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Guidance on the operation of Sub-Boards of Examiners

Introduction

1. This document is intended to give guidance to colleagues involved in the management of examination Sub-Boards (or Sub-Board of Examiners), in particular chairs and secretaries. It will give guidance on the various policies, methods of operation, and roles of participants. This document is intended to provide support to Sub-Board of Examiners rather than be a prescriptive set of “rules”.

It is for the chair persons of Sub-Boards of Examiners to ultimately decide how boards will be conducted, within the College’s regulatory framework.

Policy context within Birkbeck College

2. The college follows a Common Award Scheme defined by the “Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study”, available at: http://www.bbk.ac.uk/mybirkbeck/services/rules/casregs.pdf

As the Scheme was introduced in 2008/9; the vast majority of students will now be classified under CAS regulations at both undergraduate and postgraduate level in 2013/14.

The following policies apply to Sub-Boards of Examiners:


Role of the Sub-Board of Examiners

3. The College Boards of Examiners have delegated authority for approving awards of the college. Sub-Boards of Examiners oversee and carry out the detailed scrutiny of assessment and make recommendations of awards to the College Boards of Examiners.

Departments do not make decisions on individual assessment matters. The terms of reference of both Sub-Board of Examiners and College Boards are attached as Appendix A.

Sub-Board of Examiners report to the College Boards of Examiners, who in turn report to Academic Board. Note that departments and school executive committees can be sent reports for information.

4. Sub-Boards of Examiners have authority for:
   - setting assessments
   - confirming individual module marks
   - deciding re-assessment / re-take regimes
   - making progression decisions
   - assigning compensated fails
   - individual mitigating circumstances decisions.
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Sub-Board of Examiners do not have authority for:

- making awards
- terminating registrations.

However, Sub-Boards of Examiners make recommendations in these areas which are formally considered by College Boards. (College Boards will not normally overturn recommendations but may occasionally refer recommendations back for further consideration).

5. Sub-Boards of Examiners are asked to report to College Boards by means of template reports, which should be completed shortly after a Sub-Board has met. These reports are in addition to minutes documenting decisions made during the meeting. These templates are provided annually by the Registry, acting on behalf of the College Boards, to chairs and secretaries. Sub-board report and minute templates can be found at the following link:

http://www.bbk.ac.uk/registry/for-staff/sub-boards-of-examiners

(Samples of both Sub-board reports and Sub-board minutes can be found in appendices C and D of this document.)

6. Sub-Boards of Examiners have a role in both module results and programme results. Each module should be assigned to a Sub-Board of Examiners which will consider the results of each student taking that module; some of those students will be awarded by a different Sub-Board of Examiners, but it is for the Sub-Board of Examiners to determine the module results for all students taking the modules within its remit. The award recommendation will be made by the sub-board responsible for the overall course of study the student is taking.

Membership of and roles of individual members of the Sub-Board of Examiners

1. The membership of the Sub-Board of Examiners is advised to the Registry by the Chair by the end of January of each year, and care should be taken to ensure that this information includes only the examiners (and not all of the people teaching on the programme).

2. Terms of Reference for Sub-Boards of Examiners can be found here in Appendix A. The purpose of the meeting is to satisfy all examiners that decisions reached in respect of the terms of reference have been reached by appropriate methods and decisions accord with policy, regulation and agreed practice of the Sub-Board of Examiners.

3. Sub-Board of Examiners do not need to undertake the detailed work that they are responsible for at meetings. For instance, Sub-Boards of Examiners are responsible for approving the examination papers for all modules within their remit.

This will normally be delegated to two individuals (one to set the paper and one to check), with external examiners required to sign off papers in each case.

The Sub-Board of Examiners does not need to receive each exam paper, but instead should be given details (preferably via a paper circulated before the meeting)
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identifying the process used to approve papers; the Sub-Board of Examiners can then indicate its approval of the process.

