

Guide to the Code of Assessment – 5

Incomplete assessment resulting from Good Cause

Contents

5.1	Scope and definitions	2
5.2	Procedure	4
5.3	Outcomes	10
5.4	Aggregation and course grade profile where assessment is missing due to Good Cause	14

5.1 Scope and definitions

§16.45 For the purposes of §16.46 – §16.53 of these regulations:

a) 'Good cause' shall mean illness or other adverse personal circumstances affecting a candidate and resulting in either:

i) The candidate's failure to

- attend an examination, or
- submit assessment at or by the due time,¹ or
- submit an online examination within the scheduled examination time,² or
- otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment appropriate to their programme of studies; or,

ii) manifest prejudice to the candidate's performance in summative except where that assessment is the independent work required for the award of a classified honours degree or a postgraduate taught masters degree.³

Good cause refers to the sudden onset of illness or adverse circumstances affecting the candidate. It is not intended to apply to chronic or persistent illness or to long-term adverse personal circumstances.⁴ Where there is a chronic medical condition good cause shall only be established where the candidate's performance in assessment has been compromised by a sudden severe episode of the illness.

b) 'Evidence' shall mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances which are advanced by the candidate for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person as defined in the Student Absence Policy.⁵ Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than seven days' duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner.

c) The events described in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of paragraph (a) of this regulation shall constitute incomplete assessment.

These definitions establish at the outset that the regulations in this section are concerned with events in which a student either:

- a) misses an examination or an assessment deadline or doesn't meet some other requirements of the course's scheme of assessment, or
- b) reports that they have submitted an impaired performance in an assessment.

These regulations apply when the student reports formally through a Good Cause claim that they were prevented by illness or other adverse personal circumstances from attending an examination or completing other assessment, or similarly reports that illness or other circumstances affected their performance. The choice of the verb 'prevented' is deliberate; the regulations are not concerned with minor occurrences which have merely hindered the student.

¹ §16.26 sets out penalties for late submission of assessment; if –in accordance with §16.27 a candidate is permitted to defer submission of the assessment, the 'due time' hereafter in these regulations will be the later time permitted. [Footnote in the Code.]

² §16.28 sets out how failure to submit an online examination within the scheduled examination time will be treated.

³ The 'independent work' includes: (a) for a classified honours degree, the piece of independent work worth at least 20 credits referred to at §16.1 and §17.1 of the Generic Undergraduate Regulations (GUR), and the equivalent in degree regulations not subject to the GUR, and (b) for a postgraduate taught masters degree, the 60 credit (or more) substantial independent work referred to in the degree regulations, taking the form of a dissertation or project.

Where a candidate believes that their performance in this assessment is being or has been affected by adverse circumstances, before submitting the work they should seek advice on requesting a deferred deadline within their period of study. [Footnote in the Code.]

⁴ A candidate experiencing chronic or persistent illness or long-term adverse personal circumstances is encouraged at as early a stage as possible to contact appropriate sources of support such as their Adviser of Study/Advising Team and the Disability Service. The [Fitness to Study Procedure](#) may be used to consider how best to support any such candidate in their studies. [Footnote in the Code.]

⁵ The [Student Absence Policy](#) is available online. [Footnote in the Code.]

Trivial events or ailments that might have a marginal impact on a student's performance are not relevant in this context. The regulations are concerned only with more serious circumstances – called 'Good Cause' – which justify the student's missing an examination or other assessment or turning in a relatively poor performance.

Good Cause is concerned with **assessment** that has been affected. It does not cover an on-going, or chronic, situation that affects a student's attendance at classes/lectures or their ability to engage in the learning during semester. A student who has been ill for a number of weeks during term may have been unable to complete the required learning and is likely to need advice from their Adviser of Studies/Advising Office about the possible courses of action, such as repeating affected courses. Footnote 4 (which appears as footnote 21 in the on-line *University Regulations*) highlights the fact that where adverse circumstances described by a student do not fall under the definition of Good Cause alternative procedures or sources of support should be considered.

A student's statement that they were prevented from attending, submitting or performing in assessment must be substantiated. For this purpose supporting evidence must come from someone appropriately qualified, and/or otherwise familiar with the circumstances and their effect on the student, to write a medical or other report supporting the student's claim. If the student has claimed that they have been ill for a period of more than seven days, that claim should be accompanied by a report from an appropriate medical practitioner. Supporting evidence might be a hospital report; a doctor or other medical professional's report; a doctor's "Fit Note"; a formal notification of a hospital or clinic appointment, or hospital discharge letter. Examples of other forms of supporting evidence are given in the [Student FAQs on Good Cause](#), including where the circumstances are not health related and where a member of staff was alerted to the circumstances at the time.

Where there has been a **short-term worsening of a long-term (chronic) condition** a student might submit a supporting letter from a relevant service such as the Counselling & Psychological Services (CAPS), their GP, mentor or other support worker. For students registered at the Disability Service with a relapsing and remitting condition, the Service will provide a letter confirming the condition, and the student can submit this as supporting evidence for any Good Cause claims associated with a short-term worsening or 'flare-up' of that condition.

