

## Guide to the Code of Assessment – 1

### Intended learning outcomes and the design of a course's scheme of assessment

#### Contents

<b>1.1</b>	<b>Courses and course credits .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Schemes of assessment.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Assessment methods and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Components of assessment.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.5</b>	<b>Assessment information, including rules on Moderation and Second Marking....</b>	<b>3</b>
	<i>1.5.1 Moderation and Second Marking of Summative Assessment .....</i>	<i>4</i>
	<i>1.5.2 Purely Formative Assessment.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>1.6</b>	<b>Feedback to students .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.7</b>	<b>Joint and Combined Honours .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.8</b>	<b>Collection and publication of exam results.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>1.9</b>	<b>Appeals.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.10</b>	<b>Provision for disabled students .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>1.11</b>	<b>Errors and corrections.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.12</b>	<b>Student transcripts .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1.13</b>	<b>Infringements of the Code .....</b>	<b>12</b>

## 1.1 Courses and course credits

§16.1 Each approved course<sup>1</sup> contributing to an award of the University shall have a credit rating based upon the notional learning hours required for its completion, and determined in accordance with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF).<sup>2</sup> Regulations governing awards of the University may express the criteria for making such awards directly or indirectly in terms of accumulated credit points. The minimum requirement for the award of credits is addressed in §16.40 - §16.44.

Nearly all courses in the University are rated at 10, 15, 20, 30, 40, or 60 credits.

## 1.2 Schemes of assessment

§16.2 a) Each such course will incorporate a scheme of assessment which:

- i) assesses candidates' performance against the intended learning outcomes of the course;
- ii) includes an appropriate combination of formative and summative elements;
- iii) deploys forms of assessment appropriate to the intended learning outcomes of the course, taking due account of its credit rating;
- iv) where re-assessment is provided for in the degree regulations, makes provision for the re-assessment of candidates in accordance with the regulations;
- v) may be changed only through procedures approved by Senate;
- vi) may be varied exceptionally in a given session in response to specific circumstances subject to the approval of the Clerk of Senate;
- vii) is as far as practicable anonymous.

b) Each scheme of assessment will set out the individual components of assessment and their respective weighting in the calculation of the final grade for the course.

- i) 'Component of assessment' means each of the weighted assessments set out in the course specification document.
- ii) Each component of assessment may include sub-components except that individual questions in an examination or other piece of assessment shall not be regarded as sub-components.

Assessment here is the measurement of student attainment in respect of:

- Knowledge and understanding;
- Skills and other attributes consisting of:
  - Subject specific and/or practical skills
  - Intellectual skills
  - Transferable/key skills.

Assessment is an integral part of any academic programme or course of study but to be effective it needs to be thoughtfully designed to reflect the principles which underpin good practice. When designing a scheme of assessment three questions must be addressed:

- What is the purpose of the assessment?
- What is being assessed?
- What method of assessment is most appropriate?

---

<sup>1</sup> The term 'course' refers to a self-contained unit of study on a particular topic with defined level, credit value, aims, intended learning outcomes, mode(s) of delivery, scheme of assessment and possibly also pre- and co-requisites. [Footnote in the Code.]

<sup>2</sup> Information about the SCQF may be obtained at: <https://scqf.org.uk/>. [Footnote in the Code.]

These questions apply to the entire scheme as well as to the individual components of assessment within it.

### 1.3 Assessment methods and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

There are two important types of assessment: **formative and summative**. Formative assessment is an unmarked assessment that allows the students to practise the skills needed for the summative assessment. Formative assessments carry zero credit weighting toward the final mark and can sometimes be completed several weeks before a summative deadline. Formative assessments are the best chance for students to get feedback on their work and use that feedback towards improvement on future work. Summative assessment is a marked assessment that helps determine the final mark on a course. Summative assessments are often completed at the end of a course but may take place throughout.<sup>3</sup>

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) describe what a student should know and be able to demonstrate at the end of a programme or course. They are a required component of Programme Specifications and Course Specifications.

Information on effective assessment and ILO design can be found at the [Assessment & Feedback Resources Hub](#).

