 - c) overall performance across each year of the programme.
- VI. The board may award a different classification from that determined by the marks awarded under the conditions prescribed in **Section 3: 5.3.2**. However, it is essential for equity and legal reasons that the same array of marks normally yield the same overall result. The reasons for any decisions that are out of line with the assessment regulations, or for any decision on individual students that are out of rank order, must be clearly specified in the minutes of the board meeting.
- VII. A summary of the potential progression or award outcomes available to the Progressions and Awards Board are detailed within **Annex 3.04**.
- VIII. Where the College has entered into an agreement with an external accrediting or professional body, the College shall ensure that membership to the relevant Progression and Awards Board is consistent with that agreement.

7. Mitigating Circumstances

- I. All significant mitigating circumstances relating to the performance of individual students must normally be documented and submitted to the Mitigating Circumstances Panel prior to the convening of any assessment or awards board.
- II. Students are individually responsible for providing documented evidence of any mitigating circumstances, which may have affected their performance in one or more assessments.
- III. Where a student has approved mitigating circumstances that result them being unable to complete the required assessment type, then reasonable adjustments can be applied, and an alternative assessment method may be permitted at the discretion of the Module Assessment Board. This will be subject to the alternative method of assessment being designed to ensure that programme outcomes can still be met.
 - A request for an alternative assessment request should be made to the MAB for decision on whether an alternative assessment would be permitted.
 - The nature and content of the alternative assessment can be signed off by the MAB Chair to ensure it will meet the relevant programme and module outcomes.
 - Outcomes of are reported to the PAB where permitted progression or awards outcomes are then confirmed.
- IV. The Progression and Award Board will, in confidence, consider the mitigating circumstances, in making decisions on module condonement, student progression and final awards. A copy of the claim and documentary evidence will be retained, in confidence, by UCAB Academic Services for one year following the students' completion or withdrawal from the programme.
- V. Refer to the Policy and Procedure on Mitigating Circumstances for full details - [Higher Education - Policies and Guidance](#).

8. Incomplete Assessment

8.1. Circumstances Unknown to the Mitigating Circumstances Panel.

- I. If it is established to the satisfaction of a PAB that a student's absence, failure to submit work or poor performance in one or more modules was due to illness or other cause found valid on production of acceptable evidence, then the board shall act under 'a to d' below.
 - a) The student will have the right to be assessed as if for the first time in one or more modules in the normal way or as specified by the Progression and Award Board. If the assessment(s) affected by illness was itself a second attempt, the student shall be permitted to resit as if for the second time.
 - b) When the Progression and Award Board is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence of the student's achievement, or this evidence is subsequently

obtained, the student may be recommended for the award for which he or she is a candidate, with or without honours classification as appropriate. To reach a decision, the Progression and Award Board may assess the candidate by whatever means it considers appropriate.

- c) An aegrotat award (see **Section 3: 5.3.4**) may be recommended when the course assessments board has insufficient evidence of the student's performance to recommend the award for which the student was a candidate. Aegrotat awards are unclassified, but this word does not appear on the degree certificate.
 - d) Before a Progression and Award Board's recommendation under b and c above is confirmed, the student must have signified in writing that he or she is willing to accept the award and understands that this implies waiving the right to be reassessed under (a) above.
- II. It is for the PAB to decide whether the student has presented a valid case and, where the board is not satisfied, the student does not have a right to resit as if it were for the first time.

8.2. Incomplete or Missing Marks due to Significant Disruption

- I. If assessment marks/grades are unavailable to the College due to force majeure (including loss due to fire, theft, loss, illness, industrial action, or other event outside of the Colleges' control), the Chair of the HE Academic Board and the Chair of the Academic Quality and Standards Committee shall have the authority to convene an emergency meeting to determine the detailed arrangements that will be implemented to address the absence of marks/grades.
- II. To ensure the quoracy of such a meeting, a minimum attendance of ten representatives is required, including the Chair(s) of appropriate Module Assessment Board(s), the Chair of the Progression and Award Board and at least two additional representatives from both HE Academic Board and the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

9. Conflict of Interest

9.1. Assessment of staff members

- I. All assessments completed and submitted by a member of Askham Bryan staff, including APRL submissions, should be double marked by a member of HE Management Group or suitable senior staff member and, in addition, should be reviewed by the assigned external examiner. This approach should ensure that individuals are not asked to make sole judgements on the work of their colleague(s). External examiner oversight adds an external, independent reassurance on the reliability of marks.
- II. Colleagues will not have access to electronic records for modules on which they are registered. Colleagues whose achievements are under discussion in either Module Assessment Boards or Progression and Award Boards will be expected to declare

their interest at the commencement of the meeting. The Chair will exercise their discretion on whether the individual is excused or asked not to contribute to specific discussions.