4. Membership and associated roles of the Sub-Board of Examiners is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chair or Deputy Chair (if the Chair person is absent) | • Has responsibility for ensuring that the Sub-Board of Examiners operates efficiently and effectively and discharge their responsibilities.  
• Chairs the meetings of the Sub-Board of Examiners.  
• Takes Chair’s action as appropriate outside of the meeting.  
• Can opt to hold the casting vote. |
| Secretary                         | • Provides support to the Chair in ensuring the efficient conduct of business, both inside and outside of meetings.  
• Outlines, understands and interprets the appropriate regulations and policies. (It is good practice in meetings to have copies of the CAS regulations and policies to hand, as well as minutes of previous meetings of the Sub-Board of Examiners). |
| Clerk (N.B. It is possible for the Secretary and Clerk to be the same person, although it is good practice to separate the roles, which are quite different). | • Distributes paperwork.  
• Takes minutes  
• Produces reports.  
• Carries out the detailed operation of the Sub-Board of Examiners.  
• Does not normally contribute to the meeting. |
| External Examiners                | • Provides careful considered advice on the awards, programmes or modules to which they have been assigned.  
• Normally have an influential role, as can have the casting vote in split decisions. However, the Sub-Board of Examiners can reject the view of the external (if this situation occurs the minutes of the Sub-Board of Examiners should detail such discussion and the decision should be referred to the College Board for ratification). |
Guidance on the operation of Sub-Boards of Examiners

| Internal Examiners                                                                 | • These are academic members of staff with internal examiner responsibility. They are not necessarily all the academic staff who teach on the programmes. |

Timing and operation of Sub-Board of Examiners meetings

5. Each Sub-Board of Examiners is required to meet at least once annually, and be attended by:
   • The Chair or Deputy Chair,
   • At least one external examiner,
   • At least two thirds of the designated membership of the Sub-Board of Examiners.

6. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss and make recommendations as to:
   • Confirming module results,
   • Make or confirm mitigating circumstances decisions (the latter were specific Mitigating Circumstances Sub-Boards of Examiners have met),
   • And to have a preliminary discussion on the external examiners’ findings in respect of the assessment processes.

7. There is no prescribed format for this meeting, however it is suggested that:
   • **7 days in advance of the Sub-Board of Examiners**- all finalists results are circulated to the Sub-Board of Examiners membership, along with:
     i. A detailed document describing how suggested recommendations have been arrived at (i.e. by applying the Common Awards Scheme formula). (The Chair, secretary and clerk should work together on this),
     ii. A statement is made describing any detail as to how the Sub-Board of Examiners can be sure, as far as is possible, that there has been no administrative error in calculating results. Reference should be made to processes such as double marking, use of SITS and mark input processes.

   • **The meeting of the Sub-Board of Examiners** can then be used to ask the membership to:
     i. Confirm recommendations for all non-borderline students as identified in the circulated documentation;
     ii. Discuss all borderline cases;
     iii. Establish consistent criteria for the use of discretion (in line with the College guidance);
     iv. Ensure consistency of all decision making by the Sub-board.

8. Reasons for the use of discretion should be carefully minuted and reported on to the College Board of Examiners.

9. It is good practice to make the guidelines on the use of discretion available for students to read by publishing them in student and programme handbooks.
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10. It is open to Sub-Board of Examiners to meet at other points of the year should they wish to do so, or to take action as a body by methods other than meetings (i.e. by correspondence, delegation or chairs action). It is good practice to report all such actions at the end of year meeting. Care should be taken when scheduling meetings to ensure that the Sub-Board of Examiners is in a position to effect the decisions they make.

11. It is expected that Sub-Board of Examiners will normally attempt to reach decisions by consensus, but that this will not always be possible. Where a consensus is not possible, votes may be taken. Normal practice is for the Chair not to vote unless as a casting vote. However, an alternative is to permit the Chair to vote and to use external examiners as the casting vote in the event of a split decision.

Mitigating Circumstances

12. Detailed consideration of mitigating circumstances is normally delegated to a Mitigating Circumstances panel comprised of a small number of the full Sub-Board of Examiners membership. The constitution of this panel is not prescribed, but does not normally include an external examiner and normally consists of no more than five Sub-Board of Examiners members.

13. Mitigating circumstances panels view all documentation relating to mitigating circumstances applications. Care should be taken to ensure that all such documentation is treated sensitively and that the provisions of the Data Protection Act are not contravened.