### 1.4 Components of assessment

Components of assessment will be the individual assessments described in the Course Specification for the course, e.g. individual exams and other types of assessment. They may also be assessments which include a number of different events, e.g. a grade for laboratory work based on a number of labs or a series of weekly quizzes. These individual events will be sub-components of the component of assessment.

§16.2 b) Each scheme of assessment will set out the individual components of assessment and their respective weighting in the calculation of the final grade for the course

- i) 'Component of assessment' means each of the weighted assessments set out in the course specification document.
- ii) Each component of assessment may include sub-components except that individual questions in an examination or other piece of assessment shall not be regarded as sub-components.

### 1.5 Assessment information, including rules on Moderation and Second Marking

§16.3 The scheme will be implemented in accordance with the following requirements:

- a) the scheme shall be fully described in the School Instructions issued in written or electronic form to all students enrolled in the course (at the beginning of the course, or as soon as practicable thereafter), with particular regard to dates, deadlines and formats of required work, weights of components of the assessment scheme, the method of marking (e.g. single marking, blind double marking, second marking), procedures for moderation of summative assessment, procedures for informing students of results and the returning of work, requirements for progression in the relevant programme and provisions for appeal;
- b) due notice shall be given of dates, times and places of written and oral examinations and other assessment events;
- d) candidates shall be supplied with relevant information on assessment criteria and on schemes for grading, classification and aggregation.

---

<sup>3</sup> The two purposes are not mutually exclusive but there will be circumstances where it is desirable to separate them, particularly in the mind of the student. For instance, summative assessment can, and often should, have a formative function, but students should always be made aware of assessments that are intended to be purely formative and the results of these should never be used to make summative decisions.

The Code highlights the importance of explaining to students how they will be assessed. This includes providing information on how assessed work will be marked and moderated.

### *1.5.1 Moderation and Second Marking of Summative Assessment*

It is recognised that there is currently a variety of practice (and of nomenclature) around moderation and second or double marking within the University. To aid consistency, the following guidance should be applied to the approach to summative assessments. (Guidance on formative assessments is provided at the end.)

#### *a) Definitions*

##### *i. Double marking*

All assessments are independently marked by more than one marker; neither has access to the grades or the comments of the other.

##### *ii. Second marking*

This involves independent marking of an assessment by more than one marker. The second marker will have access to the comments of the first marker and to the grades awarded by that marker.

Both double marking and second marking may require some additional procedures to be specified e.g. in respect of resolving differences between the grades assigned by each marker.

##### *iii. Moderation*

This is really a process of review to check consistency of grades awarded for an assessment, normally through sampling the assessment. This may involve some second marking of individual assessments and thus may require some additional procedures to be specified e.g. in respect of selecting the sample of assessments that are to be moderated, resolving differences between the grades assigned by the marker and moderator, and/or implementing procedures to address where grade differences are seen across a number of moderated scripts.

#### *b) QAA Guidance*

The [QAA UK Quality Code<sup>4</sup> for Higher Education Advice and Guidance on Assessment](#) contains some general advice in relation to marking and moderation which informs the remainder of this guidance note.

The QAA UK Quality Code states that:

“(p)rocesses for marking assessments and for moderating marks should be clearly articulated and consistently operated by those involved in the assessment process.

Internal moderation is a process separate from marking and provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers.

Moderation focuses on the marks awarded to the full set of assessed work for an assessment, course or programme, in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is therefore separate from the question of how differences in marks between two or more markers are resolved<sup>5</sup> and is not about making changes to an individual student’s marks.

Staff [should be] clear how moderation will be conducted – for example, through sampling assessed work, reviewing all the marks awarded, and providing opportunities for discussion between moderators to develop shared understandings.”

---

<sup>4</sup> References are to the Quality Code 2018, pending publication of Advice and Guidance on the Quality Code 2024.

<sup>5</sup> Guidance in relation to how such disagreements can be resolved is provided in **d**).

### c) *Second Marking and Moderation: General Points*

The aims of moderation and second/double marking are to ensure that appropriate standards are being applied in assessment and that they are being applied consistently across the cohort of students being assessed.

