1 Format of the Board of Examiners

1.1 Boards of examiners may be held as in-person meetings on a College Campus (or other venue as appropriate for the programme under consideration), virtually through a secure video-conferencing platform, or in a hybrid mode. Each Department will confirm the expected mode of attendance for their Boards when setting the dates.

1.2 Where Board of Examiners will be held wholly or partly online, when preparing it is important to ensure that best practice for online meetings is followed, including ensuring that principles of data protection are adhered to. Following the adequacy decision, the data sharing with the EU may continue, within the bounds set out in GDPR legislation.

1.3 There are a number of factors that need to be considered in preparing for the Boards this year which may impact on the decision of each Board as to how they wish to proceed. Support and guidance from ICT on secure remote working including distribution of files can be found at http://www.imperial.ac.uk/admin-services/ict/self-service/be-secure/.

1.4 Further information on GDPR can be found on the College webpages at https://www.imperial.ac.uk/admin-services/secretariat/information-governance/data-protection/gdpr/.

2 Academic Regulations

This year, Examination Boards will need to apply the relevant set of Academic regulations to students as below:

2.1 Undergraduate Students:

Undergraduate students who commenced their studies in 2019/20 (or have joined a cohort from a previous year) will be considered under the Single Set of Academic Regulations. This would normally cover all students in years 1, 2 and 3.


All other continuing undergraduate students (including MBBS) will be considered by the previous regulations. This would normally be year 4 of integrated master programmes, year 5 and 6 of MBBS.

https://www.imperial.ac.uk/about/governance/academic-governance/regulations/2021-22-regulations-b/
2.2 Postgraduate Students:

Postgraduate students who are on programmes which have been through curriculum review are to be considered under the Single Set of Academic Regulations. A full list of these programmes can be found on the academic regulations webpages.


All students on other postgraduate taught programmes will be considered under the following regulations:

https://www.imperial.ac.uk/about/governance/academic-governance/regulations/2021-22-regulations-b/

3. Advice for the application of Mitigating Circumstances decisions.

3.1 Board of Examiners will need to consider students that have had accepted Mitigating Circumstances claims under the previous policy and/or under the updated procedure, which was introduced in October 2018. This is likely to be those Boards considering a student in their fourth or subsequent year of their programme but may relate to students that have repeated a year of study. This guidance is provided to support members of Boards in their decision-making process.

3.2 Examinations Boards will need to consider the recommendations made from Mitigating Circumstances Boards for accepted claims in accordance with paragraph 8.6 of the Mitigating Circumstances Policy and Procedure, as follows.

1) **Defer:** Where the student has failed the assessment(s), the Board of Examiners can consider offering the student:

   a) a further opportunity to attempt the assessment(s) at the next available assessment point. If relating to a first attempt at the assessment this will receive an uncapped mark.

   b) to take an uncapped Supplementary Qualifying Test(s) (Faculty of Engineering, old curriculum only) to retrieve outstanding modules

   c) to be permitted to take an SQT(s) (Faculty of Engineering old curriculum only) to enable progression

   d) to be offered an opportunity to retake the year as a first attempt

Where the assessment(s) has/have been passed or the module overall is a pass, and therefore a) to d) are not applicable, the Board of Examiners may consider:

   e) extended consideration at the borderline for an uplift in classification in accordance with the regulations
f) consideration at the borderline where a qualifying mark is required for continued progression

Whilst the above options would normally be sufficient the Mitigating Circumstances Board may make a recommendation in the light of the information that it holds for a particular action. However, it is ultimately the decision of the Board of Examiners in the knowledge that the student has an accepted claim for mitigation to consider the appropriate ‘mitigation’ to be offered, subject to the regulations and any programmes specific requirements.

2) Allow Late. Where the claim was submitted to mitigate for the late submission of a piece of assessment, (either coursework or a timed remote assessment) it would now be accepted as though ‘on time’ and receive an uncapped mark.

3.3 What can’t a Board do?

Boards cannot increase the marks or overall weighted average of a student on the basis of accepted claim for mitigating circumstances. The transcript must show the marks and credits as actually achieved.

For further information about considering borderline students, see the relevant section below.