14. Mitigating circumstances panels should keep detailed minutes of the panel meetings; these minutes should be available to all Sub-Board of Examiner members (including external examiners) upon request. The minutes should not refer to student names, but should refer to either candidate numbers (A Letter + 6 digits). Sample Mitigating Circumstances Panel minutes are attached as Appendix B.

15. Mitigating circumstances panels should write Mitigating Circumstances Panel Reports for submission to the Sub-Board of Examiners meetings. These reports should:

- Indicate the panel's recommendations in each case, referring again to candidate numbers only. Details on the specific circumstances in each case should be kept broad, but should be sufficient to satisfy sub-boards of the appropriateness of the decision. Appropriate wording is e.g. reference to “illness”, or “family problems”, along with a note of the nature of the evidence supplied to support the cases.
- Provide full detail of the reasons for rejection of any applications of mitigating circumstances under section 3 of the report.
- Outline the criteria used by the panel in making their recommendations.

Production of Sub-Board of Examiners Reports

16. Reports from Sub-Board of Examiners are required by the College Boards, which normally meet around 2 weeks after the Sub-Board of Examiners; as College Boards
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should also have papers circulated 1 week in advance this means that Sub-Board of Examiners reports often need to be produced 2-3 days after the meeting.

17. The purpose of Sub-Board of Examiners reports is to enable the College Boards of Examiners to fulfil their responsibilities, by outlining the recommendations and decision of Sub-Boards of Examiners without overloading Boards with extraneous information. Reports will assist the College Boards in ensuring consistency of practice across the College. The statistics are normally used to highlight Sub-Board of Examiners which may have unusual trends or results, while the narrative sections are used to outline practice to the College Boards. College Boards are then asked to reassure Academic Board that practice is appropriately consistent across the College.

18. The principle duty of College Boards is to ensure consistency of decision making between Sub-boards, particularly in the exercise of mitigating circumstances and discretion decisions.

19. Reports from Sub-Board of Examiners must provide:

   a. Confirmation that awards have been recommended according to the relevant regulations and policies; or;
   b. Where recommendations deviate from these regulations and policies, full details must be given on any rationale applied;
   c. A rationale for raised and lowered marks: marks should not be adjusted for individual students. Sub-boards should ensure that marks across a module are only raised or lowered after the External Examiner has reviewed all the submitted work for that module.
   d. Further detail on reasons for rejection of mitigating circumstances applications. This is so that practice across Sub-Boards of Examiners can be considered by College Boards, who are then able to report to Academic Board on the consistency of practice across the college. It is not the purpose of College Boards to consider individual cases in detail, but to consider overall practice between Sub-Boards of Examiners.
   e. Statistical information (percentages as well as absolute numbers) on all recommendations and decisions to enable comparisons to be drawn between Sub-Boards of Examiners.

20. Reports from Sub-Board of Examiners must be:

   a. Anonymous, in accordance with the College Policy on Marking and Moderation. Mark profiles should be presented by candidate or examination number and examiners should refrain from referring to student identity when considering cases.

   b. Template reports are supplied by the Registry on behalf of the College Boards (http://www.bbk.ac.uk/registry/for-staff/sub-boards-of-examiners) and a sample sub-board report is attached as Appendix C. If there is no information to supply under a sub-heading, the sub-heading should remain, but a “not applicable” note should be included.

Production of Sub-Board of Examiners Minutes
21. The purpose of the minutes of Sub-Boards of Examiners is to serve as a record to ensure that decisions and recommendations made by the Sub-Board of Examiners are transparent, and that there is an audit trail of any decision that involves the exercise of discretion by the Sub-Board of Examiners. The minutes should record the decisions and recommendations of the Sub-board of Examiners including:

- The awards and classifications recommended for each candidate;
- Any decisions taken on issues such as progression or form of reassessment;
- Any discussions relating to the exercise of discretion. For example, where the Sub-Board recommends that a student should be awarded a higher degree classification than the one suggested by the overall result, the reason for this recommendation should be included in the minutes.

22. The minutes of Sub-Board of Examiners meetings should be anonymous, in accordance with the College Policy on Marking and Moderation. Mark profiles should be presented by candidate or examination number and examiners should refrain from referring to student identify when considering cases.