In some cases, it may be possible to achieve these aims without the processes of moderation or second/double marking, as set out in **d) i. - v.** below. Exceptions where this is the case might include multiple choice examinations or assessments where it is possible to use highly prescriptive marking schemes. There may also be cases where the contribution of an individual assessment to the overall course grade is very small, and the resource required to carry out processes of moderation and second/double marking would be disproportionate. See **d) vi.** for guidance on the appropriate quality assurance steps that should be taken in these cases.

Regardless of whether moderation or second/double marking is carried out, processes must be in place for ensuring that grades are accurately recorded and that any calculations involved in arriving at a grade have been correctly carried out.

### d) *Marking and Moderation Practice*

#### i. Non-honours undergraduate assessments

Individual summative assessment components which form part of the assessment scheme for a non-honours undergraduate course do not require to be second/double marked but must be **moderated**.<sup>6</sup>

The process of moderation will depend to some extent on the particular marking arrangements for the work that has been submitted. Where all the submitted assessments have been marked by the same marker, then a sample of the marked assessments should be reviewed by another marker, who should also have access to a complete list of the grades awarded for the assessment. The sample should consist of 10% of the marked assessment (subject to a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 25) **plus** all those assessments which have been graded at E1 or below. The sample should cover the whole range of grades awarded by the initial marker.

Where marking of the same piece of work (e.g. the same essay or exam question) is shared between two or more different markers, moderation should involve two processes. First there should be an initial discussion involving those who are undertaking the marking. This could take place before marking has started and be focussed on an outline answer and marking plan. Alternatively, the meeting could take place after a small number of assessments have been graded by each marker and considered by the person with overall responsibility for marking the assessment.

The second stage in the moderation process will involve the moderator considering a sample of the assessments drawn as before. This sample should include assessments marked by each of the initial markers.

As was noted in **b)**, moderation is not generally about making changes to an individual student's marks. However, both processes of moderation described above can result in disagreements between the initial marker and the moderator:

- A **minor disagreement** is where there is a difference of no more than two secondary bands<sup>7</sup> in the grades awarded for an individual question or (consequential to differences in individual question grades) in the grade for the assessment as a whole.

---

<sup>6</sup> Separate to the moderation process, a marker may ask for a particular assessment to be second marked where the first marker indicates that they would benefit from further comments and discussion about the assessment e.g. if it is adjudged to be very close to a borderline.

<sup>7</sup> This applies to work marked under Schedule A. Even if the disagreement goes across a primary band boundary, e.g. B1 and A4 would still constitute minor disagreement.

- Where the difference is more than two secondary bands, this is referred to as a **major disagreement**.<sup>8</sup>
- Differences between the initial marker and moderator are **consistent** if they show a consistent, pattern across the whole moderation sample – i.e. where the moderator would consistently have marked differently across the entire sample.
- Differences between the initial marker and moderator are **not consistent** if they do not show a consistent pattern – i.e. the initial marker's grade is sometimes higher and sometimes lower than the moderator with no clear tendency to lie in one direction or another.

Disagreements between the initial marker and moderator should be addressed as follows:

#### **Differences which are consistent**

- Where there are only **minor disagreements** between the marking of the moderator and that of the initial marker, an attempt should first be made to resolve each disagreement by discussion between the initial marker and moderator. Where this does not resolve the disagreements, a further sample of the assessments should be selected and reviewed by another moderator.<sup>9</sup> If the view of the second moderator aligns with that of the first moderator, all the grades awarded by the initial marker must be reconsidered by the initial marker in the light of the feedback from the two moderators. If, however, the view of the second moderator aligns with that of the initial marker, an attempt should be made to resolve the disagreement by discussion amongst all three parties.
- Where there are **major disagreements** between the marking of the moderator and that of the initial marker, again a further sample of the assessments should be selected and reviewed by another moderator. Again, if the view of the second moderator aligns with that of the first moderator, all the grades awarded by the initial marker must be reconsidered by the initial marker in the light of the feedback from the two moderators. Again, if the view of the second moderator aligns with that of the initial marker, an attempt should be made to resolve the disagreement by discussion amongst all three parties.