For **personal circumstances which are not health related**, a student might provide a letter or document from an independent responsible person (or organisation), vouching for the circumstances they are reporting, such as a support service (e.g. a social worker, Citizen's Advice Bureau or other support organisation) or a member of staff who was alerted to the circumstances at the time. Letters of support from personal friends or family members might also be submitted in relation to any circumstances, but these carry less weight in supporting a Good Cause claim and the student should explain why this is the best evidence available to them. More information on types of supporting evidence is given in the [FAQs for students](#).

Repeated Good Cause claims from the same student may signal a wider issue, which may or may not be evident from the circumstances described in the claims. Follow up by the Adviser/Advising Office may be appropriate.

5.2 Procedure

§16.46 It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to make relevant good cause circumstances known to the School responsible for the assessment by submitting a claim to MyCampus, which must be supported by appropriate evidence.⁶ The outcome of any claim shall be notified to the candidate as soon as reasonably practicable.

§16.47 Where incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, notification later than five working days after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, shall not be taken into account unless circumstances have prevented the candidate from submitting a claim within this time. A candidate may not retract a claim of good cause more than five working days after the examination or after the date at which submission of work for assessment was due, nor after the date of publication of the results (including provisional results) of the assessment, whichever date was earlier.

It is the student's own responsibility to ask for consideration under these regulations by submitting a Good Cause claim in MyCampus. The claim must be submitted, together with the supporting evidence, not later than five working days after the missed examination(s) or other assessment submission date(s). No later claim will be considered unless the student can also demonstrate that they had been unable to submit the claim at an earlier date. (If supporting evidence is not immediately available, the student should submit the claim within five working days and indicate that the evidence is to follow as soon as possible.) Any claim submitted after results have been published – even if they are only provisional – should not be considered. A student wishing to raise adverse circumstances at that stage would need to use the academic appeals process.

This concept is illustrated in this example of a [timeline for the submission of a Good Cause claim and academic appeals](#) for an assessment deadline in Semester 1.

§16.48 a) The primary responsibility for determining claims of incomplete assessment due to good cause shall lie with the appropriate Board of Examiners. However, should a meeting of the Board of Examiners not be anticipated until some significant time after the relevant examination or assessment submission date, the Head of School or nominee⁷ shall determine the outcome of a claim of good cause in consultation with the relevant Assessment Officer. Any such decisions shall be reported to the Board of Examiners at the next available meeting. Although the Board of Examiners may pass comment on such decisions, it may not overturn a decision where this would cause detriment to the candidate.

The general rule is that the relevant Board of Examiners must determine whether the evidence presented by the student is strong enough to justify the 'Good Cause' claim being accepted. However, in practice, decisions as to whether a student has demonstrated 'Good Cause' often cannot wait for the next meeting of the Examination Board; it is then the Head of School who makes this assessment. Their decision must be reported to the Board of Examiners, who may only overturn it where this would be to the benefit of the student. The Head of School may delegate decision-making in this respect to senior role holders such as Head of Subject, Programme Convener or Head of Year. Decisions must be made in consultation with the

⁶ The mechanism for notifying the Head of School is MyCampus. In the event that this facility is not available, the candidate should contact the Head of School directly.

In cases where candidates present sensitive personal information which they are reluctant to discuss with more than one or two members of staff, a member of staff should be given responsibility by the Head of School for ensuring that relevant information is passed to appropriate colleagues in order that their circumstances may be taken into account.

Where a candidate is seeking an extension of more than five working days to an assessment submission date they should submit a claim of Good Cause to MyCampus but they are also advised to alert a member of staff such as Adviser of Studies or Assessment Officer to the claim in order that it may be considered promptly. [Footnote in the Code.]

⁷ The nominee of the Head of School with responsibility for considering such claims shall be indicated in the programme documentation. Such a nominee will typically be an Honours Convener, Head of Year, Programme Convener or holder of another similar senior role. [Footnote in the Code.]

Assessment Officer. The 'decision makers' are therefore the Head of School (or nominee) and Assessment Officer.

Given the volume of claims that are made, Schools are advised to manage this activity through a 'Good Cause Committee' to better enable an objective approach to supporting students in a fair and consistent manner.

Good Cause Committees

It is recognised that there is wide variation across the University in terms of how the Good Cause process is implemented at local level, ranging from who is involved in the process to how decisions are made. While the University strongly encourages harmonisation, the following guidance for the management of Good Cause claims is deliberately not prescriptive, instead aiming to provide a broad framework based on good practice. Where there are reasons at local level for deviating from this good practice, Schools should consider documenting these reasons.

Where established, Good Cause Committees are responsible for considering Good Cause claims and making specific recommendations to the relevant Board of Examiners, based on the evidence that has been provided to them. Good Cause Committees should be empowered to assess the validity of claims and essentially determine whether:

- The claim is not accepted because either:
 - the grounds are not deemed to be within the scope of the Good Cause process.
 - the evidence provided does not cover the relevant period.
 - the evidence provided is either not of sufficient weight or from an approved source.
 - the evidence provided is insufficient to support the claim of serious impact.
- The claim is accepted because there are sufficient grounds for believing that the student's ability to perform in the relevant assessment(s) has been adversely affected by Good Cause.