- III. Results will be published anonymously removing any potential for staff information being accessible by students.

9.2. Assessment of friends, family members, or other potential conflicts of interest

- I. In such a situation all assessments completed by a student who is a friend, family member or other contact where there may be a conflict of interest, including AP(E)L submissions, should be double-marked and, in addition, should be reviewed by the assigned external examiner. This approach should ensure that individuals are not asked to make sole judgements on the work of somebody personally known to them. External examiner oversight adds an external, independent reassurance on the reliability of marks.
- II. Colleagues whose achievements are under discussion whose friend, family member or other contact where there may be a conflict of interest in either Module Assessment Boards or Progression and Award Boards will be expected to declare their interest at the commencement of the meeting. The Chair will exercise their discretion on whether the individual is excused or asked not to contribute to specific discussions.

10. Reassessment, Restudy and Repeat

10.1. Reassessment

10.1.1. Standard rules for permitting reassessment

- I. Students who have obtained Fail (F) grades at the first attempt in a module, including a Major or Research Project, will have the right to be reassessed once, within the following limits:
 - either
 - a) A maximum of 60 credits, per level
 - or
 - b) A maximum of two modules per level where the failed module exceeds 40 credits.

10.1.2. Rules for permitting reassessment – Veterinary Nursing Level 4

- I. Students who have completed 100 credits of level 4 (Year 1) but have obtained one or more Fail (F) grades will be permitted to submit reassessment of components with

a Fail grade prior to sitting the final 20 credits at level 4 (This rule overrides the minimum 60 credits requirement at this stage).

- II. If after completion of all 120 credits at level 4 a student has failed more than 60 credits, then a restudy or repeat opportunity may be offered.
- III. Standard reassessment rules apply if a student fails the final 20 credit module within the year 2 of the programme or any modules within the 3rd year of their FdSc Veterinary Nursing programme.

10.1.3. Reassessment of accreditation fails

- I. Students will normally have the right to be assessed up to four (4) times in any module which has PSRB accreditation requirements, which was awarded an Accreditation Fail (AF) grade (1st attempt plus three further reassessments).
- II. For modules originally awarded AF grades, the student will only be reassessed in the component(s) which were graded below 40% (0-39.48%).
- III. The module mark awarded following reassessment is restricted to the original AF mark.
- IV. If the student fails to pass the previously failed component(s) in an AF module, they will be awarded a further AF grade.
- V. Any assessment component with an accreditation fail will be capped at 40%, but overall module grade would not be capped and the original mark at 1st attempt will be awarded.
- VI. Students who have not been withdrawn from the course and who have been awarded AF grades, after any permissible reassessments, will not normally be permitted further reassessments.

10.1.4. Format and timing of reassessments

- I. The form and timing of reassessment is at the discretion of the MAB, but will normally be:
 - a) Reassessment of each individual component what was failed:
 - b) Completed immediately after the PAB (during a specific assessment window), or within a specified period for part-time students.
- II. Students who are offered a reassessment are permitted to submit work that they have submitted before (also known as “put it right”), but with sufficient updates and refinements to enable them to meet the required learning outcomes (this is not permitted for examinations or time-constrained assessments).
 - a) In these cases where a student has failed and not received credits for a module, and similarity to previous work in the uncredited components appears in subsequent reassessments, this sits outside of the remit of Academic Misconduct.

- b) Where a student has failed an assessment due to late submission of the original piece of work they are permitted to submit the original work without changes.
- III. For Pass/Fail components related to achievement of work placement hours, students are permitted to use previously logged hours and add to those.
- IV. The maximum mark awarded for a reassessed module is 40%. If a student fails to achieve 40%, a Fail (F) grade will be awarded. See **Section 3: 10.1.3** for rules on grading of accreditation failures.
- V. If the failed component is Pass/Fail only then the module grade would not be capped. This module will be recorded as Fail (F) until the Pass/Fail component is completed.

10.2. Restudy of Modules

- I. Students who have not been withdrawn from the programme, but have been awarded Fail (F) grades, after attempting any permissible reassessments, may be permitted to restudy the module(s) only once.
- II. The opportunity to restudy module(s) will not be available, if a student elects **not** to undertake scheduled reassessment(s) and any of the grade for the module will be capped at 40%.
 - I. Where a student is progressing into the next year of study the maximum volume of repeated credits normally permissible in any one level is either one module up to 20 credits in value or a combination of modules up to a total of 20 credits in value, alongside their next year of study (See **Section 3: 5.1** for rules on progression).
- II. Students who fail to pass a restudy will not **normally** be permitted a further reassessment opportunity.