#### **Differences which are not consistent**

- Where there are only **minor disagreements** across the sample, there should be a discussion between the moderator and the initial marker about each disagreement. Following this discussion, in individual cases the initial grade (and, where appropriate, the feedback provided to the student) may be adjusted – with the basis for the agreement on the mark awarded being noted in each case.
- Where there are **major disagreements** between the marking of the moderator and that of the initial marker, an attempt should first be made to resolve each disagreement by discussion between the initial marker and moderator. Where this does not resolve the disagreements, a further sample of the assessments should be selected and reviewed by another moderator. If the view of the second moderator aligns with that of the first moderator, all the grades awarded (and the feedback provided) by the initial marker should be reconsidered by the initial marker in the light of the feedback from the two moderators. If, however, the view of the second moderator aligns with that of the initial marker, an attempt should be made to resolve the disagreement by discussion amongst all three parties.

---

<sup>8</sup> Where work is marked on Schedule B, all differences between markers should be considered major disagreements.

<sup>9</sup> For example, the course coordinator, if not already involved in marking or moderation, or another marker.

Where, following any of the above moderation processes, there is a continued disagreement between the initial marker and the moderator(s), further steps may be taken to resolve this disagreement, as set out in **d) iv**.

ii. Honours and taught postgraduate assessments

Unless these assessments take the form of closed, automatically-marked formats<sup>10</sup> such as multiple-choice examinations (see also c) above), all summative assessments for Honours and taught postgraduate courses must involve some degree of **second** or **double marking**. Following completion of second/double marking, any subsequent moderation would be carried out as described in **d) i**.

In the case of coursework and examinations, as a minimum this should involve **second marking** of a sample of the work. This sample should constitute at least 10% of the assessments (or at least 10, where the student cohort is less than 100) and should include, for Honours and postgraduate certificate/diploma courses all assessments graded at E1 or below, and for postgraduate taught masters courses all assessments graded at D1 or below.<sup>11</sup> Care must also be taken, in selecting the sample, to ensure that no student is (dis)advantaged through initially (not) being selected for second marking – e.g. compared with another student whose assessment **is** selected for second marking and, as a result, whose grade is adjusted. For example, where a **consistent** pattern of disagreements between the first and second markers is identified, a further sample should be selected for second marking, or all relevant work<sup>12</sup> should be second marked.

Where a single piece of assessment constitutes the whole assessment for a particular course, or where the course constitutes the independent work required for the award of an Honours or masters degree, all of the assessments should be second marked, i.e. with a 100% sample,<sup>13</sup> or (preferably) double marked.

Where there is disagreement between the first and second markers, an attempt should first be made to resolve this disagreement by discussion between the two markers. Where this does not resolve the disagreement, further steps may be taken to do so, as set out in **d) iv**.

In addition to second/double marking of assessments, a process of moderation may also be appropriate to check the overall consistency of the grades awarded for the assessment. See **d) iii**. for further guidance on this point.

Where appropriate, GTAs and adjunct staff may be involved in (first or second/double) marking work that counts towards a student's final award, such as at Honours level or, exceptionally, on PGT programmes.<sup>14</sup> In this situation, the provision of appropriate guidance and support is particularly important.<sup>15</sup> In determining whether such involvement is appropriate, relevant considerations will include a GTA's previous marking experience and the nature and level of detail of the marking rubric.

---

<sup>10</sup> These automatically-marked formats should, nevertheless, still be subjected to spot checks to validate their accuracy.

<sup>11</sup> Exceptional cases, where 100% of the assessments should be second/double marked are highlighted in the next paragraph.

<sup>12</sup> "Relevant work" here means the only part of an assessment (e.g. an individual question or essay topic) where the consistent pattern of disagreements is observed. It would not be necessary to second mark *all* parts of an assessment if moderation identifies that a consistent pattern of disagreements is identified in only one part of the assessment.

<sup>13</sup> It is recognised that second marking of a 100% sample differs from double marking only insofar as the second marker will have access to the comments of the first marker and to the grades awarded by that marker.

<sup>14</sup> Further policy guidance is available concerning '[Postgraduate Students \(GTAs\) Who Teach](#)'.

<sup>15</sup> For example, when a GTA carries out Honours or PGT marking for the first time, best practice would be for all the assessments to be second marked by a more experienced marker.