23. Minutes should be produced for all Sub-Board of Examiners meetings and should be held within departments. Accurate minutes are crucial as they are predominantly used to inform appeals. Departments should establish systems to enable the archiving of minutes so that they can be accessed in future years. They should also be used to inform subsequent agendas for Sub-Board of Examiner meetings. Sample Sub-Board minutes are attached as Appendix B.

24. Sub-Boards of Examiners should aim to have minutes produced and approved by the chair within 6 weeks of any meeting. Minutes should not be published on any school / department or programme web pages, as any reference to individuals should not be released into the public domain, in accordance with the Data Protection Act. However, individuals may request copies of redacted minutes under the Data Protection Act, or Freedom of Information Act. All such queries should be referred to the Registry (Data Protection) or Council Secretariat (Freedom of Information), who will advise how to proceed.

Academic Standards and Quality
May 2014
The terms of reference of Sub-Boards of Examiners for all programmes within the Sub-Board’s purview are:

1. to nominate external examiners for the Sub-Board as appropriate;

2. to be responsible for the setting of assessments, including examination papers, and to ensure that regulations and policies relating to assessment have been followed correctly;

3. to be responsible for the setting of marking schemes for programmes not included in the Common Awards Scheme. Programmes not included in the Common Awards Scheme will normally only include programmes for which professional body requirements preclude their inclusion, some programmes offered in partnership with other organisations or where existing pre-CAS programmes are being discontinued. Any new programme should gain the specific approval of Academic Board to be offered outside of the Scheme.

4. to approve marks for all elements of assessment and overall module results and to determine which students have passed or failed individual modules within the Sub-Board’s remit;

5. to determine for students who have not passed a module whether they should be permitted to be re-assessed in one or more elements of assessment or retake the module concerned in line with the relevant assessment regulations;

6. to determine the format and timing of all reassessments;

7. to make decisions on the progression of students to the following academic year, where appropriate.

8. to assign, at the Sub-Board’s discretion, a compensated fail to students who have fulfilled the appropriate criteria;

9. to apply the College’s Policy on Late Submission;

10. to form, at the Sub-Board’s discretion, a mitigating circumstances panel, to assess applications for mitigating circumstances and inform the Sub-Board of their recommendations, in line with the College Policy on Mitigating Circumstances;

11. to consider the recommendations of the relevant mitigating circumstances panel in determining a decision regarding an element of assessment or overall module result;
12. to ensure that, where an investigation into an assessment offence is ongoing, any mark or overall module result related to the alleged offence is withheld until such time as the investigation is concluded;

13. to consider and make recommendations for the termination of registration (exclusion) from the programme and College in line with the regulations and procedure relating to the termination of registration due to academic failure;

14. to consider reports from external examiners, making responses and recommendations to the relevant College Board of Examiners as appropriate.

15. to oversee, in accordance with the College’s Admissions Policy, admission to programmes of study within the sub-board’s remit.

Where a Sub-Board is responsible for making recommendations on the conferment of awards, the Sub-Boards will also:

16. recommend awards and classifications\(^2\) in line with the appropriate regulations and the individual programme specification;

17. make recommendations for and/or approve aegrotat\(^3\) awards in accordance with the conferment regulations.

18. ensure that any candidate who satisfies the minimum requirements is recommended the appropriate award.

**CONSTITUTION**

The constitution of Sub-Boards of Examiners is as outlined in the College Policy on the Operation of Boards and Sub-Boards of Examiners

\(^2\) Classification: Shall relate to any classification of an award whether it be undergraduate honours classification (first, upper second etc) or distinction, merit and pass employed on other undergraduate or postgraduate awards.

\(^3\) See Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study, Regulation 61.
SAMPLE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES PANEL MINUTES

SUB-BOARD FOR THE BSc COMPUTING

MEETING 3rd JUNE 2014

MINUTES

Present: Professor J Chair [Chair]; Dr B Senior-Lecturer; Dr A Lecturer

Secretary: P Clerk

1 Minutes
AGREED:
1.1 The minutes of the meeting of 21st June 2013 were CONFIRMED

2 Guidance
2.1 The Sub-Board RECEIVED and NOTED the College’s Mitigating Circumstances Policy for 2013-14

3 CASES
Student E2043
3.1 The panel received an application from student E2043, claiming illness during the examination period.

