

Title: Subject Assessment Board guide for module leaders and other teaching staff.					
Version	Issue Date	Revision Description	Author	Approved By & Date	Next Review Date
1.0	Sept. 2014	First Issue	Chris Laity		August 2019

Subject Assessment Board guide for module leaders and other teaching staff.

This guide is intended primarily for module leaders to outline their responsibilities prior to, during and after Subject Assessment Boards. It is also useful for any member of a teaching team.

Prior to the Board

Module leaders are responsible for:

- Ensuring that marks have been received from all staff teaching on the module and have been entered on the system or submitted to the administration team for entry (as per your faculty procedures) by the deadlines issued by your faculty
- Checking that the marks entered are free from error or raising any queries regarding missing or inaccurate marks with the Subject Leader/administrative staff as appropriate
- Completing (at least partially) a module review form that summarises how the module ran that session and states the reasons for any proposed mark amendments
- Ensuring that any issues to be brought to the attention of the board are discussed prior to the board with the Subject Leader and, if appropriate, the External Examiner
- Ensuring, in conjunction with the Subject Leader, that marks have been received from Partner Colleges (if applicable) and entered as above and that internal moderation has been done
- Providing a copy of the syllabus, assessments set, sample of marked student work, summary of marks, module review form, etc. in readiness for the External Examiner's visit. Being aware of your faculty's procedures for the provision of these and any other information needed for the External Examiner
- Confirming module marks

Members of a teaching team/ staff teaching on a module are responsible for:

- Providing marks to the module leader and discussing any proposals with the module leader or subject leader prior to the board
- Contributing to the module review form

At the Subject Assessment Board

Module leaders are responsible for:

- Having information regarding your module available, including a summary of marks for your module and the module review form
- Confirming that the recorded marks are accurate and that there are no proposals for any mark amendment
- Proposing any amendments to marks/outcomes and justifying the reasons for the proposal (see overleaf for what is and what is not appropriate to propose)

- Commenting on the performance of the module and briefly mentioning any proposed future changes to the module

After the Subject Assessment Board

All staff are responsible for:

- Ensuring confidentiality of results. (Module marks approved in the board are not formally made available to students until after the Award and Progression Assessment Boards)

What may be proposed to the Subject Assessment Board

Movement of module marks

The **only circumstance** in which module marks can be adjusted is when **an unplanned event** occurred that impacted upon students and there is **evidence** of that impact. Performance statistics indicating that the results are seriously out of line with past performance would be suitable evidence.

In these circumstances, marks can be uplifted (note this also covers **reduction**) by a **fixed mark** (all students have their marks increased by 3 marks for example) or by a **percentage** (all marks raised by 5% for example). Marks may be adjusted at **overall module level** or at **element of assessment level**. Marks can be adjusted for **all** students on the module or for a **group** of students, e.g., students studying at a different location or cohorts of students taught at different times in the same academic year.

An example why an **overall module mark** may need to be adjusted is long term staff absence affecting delivery of the module. An example why an **assessment mark** may need to be adjusted is a fire alarm sounding in middle of an examination and disrupting the examination process.

Selected examples of what may not be proposed to the Subject Assessment Board

- **Changing the mark of one student but not another with the same mark.** Any decisions made must treat all students in the same way. It is not acceptable to consider two students with a mark of 39 say and suggest, for example, that one should pass because his/her examination mark is good but the other should not because his/her examination mark is poor. The module has been approved with the assessment method stated and the students have achieved the same mark based on that assessment method. To suggest in the board that one assessment mark carries more weight is moving away from the published and approved module assessment.

The two **exceptions** to the above are:

- (i) when an arithmetic error has been uncovered, for example the external examiner has discovered an error in adding up the marks on a script in the sample of work but is satisfied that it is an isolated case
- (ii) where an external examiner has been asked for his/her view on work such as a project or dissertation where internal markers have not reached agreement. Note that external examiners are not expected to act as third markers so this situation would only arise in rare cases when the normal internal moderation of marks has failed to come to a decision.

- **Adjusting borderline marks purely to improve students' grade profiles** where there is no clear rationale for doing so, e.g., changing all 59s into 60s. Note that the new classification method does not use profiling anyway.
- **Asking the board to decide whether some of the '9's should move up.** There is no problem in recording a 39, 49, 59, 69 etc since this is the module mark that has been generated from the constituent marks. The module leader/teaching team are the only ones who can judge student performance on the module.

Useful Regulations

Submission of work

A deadline is given for handing in each piece of work. If the deadline is met, the student is awarded the full mark that the work is worth. If the deadline is missed, then the student has 5 working days in which to submit the work but the maximum mark that can be awarded for the piece of work is 40%. If the work is submitted later than 5 working days past the deadline or not at all, a mark of 0 is given. Not all pieces of work qualify for this late submission policy, so please check which ones do.

Extenuating Circumstances/Fit to Sit

If a student has submitted a claim for extenuating circumstances and that claim has been accepted, then the work should be submitted and marks awarded as advised by the faculty. The new Fit to Sit policy means that a student, in sitting an exam/test/other or submitting work, declares that they are 'fit to sit'. They cannot subsequently claim that their performance in that assessment was affected.

Passing a module

In order to pass a module, an overall module mark of 40% or more is necessary and there must be no significant weakness. A significant weakness is defined as less than 30%.

For some modules the elements of assessment all test the same learning outcomes and in order to pass a module, it is only the overall module mark that matters (we sometimes refer to such modules as bonded).

In other modules as well as an overall 40%, a minimum mark must be achieved in each element (we sometimes refer to such modules as non bonded).

Module	Coursework (50% of module)	Exam (50% of module)	Module mark	Outcome	Comment
Bonded	64%	28%	46%	PASS	It is only the module mark of 46% that matters
Non bonded	64%	28%	46%	FAIL	Significant weakness In exam (as mark is below 30%)
Non bonded	64%	38%	51%	PASS	No significant weakness although there is a weakness in exam

Failing a module

If a student fails a module but has handed in work and gained some marks, they may be able to resit it (this will depend on the Award and Progression Assessment Board). However, if a student does not hand in any of the work for a module and therefore has a module mark of 0 recorded, they will not be offered a resit in it and the Subject Assessment Board records ROS (Repeat or Substitute). Note that it is possible to distinguish between a non submission 0 mark and an 'earned' 0 mark. Note also that the board has discretion in whether to offer a resit if the module has only one element of assessment, such as a dissertation.

Resits

Students are informed via online results which parts of the module they have to resit. It is the second (resit) mark that will be recorded, even if the mark achieved at the resit is lower than that achieved at the first sitting. If a student fails to attend a resit examination or fails to submit non-examination resit work (eg coursework), the mark for that element will be 0.

Resit work should be marked as it would be at the first sitting and the full mark that the work is worth should be recorded. The rules for passing a module at second sitting are exactly the same as at first sitting. However the **maximum module mark** that can be achieved in a resit module is **40%**, i.e. the module mark is capped at 40%.

Compensation

An Award and Progression Assessment board has the power to compensate failed modules (up to 20 credits). Please see Academic Handbook for compensation regulations (B.2.8.5).