4 Impact of strike action

4.1 The Boards of Examiners should consider any cumulative impact in relation to the strike action that has occurred during students’ programmes of study. Depending on the programme, students may have been disrupted due to strike in 2017/2018, 2019/2020 and in the most recent periods of strikes during 2021/2022.

4.2 For those students that were impacted in 2017/2018 or 2019/2020, it is likely that the decisions made at the time remain appropriate but may have been subsequently impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and/or further strike action. As any impact will differ from programme to programme, Boards should ensure that its discussion and any agreed actions taken in relation to student results and progression due to strike action is recorded in the minutes.

5 Ongoing Impact of Covid-19 – Safety Net and Fair Assessment

5.1 For Undergraduate Programmes of Study, a College wide Safety-Net Policy was agreed for 2019-20. The safety net augmented, where possible and appropriate, practices already approved for special situations in our regulations. These applied in 2020-21 under the approach to Fair Assessment. Whilst in 2021/22 College processes have returned to normal, Boards will need to continue to satisfy themselves that the following practices have been adhered to:

- The processes and methods for marking assessments have been conducted in the normal way.
• That students have satisfied the usual requirements for progression or award, i.e. a student must pass modules as specified for their programme for the safety net to be considered.

• Students who do not meet these requirements will retain the right to resit opportunities, as set out in the regulations.

6. Classification and Consideration at the Borderline

Classification

6.1 Integrated Masters students and some Postgraduate students on the continuing non-Curriculum Reviewed curricula graduating this year will be considered under the continuing student regulations. Final year undergraduate (Bachelors) students and any postgraduate students completing programmes that have been curriculum reviewed will be considered under the Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study (the single set of Regulations). There are differences in the classification and borderline processes between these regulations.

6.2 Notes for programmes on the Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study (single set):

• Candidates whose programme overall weighted average (POWA) is 0.5 percentage points or less from the threshold mark (such as 70 for Distinction or First Class honours) will be automatically rounded to next whole integer (for example 69.50 will become 70.00).

• Normal classification borderline is between a POWA of n8.00 and n9.49 (for example 68.00 to 69.49). All students that fall into this are expected to be considered for a higher classification in line with the agreed process/criteria for the programme. All decisions should be recorded in the minutes as normal.

• Compensation is applied at module level, to the maximum of 15 credits per academic level (or less where specified in the Programme Specification to meet PSRB requirements).

Borderline cases

6.3 Where a student meets the criteria above for consideration as a borderline candidate, it is important to ensure that the official minutes of the Board of Examiners meeting set out clearly discussions and decisions taken, where the Board has exercised discretion outside the ‘norm’.

These minutes are necessary to ensure:

• The College is able to review individual exceptional decisions to ensure that they are made in a clear and rational way, with due consideration of all factors.

• An accurate record of the decision is available in the event of an appeal, complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education, through civil action or in the event of a Subject Access Request under Data Protection legislation.
Informed advice or guidance is available to students of the deliberation of the Board, if requested

The College can identify trends and take action as needed.

6.4 The requirement to record the decisions does not necessarily mean that each decision will need significant detail. For example, where there is a clear algorithm to consider students in the borderline zone for an uplift in classification (where there is no mitigation to consider) this can simply state that candidate X was considered in the classification borderline and the decision was to uplift/not uplift as the criteria was met/ not met due to...

6.5 Where a student has an approved claim for mitigating circumstances, which has not been taken into consideration because the module was passed at the first attempt, the Mitigating Circumstances Procedure allows the Board of Examiners to give extended consideration at the borderline for an uplift in classification. The continuing regulations state that the borderline can be extended to a 5 percentage point band. The Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study (single set) do not stipulate a specific band. Where a Board considering candidates for higher classification under the Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study (single set), a consistent approach should be taken and each decision should be clearly recorded.

6.6 Care should be taken to ensure that the mitigation is taken into account fully, without double counting or providing an undue advantage to the student. When designing any form of algorithm for consideration at borderline, the Board should carefully consider how the design can or should be adapted in cases of approved mitigation, so as to avoid putting in place impossible requirements or to “double count” mitigation.

6.7 Examples of methods that a Board may use include:

- Recalculating the POWA (or module marks) by excluding those modules (or assessments) that have been impacted by mitigating circumstances. NB this is not suitable if a significant proportion of the final year has been impacted by mitigation.
- Considering the ratio of modules in the higher to lower bands, when those impacted by mitigation have been excluded.
- Considering the overall profile of the student when marks that have been impacted by mitigating circumstances have been excluded.