### iii. Second marking versus moderation?

**D) i. and ii.** presented guidance on the practice of moderation and second marking in the context of non-Honours and Honours/PGT assessments respectively. The question then arises: where an assessment has been second or double marked, is moderation still required? In principle the answer may still be “yes”, since (as was noted in **b**), quoting from the QAA guidance) internal moderation is in principle a separate process from marking, designed to provide assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately.

If, however, there is broad agreement between the grades assigned by first and second markers for an assessment, this already provides an indication that the assessment criteria have indeed been applied correctly – although an additional, objective calibration via internal moderation of a sample of the assessments, e.g. following the steps set out in **d) i.**, may still be useful. Such an approach could be particularly useful where an assessment has been second or double marked, but with each pair of markers only marking a subset of the student cohort. The value of an additional moderation step would, then, principally be to verify the consistency of the marking across those different subsets, each marked by a different pair of markers.

In summary:

- Where all assessments have been second/double marked, and the first and second markers have marked **every** student’s assessment, an additional moderation step is not obligatory but may still be advisable where there are consistent disagreements between the first and second marks initially awarded for a significant number of the assessments.
- Where all assessments have been second/double marked, but with different pairs of first and second markers assessing different subsets of the student cohort, an additional moderation step may be useful to verify the consistency of the marking across the cohort.
- Where a subset of the assessments has been second marked, an additional moderation step may again be useful to verify that the sample of assessments for second marking is appropriately representative of the cohort as a whole and that the assessment criteria have been applied appropriately.

### iv. Resolving disagreements

Where the process of second (or double) marking or moderation results in a disagreement between the grades awarded, there should be an initial discussion between the marker(s) or moderator(s) to resolve differences and to agree on a mutually acceptable grade and, where appropriate, the feedback to be provided to the student. If no agreement is possible following this discussion, the course coordinator<sup>16</sup> should intervene and seek to establish agreement or, should this still not be possible, to take a decision on which grade should be awarded.

Where there are such cases, the sample of assessments reviewed by the external examiner should include some of those assessments where there was disagreement, and the external examiner should be asked for their view on the resolution adopted. The final decision on the grades awarded is, of course, a matter for the Board of Examiners in the light of the advice from the external examiner.

### v. Recording of the moderation process

It is important for a record of moderation to be kept which will confirm, for each assessment:

- who moderated the work,

---

<sup>16</sup> Or, if the course coordinator is one of those involved in the marking or moderation process, the Head of School or their nominee.



- that the number and percentage of items moderated was in line with this guidance,
- details of any outcomes of the moderation process, e.g. resolving of disagreements.

Where there is disagreement, this should be recorded, as should the process by which the disagreement was resolved and the outcome of that process. If agreement was ultimately not possible the steps taken, for example referral to the external examiner, should be recorded. This record should be retained and made accessible to the Board of Examiners if required.

With the exception of cases where there is disagreement, Schools should not routinely keep a record of which items were moderated or of the individuals whose work was moderated.

vi. Exceptions to the use of moderation and second marking

**Where a decision is taken that the form of assessment used, and the approach to marking it, means that appropriate standards of marking and consistency can be achieved *without* using the processes described in d) i. - v., there must be a clear rationale for this decision.**

There may be cases where it is difficult to carry out second marking and/or moderation, for example in the assessment of presentations, live performances or work carried out in laboratories or tutorials. However, even in such cases, wherever it is possible to involve more than one marker in the process of assessment – for example, by involving a second marker in assessing a student presentation – then this should be done, and an agreed mark reached for the assessment. (It may also, in some cases, be practicable e.g. to make a recording of all, or a sample, of a particular type of assessment which can then be used afterwards in the process of moderation.)

Where second/double marking and/or moderation (in the sense of reviewing a sample of the work assessed) is deemed to be impossible or impractical, then the following three steps should nevertheless be taken:

- Firstly, the rationale for **not** carrying out second/double marking and/or moderating a sample of the assessed work should be considered and agreed by the Head of School or nominee and communicated to students through course documentation.
- Secondly, the criteria for marking the assessment should be clearly articulated and discussed with an external examiner before the assessment is undertaken for the first time and communicated to students, ideally through course documentation. Ideally, before marking is undertaken, those involved in marking the assessment should meet to arrive at a shared understanding of the criteria and how they should be applied. The use of marking rubrics, which should also be made available to the external examiner(s) and students is strongly recommended.
- Thirdly, where assessments are marked by more than one marker, after the grades for the assessment have been received the course coordinator should review the grades awarded by each marker. Where these appear to be significantly out of line<sup>17</sup> with grades awarded by other markers the course coordinator should discuss this with the marker concerned<sup>18</sup> and then make any necessary adjustment to the grades.