3.2 The panel noted that the application was accompanied with appropriate documentation, and accepted the application. The panel recommended that the student be offered the opportunity to resit the following examinations at the next available opportunity

CP001 Introduction to Computing
CP002 Advanced Computing

Student E2185
3.3 The panel received an application from student E2185, claiming illness during the examination period.

3.4 The panel noted that the application was not accompanied with appropriate documentation, and rejected the application.

Student E4364
3.5 The panel received an application from student E2043, claiming personal circumstances had affected their study throughout the year.

3.6 The panel noted that the application was accompanied with appropriate documentation, and agreed that the circumstances described were serious enough to affect the student’s performance. The panel accepted the application and recommended that the student be offered the opportunity to resit the examinations for the year at the next available opportunity.

Student E2853
3.7 The panel received an application from student E2853, claiming personal circumstances had affected their study throughout the year.
3.8 The panel noted that the application was accompanied with appropriate documentation; however the panel agreed that the circumstances described were not sufficient to warrant acceptance. The panel rejected the application.

4. SUMMARY

4.1 Student Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Number of students submitting claims</th>
<th>Percentage of students submitting claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Mit Circs Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of applications</th>
<th>Number of applications accepted</th>
<th>Percentage of applications accepted</th>
<th>Number of applications rejected</th>
<th>Percentage of applications rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Accepted claims decision outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of accepted claims</th>
<th>a)</th>
<th>b)</th>
<th>c)</th>
<th>d)</th>
<th>e)</th>
<th>f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) should be given another assessment opportunity which shall not count as an additional attempt at the assessment (known as a reassessment without penalty). Alternatively, the board may feel that the circumstances and evidence warrant a retake without penalty of the module.

(b) should not be penalised for late submission of coursework and allow the student their true mark for the element in question (where a panel has not already made this decision on the board’s behalf).

(c) in the case of failure by 2 percentage points or less, raising the numerical result to the pass mark.

(d) should only use the marks from non-affected elements of the assessment to decide the module result

(e) should have their final classification raised (if the final classification index is within 2% of a borderline).

(f) If the overall degree result is 2 percentage points or less below a class borderline, the numerical overall result may be raised so that the higher class is achieved.

4.4 Reasons for rejection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Reason for rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2853</td>
<td>The circumstances described were not sufficient to warrant acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2185</td>
<td>The application was not accompanied with appropriate documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting concluded
SAMPLE SUB-BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT

Sub Board Name: BSc Town Planning  
Date of Meeting: 20th June 2014

List of Programmes:  
The Sub-Board considered results for students registered to the following programmes:

Cert HE Town Planning  
BSc Town Planning  
BSc Town Planning and Architecture

SECTION 1 - MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES
Statistics Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>Number of students submitting claims</td>
<td>Percentage of students submitting claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mit Circs Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of applications</td>
<td>Number of applications accepted</td>
<td>Percentage of applications accepted</td>
<td>Number of applications rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Of the 75 students registered to programmes overseen by the sub-board, 25 submitted one or more claims for mitigating circumstances (33%).

2. 30 applications were accepted (86%). Of these, in 15 cases students had work that was submitted after the published deadline marked with no cap. In 1 case a mark of 39 for the module was raised to a 40. In 13 cases students were permitted a further attempt at examinations without penalty. In 1 case the student had passed the module concerned and no further action was necessary.

3. 6 applications were rejected (14%). In 4 of these cases the applications were not accompanied by appropriate supporting documentation. 1 application was accompanied by documentation that did not cover the assessment period. In 1 case the sub-board considered that the personal circumstances (failure to set an alarm clock on the morning of the examination) did not constitute valid mitigating circumstances.

4. There has been a large increase in the number of mitigating circumstances submitted in 2014 compared with the previous year. This can be attributed to the 50% increase in students onto the course and a specific issue with submission of an essay through the online portal which has subsequently been rectified.
SECTION 2 - RESULTS

5. 25 students were registered to the Cert HE Town Planning. 30 students were registered to the BSc Town Planning, of whom 10 were finalists. 20 students were registered to the BSc Town Planning and Architecture of whom 8 were finalists.