The potential outcomes resulting from the Good Cause Committee's deliberations are set out in more detail in section 5.3 below.

Membership and Quorum

Schools and Subjects differ in terms of their size and organisational structure, and it is likely that the membership of the Good Cause Committee will vary accordingly. It is suggested that its membership should comprise at least three members of School or Subject staff. As a minimum, the Code of Assessment requires the involvement of the Head of School (or delegated nominee) and the Assessment Officer⁸ and they are considered the key decision makers. Good Cause decisions should never be made by a single member of staff. Schools may also wish to consider the appointment of a School Good Cause Committee Coordinator (or similar), with a view to further developing staff expertise around Good Cause. This is important so that members with appropriate expertise can act as alternate Head of School nominees or can be named as additional Assessment Officers. Where there are multiple Assessment Officers for a course or programme, the officer responsible for Good Cause should be identified at the start of the year, and the other officers identified as possible deputies in case the responsible Assessment Officer is unavailable.

The Good Cause Committee membership may also include a Senior Adviser of Studies, Year Head/Course Convener, Examination Board Chair(s), and other academic or professional services staff as appropriate.

⁸ Sometimes referred to as School Exam Officer.

At the start of the academic session, each Good Cause Committee should determine the minimum viable number of people required to support consistent decision making, based on the size of its membership. As the key decision-makers in the process, the Head of School (or delegated nominee) and the Assessment Officer, should automatically be included in any agreed quorum.

Members should normally have had no significant prior involvement with the student that might influence their decision. Unless claims have been suitably anonymised, where a Committee member is perhaps the Adviser or supervisor of a student making a claim, they should not take part in the decision-making. However, if asked by the student, they may provide the student with a statement to be included with the claim as supporting evidence, if appropriate.

It is recommended that the Head of School (or delegated nominee) convene the committee. For the avoidance of doubt, the Assessment Officer may never be a delegated nominee. The Convener is expected to ensure that the Good Cause Committee undertakes its responsibilities in a fair, transparent, and impartial manner and in accordance with relevant University and programme regulations and procedures. The Convener should also ensure that all members are encouraged to contribute to discussions and that business is conducted collegially.

Member Training and Development

Good Cause Committee members should be suitably trained and have a good understanding of the University's processes, including the regulations that apply to the student's degree programme. Heads of Schools are responsible for ensuring that appropriate training and guidance is provided to all staff involved in considering Good Cause claims. This may include annual briefing sessions at the start of the academic year and/or issuing locally prepared guidance explaining School-based processes (which should be used to supplement rather than replace the central guidance provided by Academic Policy & Governance). New members should be signposted to the [Code of Assessment](#) and [Good Cause](#) process, and should also link to centrally provided information (e.g. [Good Cause FAQs](#)).

Heads of Schools might consider providing Good Cause Committee members with access to appropriately anonymised previous decisions with a view to aiding consistency of decision making. Good Cause Committees might also be encouraged to involve staff from other schools (both within or outwith their College) in quality-checking decisions. At College-level, the establishment of forums or spaces where Good Cause Committee members can meet to discuss issues relating to Good Cause should be encouraged. Bringing such staff together, at College-level, presents valuable opportunities for sharing best practice.

Evidence and Access to Evidence

Schools should only process the data that they need to determine the outcome of the student's Good Cause claim. A student's Good Cause information should only ever be available to those that require to access it either to manage the process or to make a decision about a claim. For the avoidance of doubt, this means the smallest number possible required to take an objective decision and with the greatest possible respect to the privacy of the student. Evidence should not be shared widely as a routine approach. Regardless of the potential wider membership of the Good Cause Committee, only the decision makers (the Head of School or nominee and the Assessment Officer, as referenced above) should routinely be given access to the supporting evidence provided for each individual claim in order to determine the veracity of the evidence.⁹ In rare cases where some aspect of the evidence is doubtful, the decision makers may engage with relevant experts, with any details shared in an anonymised format. The wider membership of the Good Cause Committee should, thereafter, provide broader views in relation to consistency of outcome and approach, with the decision makers providing oral

⁹ This refers to access over and above the standard access afforded to the six individuals per course who have access permissions in MyCampus for processing purposes.

overviews of individual cases where necessary. This balanced approach of limiting access better protects students' privacy and serves to shield more staff from having to engage unnecessarily with potentially traumatic materials. In rare cases, there may be highly sensitive personal information that a student believes is pertinent to their case but which they might be reluctant to disclose. The Code of Assessment makes allowance for this by directing the student to contact their Head of School to discuss arrangements for sufficient but restricted information to be passed to appropriate colleagues so that the claim can be considered. In such cases, students must still submit a claim in MyCampus, indicating who they have shared these details with, but would not need to submit the evidence, on the basis that they have already shared this with the staff member supporting their claim. That staff member will, in turn, be able to provide confirmation that there are significant adverse circumstances relevant to the claim, when the student's claim is considered.