10.3. Repeat of Modules or Programme Year

- I. Students who fail to satisfy the requirements for progression or for award will normally be withdrawn unless the PAB exercises discretion to allow a repeat of all or part of the year.
- II. This discretion to offer repeat will **normally** only be allowed if the student has:
 - a) obtained a mean mark of over 40% for that year of the course after permitted reassessment,
 - and;
 - b) obtained credits that are no more than 60 credits short of the requirement to proceed to the next level of their registered programme.
- III. If a student has less than 60 credits, it will be at the discretion of the PAB to decide if expectational repeat study is permitted.

- IV. Students who accept a repeat study will not be eligible to register, concurrently, for other taught elements of their programme, until they have passed all their outstanding modules. There is no automatic entitlement to repeat study for students who fail more than 60 credits in a part, and such students will normally be withdrawn from the course.
- V. Students who fail to pass a restudy will not **normally** be permitted a further reassessment opportunity, all modules will be capped at a pass (40%).

11. Release of Results to Students

11.1. Standardised process for release of results post-PAB

- I. The post-board results process varies depending on the board outcome for the student.
 - a) **Progressing students** receive an email confirming their progression to their next level of study usually within seven (7) working days of the PAB.
 - b) **Awarded students** receive a phone call from their Course manager informing them of their completion of their programme and the classification that has been awarded usually within two (2) working days of the PAB.
 - Award students also receive an email from Academic Services confirming the outcome of the boards.
 - c) **Reassessing or restudying students** receive a phone call from their course manager informing them of the board outcome, usually within two (2) working days of the PAB.
 - The student will also receive an email from their course manager outlining the instructions for their reassessment, usually within seven (7) working days of the PAB.
 - Students who are required to restudy a module receive an email confirming the outcome of the board from Academic Services, usually within seven (7) working days of the PAB.

11.2. Graded Transcript

- I. Students should normally be able to view their grade profile via the student-facing records system, which will usually be available within two (2) working days after the relevant PAB.
- II. Following the Progression and Award Board an awarded student will receive a formal graded transcript, alongside a Certificate of Achievement at the achieved level (e.g., Award of Learning, Cert HE, Foundation Degree). These documents are usually released following completion of the graduation ceremony for that graduating year.

12. Academic Appeals

- I. Students who have valid reasons for academic appeal may do so following the guidance published within the Academic Appeals Policy and supporting Procedure - [Higher Education - Policies and Guidance](#).

13. Supporting Documents

- Annex 3.01 UCAB Assessment Principles
- Annex 3.02 Assessment Tariffs
- Annex 3.03 Assessment Criteria
- Annex 3.04 PAB Outcome Options

Glossary of Terms

Summative Assessment	Formal assessment contributing to the final grade of a module or programme.
Formative Assessment	Non-graded feedback assessments aimed at supporting student learning.
Assessment Tariffs	Prescribed limits and expectations for the volume and type of assessments per credit/module.
Assessment Criteria	Standards used to judge the quality of a student's work.
Module	A discrete unit of study within a programme, typically carrying a set credit value.
Micro-credential	Short courses (usually 10 credits) with focused learning outcomes, often assessed on a pass/fail basis.
Pass/Fail Assessment	Assessments that do not use numerical grades, only pass, or fail.
Mark Rounding	The practice of rounding borderline marks up to the next grade boundary (e.g., 39 to 40).
Accreditation Fail	A grade denoted by the code AF, given when a student fails a required component in a professionally accredited module, even if the overall module mark is above 40%.
Compensation	A process allowing marginal failure (35-39.49%) in a module to be offset by good performance in other modules.
Condonement	A process where failure in a module (35-39.49%) is excused due to mitigating circumstances.
Mitigating Circumstances	Unexpected events affecting student performance, requiring formal submission for consideration.
MAB	Module Assessment Board - A panel that reviews and confirms individual module grades.
PAB	Progression and Award Board - A panel that determines overall student progression and final awards.
External Examiner	An independent academic appointed to review standards and consistency in assessment.
Restudy	A repeat of a failed module after permissible reassessment attempts have been exhausted.
Reassessment	An opportunity to retake failed assessments, usually limited in number.
Repeat Year	Re-enrolment to retake all or part of a year of study after failing to meet progression requirements.
Aegrotat Award	An unclassified degree awarded when a student is unable to complete assessments due to serious illness or other valid reason.
Posthumous Award	A qualification awarded to a deceased student, accepted by a designated individual.
Academic Misconduct	Any dishonest or unethical academic behaviour such as plagiarism or cheating.
Graded Transcript	An official record of a student's module results and final classification.
CATS	Credit Accumulation and Transfer Scheme – a system for assigning and transferring academic credit.