6.8 Boards are reminded that appeals made on the basis of mitigating circumstances that have not previously been declared are dealt with as late mitigating circumstances claims by Boards, rather than as appeals via Registry.

7. Academic Misconduct

7.1 The previous Cheating Offences Policy was replaced with the Academic Misconduct procedures from September 2018. The changes to the updated procedures mainly relate to the processing of allegations and the consideration of sanctions in relation to allegations of academic misconduct.
7.2 Cases considered within the Department of behalf of the Board must be reported to the next Board of Examiners. The outcomes of cases managed by the Student Casework team will be reported back to the Department and should be reported and formally recorded at the Board.

Sanctions in the Academic misconduct process

7.3 When the panel considers a proven case of academic misconduct, they do not have the full details of the student’s programme of study, such as year marks, previous repeated assessment or programme specific regulations. Therefore, there may be occasions in which the given penalty would have an undue impact on the student, such as preventing course completion where this was not intended. This is most likely where sanctions require a mark of zero to be recorded for the referral where passed, if the remainder of the student’s profile means that they fail to achieve a minimum overall percentage mark for completion of the stage or final classification.

The intention of the penalty is to reduce the final overall weighted average of the student and potentially lowering the classification. It is not intended to be a *de facto* expulsion. The Board should therefore take this into account and modify the penalty accordingly. Any modifications must be clearly identified, the reasoning and actions recording in the minutes of the Board of Examiners and provided to the Student Casework team for the official record of the offence.

8. Ongoing Impact of Curriculum Review

8.1 Due to the introduction of new or revised curricula from 2019/20 following the Curriculum Review process, Boards of Examiners need to continue to consider the wider implications of any decision to require a student to undertake a retake. Clear guidance will need to be provided to students who may need to transfer over to the new curricula either as a result of going straight to retake year under the new curricula or following unsuccessful resits.

9. Guidance with regards to referral limits and compensation under the Single Set of Taught Academic Regulations

9.1 The attached flowcharts (annex b) should be used to consider students that are governed by the Single Set of Taught Academic Regulations. Additional support can be requested from the Quality Assurance team. Please email quality@imperial.ac.uk in the first instance.

10. Reporting Board of Examiner Outcomes

10.1 The outcomes from the Board of Examiners should be recorded on the results return template received from the Assessment Records team, and returned as promptly as possible in order to complete the results process.

10.2 Provided at annex a is the coding for the results template. Any queries regarding coding should be directed to assessment.records@imperial.ac.uk.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Code</th>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Award (Completion)*</td>
<td>AW</td>
<td>This outcome should be used when a student has successfully achieved the required number of credits at the required level (including any programme specific requirements as set out in the Programme Specification) to be considered for award, and the College is authorised by the Board of Examiners to confer the degree award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award (Exit)</strong></td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>This outcome should be used when the student has not achieved the required number of credits at the required level to proceed on their current programme of study but have been confirmed as eligible for a different award by the Board of Examiners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progression outcome decisions of AT are subject to the criteria outlined in the Programme Specification with regards to minimum required number of credits at the required level (including any programme specific requirements) for the award conferred by the Board of Examiners (i.e. MSci/MEng student awarded a BSc (Hons)/BEng (Hons)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progression outcome decisions of AT should also be used where there is provision in the Programme Specification for an exit award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceed</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>This outcome should be used when a student has successfully achieved the required number of credits at the required level and is authorised by the Board of Examiners to proceed to the next level of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceed (Transfer)</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>This outcome should be used in either of the below scenarios:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ where the minimum required number of credits at the required level to proceed on their current programme of study has not been met, and the student is authorised by the Board of Examiners to transfer to a different programme of study (with no reassessment required);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ where the minimum required number of credits at the required level to proceed (or be awarded) on their current programme of study has been met, but the student is authorised by the Board of Examiners to proceed on a programme with a different target award to that of their initial programme award (e.g. BEng to MEng).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progression outcome decisions of PT are subject to the criteria outlined in the Programme Specification for the particular programme of study, which clearly states the circumstances in which a student would be required, or authorised, to transfer, including if they have not met the required level of performance for a placement year (including study abroad).