Information provided in Good Cause claims and its supporting evidence is often highly sensitive and must be treated in strictest confidence. Schools must ensure that any information downloaded from the claim is stored and shared securely. How this is operationalised varies across the University, and Schools have flexibility to decide how to present the relevant information to its Good Cause Committee (data must be stored and shared only using the University's standard hosting services and software applications such as Outlook, OneDrive/SharePoint, its IT Helpdesk system (Ivanti), its virtual learning environment (Moodle) and its student records system (MyCampus), with access limited to those either administering and/or contributing related information for consideration by the relevant decision-making individuals or committee). When designing their process, Schools should consider ways to preserve anonymity where possible and prevent potential conscious or unconscious bias in considering requests, as a minimum using the student's student number rather than their name. For example, the Adam Smith Business School routinely replaces student names and student numbers with case numbers.

Note: a Privacy Notice specific to information submitted in a Good Cause claim is in development and further information on this will follow, including implications for the retention of relevant data.

Good Cause and Safeguarding: What to do if the content or evidence provided in the Good Cause claim gives rise to safeguarding concerns.

Where there are concerns for a student which do not require immediate attention but suggest they may in the future present a risk of harm to themselves or others a referral should be made to the Safeguarding team via email safeguardingteam@glasgow.ac.uk (9:00 am – 5:00 pm Monday to Friday) or University Security team out with these hours. (In these circumstances, the University Security team would deal with any immediate concern and would pass any follow up to the Safeguarding team.) Examples of this type of situation might be where a student has experienced some significant mental health difficulties or where a student reports to be feeling overwhelmed but has not mentioned feeling currently suicidal. The Safeguarding team will risk assess and signpost the student as appropriate. Where there is deemed to be no immediate risk of harm to the student, but the student may benefit from support, the Safeguarding team may ask you to seek permission from the student for the Safeguarding team to contact them. If you are in doubt, you should always refer to Security in the first instance. The Security team will redirect concerns to the Safeguarding team as appropriate.

Where there is no ongoing indication of current risk but there are signs that the student may require support, consent should be sought from the student to make a referral to the Safeguarding team via email. The Safeguarding team can offer support and guidance to the student in such circumstances. For example, a student might describe in their claim, a previous attempted suicide or serious self-harm behaviours, a period of significant poor mental or physical health or being a victim of a crime.

There is no expectation that Good Cause claims are considered immediately on receipt, however, for completeness the following information is provided:

If you believe the student may present a risk of harm to themselves or others and where there is information to suggest that the student may need immediate attention, in such an emergency call 999- this will take you through to Security from a University phone. Then call Security. If you haven't already told Security what's happening, you can contact them on: Gilmorehill: 4444 (0141 330 4444); Garscube: 2222 (0141 330 2222); Off campus: +44 (0)141 330 4444. Security will monitor the situation and liaise with emergency services.

Examples of this type of situation would be where a student has been hospitalised (serious illness/mental health crisis), is at risk of suicide/in mental health crisis; or has been subject to crime. The Security team will ensure the appropriate response is taken, which may include their staff dealing with immediate risk and/ or referring on to the Safeguarding team.

Staff should also be aware that if a student reports an incident of sexual violence or harassment through their Good Cause claim, a report should be submitted via the [University reporting tool](#). This report may be made by the student, or where the student prefers, by the member of staff. The student can make their report anonymously, or if the student does not give consent for staff to share details, staff are asked to submit an anonymous report that does not identify the student. The student should be advised of this and reassured they cannot be identified by the report.

Operation of the Good Cause Committee

It is expected that Good Cause Committees will normally be supported by a clerk or note-taker who is not part of the Committee. The clerk should keep a record of the Committee's proceedings. The format of these records should be agreed locally at School-level and in many cases that may take the form of a spreadsheet. The purpose of the records is to document outcome decisions and in circumstances where it is necessary to capture further detail (for example to establish precedents) a concise summary should be provided. Decisions must be recorded in the student's Good Cause claim in MyCampus. As well as ensuring that students receive the outcome, this also enables the capture of data which can be used to identify trends or areas of concern.

Good Cause Committees should be scheduled with reference to the programme's assessment calendar and at least once prior to each meeting of the relevant Boards of Examiners. Given the volume of claims that are made, Good Cause Committees may meet on a regular basis through the semester once assessments are being submitted, in some cases perhaps on a weekly basis. (See also below in relation to expected timescales for notifying students of the decision on their claim.)