### 1.5.2 Purely Formative Assessment

Where purely formative assessments are marked by more than one person it is important that processes are put in place to ensure consistency of marking and of feedback so that: (a) students are reassured as to the reliability of the grade awarded; and (b) students are treated fairly in terms of quality of feedback.

---

<sup>17</sup> Guidance on what would constitute a major, as opposed to a minor, difference is provided in **d) i.**

<sup>18</sup> It is understood that there may be instances where the course coordinator is the sole marker of the assessed work. In this case, another identified person should be involved in the process.

## 1.6 Feedback to students

§16.4 The scheme shall describe how candidates will receive feedback to guide their subsequent learning. That feedback may include the results of summative assessment. Where these are provided they will be provisional until they are confirmed or amended by the appropriate Board of Examiners.

The timing and content of assessment feedback to students constitutes part but only part of the much larger topic of how assessment may contribute to the effectiveness of teaching and enhancement of the learning experience. To support this, the University's [Assessment & Feedback Resources Hub](#) contains extensive guidance regarding the provision of valuable feedback to students. Students should be made aware that assessment outcomes remain provisional until they are confirmed or otherwise by the appropriate Exam Board.

A separate University policy is available concerning [feedback following summative examinations](#). The provision of individual feedback to all students after exams is not expected to be the norm. However, the policy requires each School to establish a series of minimum standards of feedback to be applied on all courses for which it is responsible.

## 1.7 Joint and Combined Honours

§16.5 Where an Honours programme involves two or more subjects, the way in which the results of assessment are to be aggregated, averaged or profiled to produce an overall classification of the degree should be agreed when the degree is approved.

Where the responsibility for assessment of a programme is shared by two or more Schools, as in the case of Joint or Combined Honours, the description of the scheme should include reference to the agreed procedure for combining results into a single programme outcome. This is discussed fully in [Chapter 2](#) of the Guide.

## 1.8 Collection and publication of exam results

§16.73 The Head of Registry shall:

- a) provide lists of candidates upon which the official return of the results shall be made by the Assessment Officer;
- b) prescribe the way in which each result shall be recorded and the completed lists returned;
- c) reject any returned list which does not conform to the prescription;
- d) authenticate the accepted lists for releasing the results.

Schools must seek to reconcile their own candidate lists with those generated from MyCampus to ensure that lists delivered to Boards of Examiners are as accurate as possible. All changes to student course records are the responsibility of Advisers of Studies and accordingly all discrepancies found by Schools should be reported to the relevant Adviser. If there are any difficulties resolving discrepancies then the relevant Chief Adviser should be contacted. Students should be encouraged to check their own MyCampus record to confirm its accuracy. Results of assessment undertaken before the end of the course are delivered directly from Schools to students rather than reported to the Registry.<sup>19</sup> (As noted above (§16.4) Schools must make clear to students where such results are subject to ratification by the Exam Board.) This division of responsibility for results should not be used to sanction the release of overall course or programme results by Schools prior to their authentication by Registry on behalf of Senate.

The Assessment Officer should familiarise themselves with Registry instructions and deadlines for the return of assessment results and should ensure that the Board of Examiners meets in time. A late or missing return from the winter diet may cause difficulties in preparing transcripts

---

<sup>19</sup> Schools need to be aware of the privacy protection rights of students under data protection legislation, and advice may be obtained from the [Data Protection and Freedom of Information Office](#).

required by visiting students' home institutions, while a late return from the spring diet may prevent a student from graduating in summer.

The return to the Registry of a student's final Honours classification will imply the student's qualification to graduate. As there are circumstances (e.g. where a Progress Committee has exceptionally authorised the 'carrying' of a non-Honours course in the final year), where the Honours results will not necessarily qualify the student for graduation, care should be taken by Schools to identify such students and to ensure that Honours results are deferred until other requirements have been met.