*Operational note: the programme transfer will be actioned upon progression to the next year of study, and will not be reflected on the student’s record during the current academic year.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral (same session)</th>
<th>DR</th>
<th>This outcome should be used when a student has failed a module(s) and is authorised by the Board of Examiners to be re-assessed in the module(s) during the <strong>current</strong> academic year (e.g. summer resits).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Referral (next session) | FR | This outcome should be used when a student has failed a module(s) and is authorised by the Examination Board to be re-assessed in the module(s) during the **next** academic year. Students are not expected to be in attendance for the duration of the next academic year and will not be re-registered for the module in Banner.  

Students should be provided with an opportunity to complete a referred assessment prior to the next academic year (with an initial progression outcome of DR), in order to allow them to progress with their cohort subject to successful completion.

Updated outcomes for students reported as FR for the previous academic year are expected at the next review point (i.e. June/July of the next academic year).

| Referral (required to transfer) | DT | This outcome should be used when a student has failed a module(s) and is authorised by the Board of Examiners to be re-assessed in the module(s) during the **current** academic year (e.g. summer resits) in order to proceed on a different programme of study.  

Students who successfully complete the re-assessment will subsequently be considered to progress under the Proceed (Required to Transfer) (PT) arrangements set out above following the resit examination board.

The Programme Specification must clearly state the circumstances in which a student would be required to transfer (i.e. MSci/MEng to the BSc (Hons)/BEng (Hons)), including if they have not met the required level of performance for a placement year (including study abroad).
Operational note: the programme transfer will be actioned upon progression to the next year of study, and will not be reflected on the student’s record during the current academic year.

### Deferral (same session)

**MS**

This outcome should be used when a student has been granted mitigation which permits them to be re-assessed in the module without penalty (as if for the first time) during the current academic year.

If a student has **ANY** failed modules not covered by mitigation, then a Referral (same session) (DR) progression outcome should be used.

### Deferral (next session)

**MN**

This outcome should be used when a student has been granted mitigation which permits them to be re-assessed in the module without penalty (as if for the first time) during the next academic year. Students are not expected to be in attendance for the duration of the next academic year and will not be re-registered for the module in Banner.

If a student has **ANY** failed modules not covered by mitigation, then a Referral (next session) (FR) progression outcome should be used.

Students should be provided with an opportunity to complete a deferred assessment prior to the next academic year (with an initial progression outcome of MS), in order to allow them to progress with their cohort subject to successful completion.

Updated outcomes for students reported as MN for the previous academic year are expected at the next review point (i.e. June/July of the next academic year).

### Re-take (full year)

**FY**

This outcome should be used when the minimum required number of credits at the required level to proceed on their current programme of study have not been met, and the student is authorised by the Board of Examiners to re-take the entire year, in attendance.

This would only normally be offered after an unsuccessful referral opportunity.

This outcome may also be used in **exceptional** cases where a student is authorised by the Board of Examiners to re-take the entire year, as if for the first time due to significant mitigation.

### Re-take (part year)

**FP**

This outcome should be used when the minimum required number of credits at the required level to proceed on their current programme of study have not been met, and the
A student is authorised by the Board of Examiners to **re-take all failed module(s)**, in attendance.

This would only normally be offered after an unsuccessful referral opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail (required to withdraw)</td>
<td>FW</td>
<td>This outcome should be used when the Board of Examiners terminate a student’s programme registration due to insufficient academic progress, and where no exit award can be offered (e.g. where a student has exhausted the maximum permitted number of attempts at a module).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor amendments required*</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>This outcome should be used when a student has satisfied the examiners in all other parts of the examination, but their essay/report/dissertation requires minor amendments. The Board of Examiners may require the student to complete the amendments specified within one month, which must then be approved by a member of the Board of Examiners or a nominee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision pending</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>This outcome should only be used in exceptional circumstances when the Board of Examiners is unable to confirm a progression outcome, or for Year Abroad or Placement years where results are yet to be received by the College for consideration and review by the Board of Examiners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any DP progression outcomes reported must be accompanied with a note indicating why a decision on progress cannot yet be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A progression outcome decision <strong>must</strong> be made prior to the start of the next academic year and reported to the Assessment Records Team for processing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal progression</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>This outcome should only be used when confirming module results only (i.e. students on part-time programmes with no formal progression point, students registered on occasional programmes, students currently on an interruption of study*, or in cases of voluntary withdrawals where no exit award has been offered).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Module results for students currently interrupted can only be returned for assessments and modules completed prior to the interruption. Students cannot attempt module assessments during an interruption of study period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These flowcharts have been developed to support the Boards of Examiners in their consideration of student academic profiles for progression to the next year of the programme.