In line with University policy, the work of a Good Cause Committee may be undertaken synchronously or asynchronously. Where the committee meets synchronously and online, this should only take place using University-approved video conferencing software such as Teams or Zoom. Staff should login to these platforms using their University email address. Further, Committee members should ensure that they are able to work in a space which will allow for confidentiality when discussing student cases. The meeting should not be digitally recorded in any way. Where the committee undertakes its work asynchronously this must be by a University-approved collaboration tool, and in all cases, members should have due regard to the sensitive information being discussed and data protection considerations, including the potential for subject access requests. While there is no set timescale for considering a claim, it is good practice for decisions to be communicated to students as soon as practicable and it is expected that decisions will normally be communicated within ten working-days. Decision points (be they in-person/online meetings or by correspondence) should be held at such frequency as required to manage the volume of claims and meet the ten working-day timescale for responding. It is recommended that students are given an indication of the likely timescale for claims made in their School via their course or programme documentation and where

circumstances lead to a delay in this timescale, students should be notified perhaps through an announcement on Moodle.

It is important to remember that all outcomes are provisional until they are ratified by the Board of Examiners (meaning that a student cannot appeal against a Good Cause decision until after the Examination Board meets). Depending on the type of claim, some decisions require consideration by the relevant Examination Board (e.g. for 'affected performance'). In these circumstances, students should be notified whether their Good Cause circumstances have been accepted or not, even if they have to then await a judgement on affected performance by the Examination Board.

Consideration of the Claim

The question to be answered is: if the student hasn't attended an examination or submitted work for assessment, was there good reason for this given the circumstances described in the claim? Alternatively, if the student has claimed that the standard of their submitted work was reduced by reason of illness or other circumstances, does the evidence support the claim?

These regulations exist with the object of providing some relief for students who have been ill or affected by adverse circumstances at a particularly unfortunate time, but decisions in favour of a student claiming 'Good Cause' cannot be taken lightly. Many students will have had problems of various kinds to overcome during the course of their studies and in their preparation for assessment. Decisions must be fair and should not undermine the standard of the University's awards.

The regulations deliberately avoid describing cases that might be cited as examples of Good Cause and Boards of Examiners, Heads of Schools and/or Good Cause Committees should apply their experience with their general knowledge and understanding to determine whether something has happened to significantly impact on the assessment and to justify the student's input to that assessment being set aside. The following general points may, however, be taken into consideration.

- The claim should indicate clearly the relevant circumstances and set out how they affected the student. If it does not do this the claim must be refused.
- A distinction is made between circumstances affecting preparation for assessment and those which impact directly on performance in assessment. The timing and duration of the circumstances are therefore of critical importance. Comparatively minor health issues (particularly those of a gastro-intestinal nature) may have no significance for assessment consisting of an essay, for example, but could be critically important if coinciding with an examination.
- Students are expected to accommodate 'every-day' disruption in their preparation for assessment, e.g. in making reasonable travel arrangements for attending an on-campus exam.
- When looking for evidence of a deterioration in performance coinciding with the reported circumstances, it is important that examiners look at the student's performance in all assessment, not just the assessment(s) they report to have been affected.
- The significance of a bereavement cannot be accurately defined by place in family alone, and the sudden death of a friend or relative might have more impact than the death of a much closer relation.

§16.48 b) In considering claims of good cause:

- i) the evidence provided by the candidate claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by them for assessment shall be scrutinised;
- ii) fairness to the individual candidate claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other candidates and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;

- iii) it shall be determined whether the failure to attend an examination or to submit work for assessment has been justified by good cause;
- iv) in the event of the candidate having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise and where the circumstances described in the claim are accepted as constituting good cause, it shall be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected shall be deemed not to have been submitted, and the procedure in §16.50 followed.

A number of things have to be taken into account before a decision can be made as to whether 'Good Cause' has been demonstrated. The evidence provided by the student in support of the claim must include relevant dates to show how the circumstances impacted on the assessment(s) in question. Further information about supporting evidence is provided in section 5.1 and in the [Good Cause FAQs](#).

While §16.48 (b) (ii) refers to fairness to all candidates, it should be noted that the needs of disabled students are assessed by the Disability Service, which may mean that distinctive arrangements for exams and/or other assessments are put in place. In such cases, Good Cause claims will be considered in relation to all the relevant circumstances.

'Manifest prejudice' to submitted work

Where a student claims that submitted work was significantly affected ('manifestly prejudiced') by Good Cause, the Board of Examiners must not speculate as to the extent to which a submitted piece of work may have been affected and attempt to determine an appropriate compensation. If the student's performance is judged to have been significantly impacted by the circumstances described in the Good Cause claim, the affected script or other material must be set aside as it cannot be used with confidence as an indicator of the student's attainment of relevant intended learning outcomes.

Judgement on whether the relevant circumstances have had a significant negative impact on a student's assessment performance should always be made, irrespective of whether the student has achieved the threshold grade (or higher) for the course in question (D3 for undergraduate programmes, C3 for PGT programmes). Judgement should be made taking into account the student's overall profile. This can be difficult particularly during the early stages of a student's career at the University. If a student submits a Good Cause claim in relation to the end of course exam, the Examination Board might have only a class test or piece of assessment available as evidence of prior performance. There are reasons why these may not provide reliable information about how a student might be expected to perform in the end of course exam. In the first year of an undergraduate degree programme, when there is least available evidence of other performance, a grade of D3 or above is generally sufficient and therefore the lack of clear evidence of manifest prejudice to performance is less of an issue. In second year, when grades determine entry to Honours, some evidence of previous performance, including on other courses, will be available. The view of Academic Standards Committee is that where Examination Boards are faced with difficult decisions they should carefully scrutinise all the available evidence but exercise doubt in favour of the student.