6. The Sub-Board considered module results for modules FSOTP001, FSOTP002, FSOTP003 and FSOTP004; these were marked in accordance with the College's Policy on Marking and Moderation.

7. The Sub-Boards considered module results for 65 students. 56 students had passed all modules; 8 students had failed to pass one or more modules and were offered reassessments; 1 student was required to retake a module.

8. The Sub-Board noted that module FSOTP002 had a comparatively high failure rate, with 20% of students who attempted the module failing it. The External Examiner agreed that the assessment of the module was appropriate; it was agreed to monitor performance on that module at next year’s sub-board.

SECTION 3 - REASSESSMENT

9. 40 students failed one or more modules in 2013/14.

10. All students who have failed a module with a score of below 30% have been advised to re-take the module, all other students have been permitted a reassessment.

11. 5 students failed more than 2 modules; these students will be required to re-take their failed modules in 2014/15.

12. 1 student failed 1 module with a mark of 29 and 1 module with a mark of 39. This student will be permitted reassessment at 1 module, but will be required to re-take the other in 2014/15.

13. 1 student failed 1 module with a mark of 15, but passed all other modules; this student will be permitted reassessment at the failed module.

SECTION 4 - COMPENSATED FAILS

14. The Sub-Board offered the award of compensated fails in various modules to 5 students who had achieved a result of between 35 and 39% for the module. 3 students have accepted these offers; at the time of writing responses from the other 2 students have not yet been received.

15. The Sub-Board also offered the award of a compensated fail to 1 student who had achieved a result of 25% for the module. The sub-board noted that the student had completed the number of attempts available for the module and considered that the student had demonstrated strength elsewhere that warranted the award of a compensated fail for the module in question.
SECTION 5 - ACCREDITATION OF PRIOR LEARNING

16. Two students used 30 credits as APL and two students used 60 credits as APL.

SECTION 6 - DISCRETION
A tally for the reason for each usage Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>New Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E4035</td>
<td>Applied Discretion</td>
<td>Preponderance</td>
<td>First Class</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Student E4035 had an overall weighted average of 69.80. The Sub-Board noted that the student had a preponderance of marks in the first class grade (210 of the 360 credits) and agreed that a first class degree should be awarded.

SECTION 7 - TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION

18. Student E2351 had re-taken 3 modules from year 1, having failed both the initial attempt and re-assessment during 2012/13. The student had failed all 3 modules with marks of 32, 18 and 39. The Sub-Board therefore recommends that Student E2351’s registration be terminated due to academic failure.

SECTION 8 - ASSESSMENT OFFENCES
Stage 1 and Stage 2

19. The Sub-Board upheld four allegations of plagiarism on coursework during 2013/14. 3 allegations were considered minor and were dealt with at Stage 1, by awarding a mark of 0 for the element in question, with the reassessed element capped at 40.

20. In one case the plagiarism was considered to be a more major case, and was dealt with at Stage 2. The case involved the substantial plagiarism, including unreferenced paragraphs copied verbatim into coursework with no attribution. The allegation was upheld, and the student awarded a mark of 0 for the module with reassessment capped at 40.

SECTION 9 - AWARDS

21. The Sub-Board recommended the award of a third class degree to the following students: E4033; E1011

22. The Sub-Board recommended the award of a second class (lower division) degree to the following students: E2010; E9048
APPENDIX C

23. The Sub-Board recommended the award of a second class (upper division) degree to the following students:
    E8543; E1345

24. The Sub-Board recommended the award of a first class degree to the following students:
    E5315; E8403

SECTION 10 - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO THE COLLEGE BOARD
Area to write to aid the College Board in understanding aspects of the report if required
SAMPLE SUB-BOARD OF EXAMINERS MINUTES

SUB-BOARD FOR THE BSc TOWN PLANNING

MEETING 20th JUNE 2014

MINUTES

Present:- Professor J Chair [Chair]; Dr F Intercollegiate [External Examiner]; Dr T Lecturer;
Dr B Senior-Lecturer; Professor V Professor

Secretary: P Clerk

1 Minutes
AGREED:
1.1 The minutes of the meeting of 21st June 2013 were CONFIRMED

2 Report
AGREED:
2.1 The Sub-Board NOTED and ENDORSED the report of the meeting of 21st June 2013,
submitted to the meeting of the College Board of Examiners for its meeting on 15th July
2013.