These flowcharts will cover most instances however, there may be occasions in which the student's specific circumstances or assessment requirements mean that additional consideration will be needed.

Boards are advised to consult the Board of Examiners Notes, the Conduct of the Board of Examiners, the Academic regulations and any specific programme requirements as approved in the programme specification.

Advice and guidance in relation to these flowcharts can be sought from the Quality Assurance Team (quality@imperial.ac.uk)

Version: June 2021
Undergraduate Programmes
(BSc, BEng, iBsc, MSci, MEng)

Module outcome at first attempt

≥40.00 [with a pass mark for all "must-pass" components] (Pass)¹

≥30.00 – 39.99 (Marginal Fail)³

≤29.99 (Fail) or ≥40.00 [but one or more "must-pass" components failed] (Fail)³

No further action needed

Eligible for compensation¹

Student has passed (including compensated pass) at least 45 ECTS

Summer reassessment (capped mark)

Student has not passed (including compensated passes) at least 30 ECTS²

Next year reassessment (with or without attendance, capped mark)

If pass

If fail (and not eligible for compensation)

Exceptionally³

Academic Fail
Termination of study

If pass

If fail (and not eligible for compensation)

No further action needed

Normal³

No further action needed

¹To be eligible for compensation the module must be designated compulsory or elective, have a module score of 30.00 -39.99, and all 'must pass' assessment components have been passed. Boards must also take into account the maximum level of compensation per level and programme.

²If a student has accumulated significant failure in the first year (Level 4) or year 2 (level 5), the Board may exceptionally consider offering a fresh start for that year of the programme (full retake of all modules, uncapped, no module marks carried over) on one occasion. i.e. not for year 1 and then year 2. Unless mitigating circumstances apply, in all other circumstances repeated modules will be for capped marks.

³This will be dependent on the type of module (for example lab based) and the overall mark for the module and year.

⁴The pass mark for level 7 modules will be 50%, regardless of the programme of study. Therefore in the chart above, when considering a level 7 module the mark boundaries should be adjusted accordingly.
Module outcome at first attempt

Pass achieved
Pass
No further action needed

Overall pass mark achieved but one or more must pass components are failed
Fail
Summer reassessment
Fail
Academic Fail
Termination of study

Consider failure in context of student’s wider performance

Fail

Student has passed the equivalent of half the year or more
Pass
Summer reassessment
Pass
No further action needed

Student has not passed the equivalent of half the year
Fail
Summer reassessment
Fail
Academic Fail
Termination of study

Exceptionally
Next year full resit
Fail
Academic Fail
Termination of study

Normally
Summer reassessment
Pass
No further action needed

A

B

To be eligible for compensation the module must be designated compulsory or elective, to be no more than 1 Standard Error of Mean (SEM) from the pass mark, and all ‘must pass’ assessment elements have been passed. Boards must also take into account the maximum level of compensation per level and programme.

If a student has accumulated significant failure in the first year (Level 4) the Board may exceptionally consider offering a fresh start for that year of the programme (full retake of all modules, uncapped, no module marks carried over) on one occasion. In addition, if a student has significant failure across the year (outside of level 4) the Board may advise a student that they should rest in the next year (full year retake, capped), as in their academic opinion the amount of work outstanding is unachievable over the summer.
To be eligible for compensation the module must be designated compulsory or elective, have a module score of 40.00-49.99, and all 'must pass' assessment elements have been passed. Boards must also take into account the maximum level of compensation per level and programme.

The Board will make consistent decisions based on overall performance (overall average for programme and credits passed to date), amount of compensation that may be offered in the programme any other particular factors relevant to the programme.

Where a level 6 module has been taken as part of a Postgraduate taught programme (normal pass mark at level 7 is 50%), the mark boundaries is the chart above should be adjusted accordingly.