Note that §16.45 (a) (ii) excludes the independent work required for the award of a classified Honours degree or a postgraduate taught masters degree from a claim of manifest prejudice.

5.3 Outcomes

§16.49 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the candidate's claim that they were prevented by good cause from attending an examination or submitting work for assessment, the assessment or assessments in question shall be treated as non-submissions. Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not indicate that the candidate's performance in assessment was manifestly prejudiced by good cause, their work shall be assessed as though no claim of good cause had been received. The candidate's grade for the course as a whole shall be calculated accordingly.

If the student's Good Cause claim for consideration under the 'Good Cause' provisions is not accepted, the outcome is the same as if no such claim had ever been made. The consequences of missing the assessment will follow, and the marks awarded for submitted work will be the marks that would have been awarded had no Good Cause claim been made.

§16.50 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the candidate shall, subject to §16.52, normally be expected to complete their assessment by attending the examination at a subsequent diet, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within their period of study. In considering whether this requirement should apply, the desirability of the candidate's assessment being conducted in full should be balanced with the practical considerations and financial costs to the candidate and the University of providing a later completion date. Consideration should also be given to the candidate's other assessment commitments to ensure that they are not unreasonably burdened. In order to permit such completion:

a) a special sitting of an examination may be arranged, or the candidate may be required to attend for examination at a scheduled diet; and/or,

b) a date for completion of non-examination assessment may be set;

as appropriate in the circumstances. In any such event, that sitting or submission shall be regarded as the candidate's first attempt if the examination or assessment missed would itself have been their first attempt.

If 'Good Cause' is established, the grade 'MV' will be returned for the course and will appear on the MyCampus record and on the transcript for that diet. (See below for one exception that applies in relation to Honours assessment, §16.52 (d) (iv)). The University's default expectation is that the student is required to complete all components of the assessment, even when such components carry a small weighting. This provides students with the fullest possible evidence base of their achievement as well as providing them with essential learning which takes place as part of their assessment. This may mean a new date for submitting the assessment, or the student being required to take the missed examination at a future diet. If retaking a missed examination isn't an option, the Head of School should consider a special replacement examination for the student. It would not normally be acceptable for significant amounts of reassessment to be removed from a candidate for reasons of assessment burden, and instead a route should be found for students to complete their assessment in a way which does not put them under undue time pressure. For example, should a Head of School consider a student would be unreasonably burdened by too much reassessment being offered, consideration should instead be given to whether the student requires a repeat year or other special arrangements. Before reaching such a decision the Head of School is entitled to consider the costs and practicalities. Note that for students coming to the end of their Honours programme the 'period of study' finishes at the end of the Senior Honours academic session, so all required assessment must be completed by then. (See below for the special rules relating to incomplete assessment in Senior Honours.)

Following an accepted Good Cause claim, a rearranged examination or revised submission date will count as the student's first attempt if the examination or missed assessment would itself have been their first attempt.

If the Good Cause Committee feels that the information the student has provided suggests they would benefit from further support, the Committee may decide to refer them to a member of staff in the School or College (e.g. Adviser of Studies, Student Support Officer), who may then contact the student to offer support and/or suggest referral to support services provided by the University (such as Counselling & Psychological Services, or the Safeguarding team), or other external support agencies. In this instance, detailed information and supporting evidence should not be passed on without the student's consent.

Note: Once the Good Cause claim has been accepted it cannot be withdrawn by the student, i.e. a student whose claim in relation to a completed piece of work is accepted and is asked to

repeat the assessment cannot later elect to take the grade that would have been awarded to the original assessment.

§16.51 If the outstanding work, in respect of which good cause is established, is identified in regulations as a requirement for the award of a degree, this work must be submitted for the candidate to qualify for the award of that degree.

§16.52 In respect of work for assessment not excluded by §16.51, where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the candidate's claim that they were prevented by good cause from completing that work on or by the due time, and where no means of substituting an alternative assessment may be found, the following regulations shall apply:

- a) The extent to which the candidate's assessment has been completed shall be determined as a percentage, taking into account the relative weights attributed to the components of a complete assessment as published in the relevant assessment scheme approved by the Senate. The extent of such completion at sub-honours levels and on taught postgraduate programmes shall be determined on a course by course basis; at honours, the extent of completion of assessment shall be determined across the whole honours assessment.
- b) The Board of Examiners shall make an overall judgement of the candidate's work submitted for assessment, using as far as possible the standards and criteria applied in respect of the work of other candidates.
- c) Where the candidate has completed 75% or more of the work required for assessment, the Board of Examiners shall determine the outcome on the basis of the work completed and make the relevant award.
- d) In respect of honours assessment,
 - i) where the candidate has completed at least 30% but less than 75% of the work required for assessment, an unclassified honours degree may be recommended if the completed portion is of honours standard, or, if the completed portion is not of honours standard, no award shall be made and the candidate will be regarded as not having been presented for assessment in the senior honours year;
 - ii) for the purposes of the award of an unclassified honours degree a candidate's failure, due to good cause, to achieve a grade D3 or above in a piece of independent work worth at least 20 credits shall not prevent award of the degree in terms of §16.51;
 - iii) where the candidate has completed less than 30% of the work required for assessment they will be regarded as not having been presented for honours assessment;
 - iv) in respect of courses where good cause is established in relation to no more than 25% of the assessment, a course grade shall be returned on the basis of the completed assessment; in respect of courses where good cause is established in relation to more than 25% of the assessment, the course grade shall be returned as MV; notwithstanding the return of an MV course grade, all components of assessment unaffected by good cause shall be included in the determination of the candidate's award in accordance with §16.52(c).

- e) In respect of sub-honours and taught postgraduate assessment, where the candidate has completed less than 75% of the work required for assessment they will be regarded as not having taken the course.

§16.53 Where the Board of Examiners decides to recommend an unclassified honours degree or to make no award under §16.52(d)(i), this outcome shall be communicated to the Clerk of Senate together with a reasoned case for the decision. If the candidate has been recommended for the award of an unclassified honours degree, and has not previously refused such an offer, the Clerk of Senate shall invite them to accept that award. In the event of the award being declined, the candidate shall be regarded as not having been presented for assessment in the senior honours year and, subject to the requirement to comply with the maximum duration of study prescribed for the degree, shall be eligible to repeat the full senior honours year.

If it is impossible, impracticable or unreasonable to give the student an opportunity to fill the gap in their assessment, then - unless the missing work is identified in regulations as a requirement for the award of the degree (e.g. the achievement of at least D3 in a dissertation

or other independent work worth 20 credits or more for the award of a classified Honours degree) the following rules are applied to determine the fairest outcome overall. Although there are similarities, the rules are different for Honours and non-Honours assessment. In each case the question to be answered is “How much of the assessment has the student completed?”

For **sub-Honours and taught postgraduate students** the percentages and decisions are determined discretely on a course by course basis, taking into account the weights attributed to each component of the assessment.

Example 5.A

If three components, A, B and C contribute 50%, 30% and 20% to a course assessment, and the student misses only component C, they will have completed 80% of the assessment.

If the student misses component A, they will have completed only 50% of the course assessment and if there is no possibility of further assessment they will be regarded as not having taken that course.

For **Honours students**, the question to be answered is “What percentage of the whole Honours assessment has the student completed?”

Example 5.B

Pat’s Honours curriculum consists of two courses (A and B) carrying 60 credits, and four (C, D, E and F) carrying 30 credits.

Pat misses the examination in course C which is worth 50% of the course assessment and misses the examination in course D which is worth 60% of the course assessment. If she completes all other components of the Honours assessment, the answer to the question of how much has she completed will be:

$$\begin{aligned} & 100 - (50 \times 30 / 240) - (60 \times 30 / 240) \% \\ & = 100 - (1500 / 240) - (1800 / 240) \% \\ & = 86.25\% \end{aligned}$$

The rules here are a little more complex.

If the student has completed at least 75% of the overall Honours assessment, and if what they have submitted is considered by the Board of Examiners to be of Honours standard, a classified Honours degree may be awarded. The classification will be determined by the results available for the assessment not affected by Good Cause. Example 5.C shows how to calculate the final GPA taking account of results missing due to Good Cause.

If the student has completed at least 30% of the overall Honours assessment (but less than 75%), and if what they have submitted is considered by the Board of Examiners to be of Honours standard, the Board may recommend to the Clerk of Senate that the student be invited to accept the award of an unclassified Honours degree. The Board must bear in mind that an unclassified Honours degree can only be offered where a student is considered to have substantially completed the learning for the degree and where assessment is incomplete due to Good Cause; a student who had been affected by longer term difficulties, resulting not only in missed assessment but also missed learning would not be covered by the rules on incomplete assessment and Good Cause, and would therefore not be eligible for the unclassified Honours degree. A student in such a situation should instead be considered for a possible repeat year or for an exit award such as the ordinary degree.

If an unclassified Honours degree is offered, the student may decline the offer in which event they will be regarded as not having been presented for Senior Honours assessment. The advantage for the student of this outcome is that they may present for Senior Honours assessment in the following session with the results of any previous attempts entirely discounted.

If the student has completed less than 30% of the assessment, or if the work submitted is not of Honours standard, the student will be regarded as not having been presented for Honours assessment and so may present for Honours assessment in the following session with the results of any previous attempts entirely discounted.

5.4 Aggregation and course grade profile where assessment is missing due to Good Cause

Chapter 2 describes the process of aggregation to arrive at a programme grade point average (GPA) and the use of course grade profile where the GPA alone does not determine the final outcome. Example 5.C below illustrates the process where some components have been missed with Good Cause and there is no further opportunity for the student to complete those components.

