

Boards of Examiners Policy

Introduction

1. This policy describes the authority, regulations, principles and procedures for the Boards of Examiners to consider the academic outcomes for students and to provide assurance of the academic standards of the awards of Imperial College London (hereafter ‘the university’) and should be considered alongside the following:
 - a. [Academic Regulations](#)
 - b. [Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedures](#)
 - c. [Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures](#)
2. For ease of use, the following appendices are published separately and contain more detailed guidance:
 - a. [Appendix A: Membership and Conduct of Boards](#)
 - b. [Appendix B: Reassessment and Compensation](#), including [module consideration flowcharts](#)
 - c. [Appendix C: Borderline, Mitigating Circumstances, Academic Misconduct and Exceptional decision-making](#)
 - d. [Appendix D: Coding for results template](#)
 - e. [Appendix E: Calculation of Module Marks and Year/ Programme Overall Weighted Averages](#)
3. This document, and its appendices, will be updated as necessary.
4. Board members should ensure that they have received any relevant changes in the Academic Regulations for the academic year, which are listed in the relevant [Changes to Academic Regulations](#) document.

Authority and Role of the Boards of Examiners

5. Boards of Examiners (‘Boards’) operate with delegated authority from Senate. Their role is to make relevant decisions on marks, progression and award and to uphold the academic standards of the university for the module(s) and programme(s) under their remit in line with the agreed Academic Regulations and related academic policies. This would include:
 - a. Receiving provisional marks for modules.
 - b. Confirming that internal and external moderation has been completed.
 - c. Considering and ratifying final module marks, including where amendments to provisional marks have been recommended such as through scaling.

- d. Receiving decisions regarding claims for Mitigating Circumstances and any recommendations of the Mitigating Circumstances Board of mitigation to be given in accepted claims.
 - e. Receiving decisions regarding proven allegations of Academic Misconduct.
 - f. Agreeing outcomes for students in line with the Academic Regulations for progression, reassessment and award.
 - g. Agreeing the timing and format of reassessment.
 - h. Considering relevant data sets for individual modules or programmes for quality assurance and enhancement purposes.
 - i. Where appropriate, confirming the outcome of relevant prizes, awards and Dean's list(s) under is remit¹.
6. The Boards will adhere to the following principles in its deliberations. Boards will:
- a. act fairly, impartially and consistently, across their programme(s) and the wider institution.
 - b. have transparent decision-making processes.
 - c. act respectfully and maintain confidentiality.
7. The university operates a two-tier structure for its Boards, **Pre-boards** and **Examiners' Progression and Award Boards (EPABs)**. An EPAB may also include a specific meeting of the Board to consider students that have completed reassessment prior to consideration for award or progression (**Re-sit Board**).
8. Where module marks and outcome decisions (where relevant) have been ratified by another Board, for example co-curricular modules or 'with management years', the marks and decisions cannot be amended by the Board that considers the students' overall progression or award.

Structure of Boards

9. The different tiers of boards are structured as follows:
- a. **Pre-Boards** (also referred to as Sub-Boards or Internal Boards) determine the overall module/component/element marks and agree, if required, any scaling or adjustments. Approved procedures for dealing with borderline candidates may be considered at the Pre-Board and provide recommendations to the EPAB meeting.
 - b. **Examiners' Progression and Award Board (EPAB)** agree the awards of final year candidates and where appropriate confirm whether or not students in earlier years can progress. The Board will also confirm re-sit or re-take opportunities for candidates. Where a separate Pre-Board is not held, the EPAB will complete the relevant consideration of marks as listed above.

¹ The Head of Department should request confirmation from the Casework Team of any pending or proven allegations of non-academic misconduct prior to the confirmation of any prizes or awards

- c. **Re-sit Boards** consider results of any reassessment or deferred examinations taken following the EPAB. These Boards make decisions in line with those of the EPAB for awards of final year students and progression for those in earlier years.
10. Where credit-bearing activity is regularly not available for consideration at the usual EPAB for progression or award, such as the outcome of study abroad, a department will need to consider the most appropriate set up of their Boards of Examiners to ensure that the moderation and ratification process of marks/credit is completed in line with the university processes and procedures.

Membership and quoracy of Boards

11. The membership of Boards of Examiners includes the Chair, the External Examiner(s) appointed to the Board, and the relevant members of the programme(s) team(s) “College Examiners”. Where the Board is considering collaborative programmes, it must also include a representative(s) of the partner(s) in line with the Memorandum of Agreement.
12. The relevant department(s)/Faculty Education Committee will agree those ‘College Examiners’ that are expected to be members of the Board. The minimum requirement is that there is sufficient representation for the modules presented to make fair and equitable decisions. It is normally required that at least one External Examiner and 60% of the members should be present for the meeting to be considered quorate. Further details are available in *Appendix A: Detailed Board of Examiners membership and conduct*.
13. Also in attendance will be key members of departmental administrative staff to service the Board. A representative from the Assessment Records Team will be invited to attend but is not required for quoracy.

Conduct of the Board

14. The Board will ensure that any decisions taken are consistent, transparent and fair, and in line with the university Academic Regulations, policies and procedures. A record of all decisions will be made in the minutes of the meeting.
15. If the Board is not quorate, for example as no External Examiners are able to attend, the Academic Registrar must be contacted (via quality@imperial.ac.uk) for advice and guidance.
16. The Board will consider the marks and profiles of students to agree progression and award decisions, including requirements for reassessment, considering as necessary accepted claims for mitigating circumstance, proven or outstanding allegations of academic misconduct or other matters that may have impacted the outcome of the results.
17. Potential changes to the examination arrangements and procedures, marking scheme and/or assessment formats for future cohorts should be discussed. A recommendation for any modifications should then be made to the appropriate committee.
18. Further details are available in the [Appendix A: Membership and Conduct of Boards](#)

Follow up action after the Board

19. Following the Board, the Chair and Secretary must ensure that:

- a. minutes are produced and approved in a timely fashion. For an EPAB or Re-sit Board, the minutes must be forwarded to Assessment Records in Registry.
- b. for sub-boards or, where relevant, students are to be considered by another Board, marks and decisions are shared in a timely manner.
- c. the marks and decisions from EPAB or Re-sit Boards are reported to Registry on the agreed template.
- d. the external examiner(s) has 'signed off' the results.

Chair's Action

20. There may be circumstances in which the Chair of the Board is required to make a decision on behalf of the Board regarding a student or group of students which may be planned or unplanned. A planned Chair's action is where the Board of Examiners is aware of a situation which means that they cannot make a final decision regarding a student(s), such as a missing mark, and agree a course of action depending on the outcome. An unplanned Chair's action where the Board becomes aware of a change to a student(s) mark which is required to be ratified, for example, an error in reporting, proven academic misconduct, or that a student's outcome should be reconsidered following an upheld academic appeal or an accepted late claim for mitigation. Further details are available in the *Appendix A: Detailed Board of Examiners membership and conduct*.

Document Control

Document title:	Board of Examiner Policy		
Version:	1.0	Date:	May 2026
Location:	R:\7.Quality Assurance\3. Policy Framework\4. Examination & Assessment\Exam Boards\BoE Policy		
Initially approved by and date:	QAEC 2026		
Version approved by and date:	QAEC 2026		
Version effective from:	May 2026		
Originator:	RPRC		
Contact for queries:	Assistant Registrar (Academic Standards)		
Cross References:	Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedures Board of Examiners Policy appendices		
Notes and latest changes:			