3 Matters Arising
NOTED:
3.1 [Any matters arising from the minutes not covered elsewhere on the agenda]

4 Mitigating Circumstances
AGREED:
4.1 The Sub-Board received the report of the Mitigating Circumstances panel meeting of 14th
June 2013, and endorsed its recommendations.

5 Module Results
AGREED:
5.1 The Sub-Board confirmed the results for the modules FSOTP001, FSOTP002, FSOTP003
and FSOTP004, as outlined in paper BScTP/09/01.

6 Reassessment
AGREED:
6.1 The Sub-Board confirmed that the following students should be entitled to a reassessment
for any or all elements not previously passed on the relevant modules:
E2005 (FSOTP001)
E2013 (FSOTP004)
E2054 (FSOTP003)

7 Progression
AGREED:
7.1 The Sub-Board confirmed that the following students should progress to year 2 of the
programme:
E7014; E7023; E7001

7.2 The Sub-Board confirmed that the following students should progress to year 3 of the
programme:
7.3 The Sub-Board confirmed that the following students should progress to year 4 of the programme:
E7015; E7087; E7015

8 Compensated Fails
AGREED:
8.1 The Sub-Board confirmed the award of compensated fails to the following students for the relevant modules:
E4855 (FSOTP004)
E4100 (FSOTP001)
E4205 (FSOTP001)

9 Accreditation of Prior Learning
AGREED:
9.1 That the following students can use 30 credits as APL:
E7023; E7001

10 Awards
AGREED:
10.1 The Sub-Board noted that student E4035 had an overall weighted average of 69.80. The Sub-Board noted that the student had a preponderance of marks in the first class category, with 210 credits out of 360, and recommended the award of a first class degree.

10.2 The Sub-Board recommended the award of a third class degree to the following students:
E4033; E1011

10.3 The Sub-Board recommended the award of a second class (lower division) degree to the following students:
E2010; E9048

10.4 The Sub-Board recommended the award of a second class (upper division) degree to the following students:
E8543; E1345

10.5 The Sub-Board recommended the award of a first class degree to the following students:
E5315; E8403
SUB-BOARD REPORTS - DO’S AND DON’TS

General
DO Use candidate numbers.
DO Complete all sections of the report, writing not applicable if necessary.
DO Complete your report using the report template.
DO Submit your report to the ASQ section of Registry Services in good time.

DON’T Use student names or numbers.
DON’T Remove headings/sections from the report.
DON’T Submit minutes in place of a report/use the minute template for the report.
DON’T Submit your report to Examinations instead of ASQ (a copy of the report should be sent to Examinations if desired).

Section 1 - Mitigating Circumstances
DO Provide statistical information and previous year comparisons.
DO Explain reasons where Mit Circs were rejected.
DO Explain high numbers of submitted MC claims.

Section 2 - Results
DO List all programmes for which results were considered.

Section 3 - Reassessment
DO Outline how many students are offered reassessment and which type.

Section 4 - Compensated Fails
DO Outline how many compensated fails were offered and for what reason.

Section 5 - Accreditation of Prior Learning
DO Provide a summary of number of the number of students awarded APL and the number of credits awarded for those students.

Section 6 - Discretion
DO Tally the reasons for applying discretion.
DO Ensure that the use of preponderance is in line with guidance.
DO Ensure that the External Examiner has seen all the scripts of a module before adjusting the marks across the module.

DON’T Raise individual marks in order to a) reach the 2% threshold or b) to meet the agreed award.
DON’T Consider exit velocity when making decisions.
DON’T Use the External Examiner as a third marker.

Section 7 - Termination of Registration
DO Explain the reason for any Termination of Registration.

Section 8 - Assessment Offences
DO Include the stage, nature and outcome in your reporting.

Section 9 - Awards
DO Group the reporting of awards by classification.
Section 10 - Additional Information to the College Board
DO Provide clarifications to any of the information within the report which will aid the College Board in considering it.