Example 5.C

An Honours programme with JH : SH weighting of 40 : 60

Course grades achieved:

JH		SH	
Course 1 (20 credits)	B3	Course 6 (15 credits)	B2
Course 2 (20 credits)	A5	Course 7 (30 credits)	C3
Course 3 (20 credits)	B3	Course 8 (30 credits)	C2
Course 4 (30 credits)	C1	Course 9 (20 credits)	C1
Course 5 (30 credits)	C2	Course 10 (15 credits)	Exam (50%) MV Essay (50%) B2
		Course 11 (10 credits)	Essay (75%) B1 Class test (25%) MV

Junior honours assessment (120 credits), carrying an overall programme weighting of 40%, is complete. GPA = 14.75.

Senior honours (120 credits) carries a 60% programme weighting, and two components have been missed with Good Cause (MV):

Course 10: 15 credit course, 50% weighted exam.

Course 11: 10 credit course, 25% weighted class test.

The contribution of senior honours assessment to calculation of the overall GPA must therefore be reduced by the proportion of senior honours assessment that is missing.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Proportion of missed SH assessment} &= [(0.5 \times 15) + (0.25 \times 10)] / 120 \\ &= 10 / 120 \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Reduced weighting for SH} = 60 \times (110/120) = 60 \times 0.917 = 55$$

SH GPA

		Grade points
Course 6: B2 x 15 credits	16 x 15	240
Course 7: C3 x 30 credits	12 x 30	360
Course 8: C2 x 30 credits	13 x 30	390
Course 9: C1 x 20 credits	14 x 20	280
Course 10: B2 x 15 credits x 0.5 (50% component missing)	16 x 15 x 0.5	120

Course 11: B1 x 10 credits x 0.75 (25% component missing)	17 x 10 x 0.75	127.5
	Total grade points	1517.5

The two missing components carry the equivalent of credits: $(15 \times 0.5) + (10 \times 0.25) = 10$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SH GPA} &= \text{grade points} / \text{credits} \\ &= 1517.5 / (120 - 10) \\ &= 13.795 \text{ (unrounded)} \end{aligned}$$

Final programme GPA

The missing components of assessment give a revised weighting of 40 : **55** rather than 40 : 60.

For the purposes of the calculation, JH will therefore carry a weighting of $(40 / 0.95) = 42.1\%$ and SH will carry a weighting of $(55 / 0.95) = 57.9\%$. The effect is that junior honours assessment will carry a slightly higher weighting than if the two components of assessment hadn't been missed in senior honours.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Final GPA} &= \text{weighted JH GPA} + \text{weighted SH GPA} \\ &= (14.75 \times 0.421) + (13.795 \times 0.579) \\ &= 6.210 + 7.987 \\ &= 14.197 \text{ rounded to } \mathbf{14.2} \end{aligned}$$

This GPA puts the student in the range where final Honours classification (in this case, Either a 2.1 or a 2.2) is determined by course grade profile. If at least 50% of the weighted course grade profile comprises B grades or above an upper second class honours degree will be awarded. If less than 50% of the weighted course grade profile comprises grades of B or above a lower second class honours degree will be awarded.

Course grade profile

Course grades are weighted in the profile by number of credits.

Any course for which, due to Good Cause, less than 75% of assessment was completed should not be included in the profile.

Any course where, despite some assessment being missed through Good Cause, 75% or more of assessment was completed should be included and given full credit weighting.

Course grades achieved:

JH	Course grades of B or higher	Course grades below B	SH	Course grades at B or higher	Course grades below B	
Course 1 (20 credits)	B3		Course 6 (15 credits)	B2		
Course 2 (20 credits)	A5		Course 7 (30 credits)		C3	
Course 3 (20 credits)	B3		Course 8 (30 credits)		C2	
Course 4 (30 credits)		C1	Course 9 (20 credits)		C1	
Course 5 (30 credits)		C2	Course 10 (15 credits)	-	-	<75% complete
			Course 11 (10 credits)	B1		75% complete
Total credits	60	60		25	80	
JH	120		SH	105		225 of 240

Proportion of weighted grade profile comprised of grades B or above:

$$= \frac{[\text{No. of JH credits } \geq \text{B} \times \text{JH weighting}] + [\text{No. of SH credits } \geq \text{B} \times \text{SH weighting}]}{120}$$

$$= \frac{[60 \times 0.421]}{120} + \frac{[25 \times 0.579]}{105}$$

$$= 0.211 + 0.138$$

$$= 0.349, \text{ or } 35\%$$

The weighted grade profile has 35% of course grades at B or above so the student qualifies for a lower second class honours degree.

§16.60 Any questions of principle or procedure regarding the operation of the regulations governing incomplete assessment and good cause shall be determined by the Academic Standards Committee or, in respect of any individual case, by the Clerk of Senate.

Any queries regarding the Good Cause process or its application can be directed to apg-academic-regulations@glasgow.ac.uk in Academic Policy & Governance.