§16.74 Responsibility for releasing the results on behalf of Senate shall rest solely with the Head of the Registry who shall determine and administer, subject to the approval of Senate, appropriate procedures for processing the overall assessment results provided by the Assessment Officer(s) for a course to enable:

- a) the publication of results via any internet-enabled computer either on or off-campus;
- b) the recording of results on the candidates' central records maintained by the Registry.

Candidates, nonetheless, are responsible for informing themselves of the results.

All assessment results are published via MyCampus. Results will not be published for any student who has a tuition fee outstanding. The Registry can be contacted for further guidance on this.

Results deadlines, by which Schools must submit results for each of their courses, are published on the Registry website for student use.

## 1.9 Appeals

§16.59 The Head of the College shall ensure that appeals against the outcomes of assessment are considered in accordance with the relevant provisions of the prevailing [Appeals Code](#).

## 1.10 Provision for disabled students

§16.3 The scheme will be implemented in accordance with the following requirements:

- c) appropriate provision shall be made for candidates with a formally recognised permanent or temporary disability (see [Examination and other Assessment Arrangements for Disabled Students](#));

The University has a validated, quality assured system to support disabled students. A needs assessment interview is conducted with a Disability Adviser in which disability related needs are identified and recommendations for support and access arrangements are made. These are communicated to the Registry and to Schools via MyCampus. Each School has a Disability Co-ordinator who is responsible for addressing the needs of disabled students as well as promoting disability equality within their School. While arrangements for extended examination times and separate accommodation for any on-campus exams are largely dealt with centrally, Schools should ensure that needs relating to course documentation, in-course assessment and online exams are met. The [Accessible & Inclusive Learning Policy](#) provides further information on this. Such provision includes online availability of the ILOs and scheme of assessment, and access to a computer if required. Tutors may also need to make reasonable adjustments to group work assessments where groups might include disabled students, for example students with hearing impairment or those with Asperger's Syndrome.

Teaching staff should be aware that students with a chronic illness, whether a mental health or other medical condition, are covered under the Equality Act and should be encouraged to seek advice at an early stage from the Disability Service. The Service also publishes [advice for staff](#). [Regulation 24](#) of the 'University Fees and General Information for Students' chapter of the *University Regulations* describes procedures to be followed and the range of provision available to students with disabilities or specific learning difficulties.

### 1.11 Errors and corrections

§16.75 It shall be stated that all released results are subject to correction in the event of detection of an error.

§16.76 If an error is detected in the return made to the Registry or in the published result, and the Exam Board determines the correct result, then:

- a) where the erroneous result is less advantageous than the result to which the candidate is entitled, the Clerk of Senate shall be informed and shall authorise the Head of Registry to correct the result;
- b) where the erroneous result is more advantageous than the result to which the candidate is entitled, the School will inform the candidate of the error and also the Head of Registry, who in turn will immediately alert the Clerk of Senate. The Clerk of Senate shall initiate a reconsideration of the result in conjunction with the relevant Head of College and Head of School and the Head of Registry; they may decide to sustain or correct the result in the light of all the factors known to them and shall communicate their decision forthwith to the Head of Registry.

In either case the Head of Registry shall communicate the outcome to the candidate in writing and shall correct if necessary the candidate's record. Any decisions regarding further progression or award dependent on the incorrect result shall be null and void, and the candidate reconsidered on the basis of the correct result.

### 1.12 Student transcripts

§16.77 The Registry shall produce and make available a transcript of the results obtained by each candidate which shall conform in scope and layout to principles agreed by Senate.

All graduating students receive a copy of their transcript of results along with their degree parchment. Further copies are available from the Registry on request (via MyCampus) and payment of a fee. Current students may request an interim transcript at any time. The University supports the European Diploma Supplement which records attainment in terms of the European Credit Transfer System.

### 1.13 Infringements of the Code

§16.78 Exceptionally when on an occasion some provisions of this Code have not been followed, the assessment results shall remain valid provided that the Head of the Registry, in consultation with the Clerk of Senate, is satisfied that the assessment has been conducted substantially in accordance with the Code.