

SECTION 26: EXAMINERS' MEETINGS

Contents

26.1	Programme Examiners' Board.....	1
26.1.1	Functions	1
26.1.2	Membership	1
26.1.3	Quorum.....	2
26.1.4	Procedures.....	2
26.1.5	Joint programmes	4
26.2	University Awarding Board and University Progression Board	4
26.2.1	Functions	4
26.2.2	Membership	4
26.2.3	Quorum.....	5
26.2.4	Procedures.....	5
26.3	Senate.....	6

26.1 PROGRAMME EXAMINERS' BOARD

26.1.1 Functions

The functions of the Programme Examiners' Board are:

- To ensure that School/Departmental assessment processes and decisions are consistent with the University's policies on assessment;
- to recommend for submission to the University Awarding Board results in respect of undergraduate awards and postgraduate and post-experience awards for the programmes within their purview, including those at branch campuses.

26.1.2 Membership and attendance

The membership of the Programme Examiners' Board comprises the Internal Examiners and the External Examiners for the programme(s). The Internal Examiners will be the Programme Directors, the School Director of Teaching and Learning, the School Director of Academic Tutoring and the School/Departmental Assessment Lead. Programmes delivered at a branch campus should also have representation from the branch campus Programme Lead or appropriately briefed delegate. The Heads of the relevant Schools/Departments will appoint a Chair from the internal membership. The

Assessment Handbook: Section 26

relevant Support Centre Manager or Henley Business School Director of Administration will appoint a Secretary.

The Programme Examiners will normally hold a preliminary meeting (in person or online) which will focus on an internal review of marks in order to identify and resolve any potential issues; External Examiners will not be expected to attend. It is a requirement that a final meeting (in person or online) is held to make recommendations in respect of awards, which the External Examiners should normally attend. This does not preclude Programme Examiners' meetings being held at other points in the assessment cycle where this would serve a purpose. Teaching staff in the School/Department, including those at branch campuses, have the right to attend the preliminary and final meetings and to participate fully in the consideration of marks and results, and should be encouraged to do so.

In the case of Master's programmes and in the case of results considered out of the normal cycle, the Chair of the relevant Programme Examiners' meeting may exceptionally agree that External Examiners convey their views to the Examiners' meeting by correspondence, provided they are available for consultation during or after the meeting.

26.1.3 Quorum

A Programme Examiners' meeting shall normally be deemed quorate if at least half of the Internal Examiners whose programmes are being considered are present, provided that the remaining Internal Examiners are available for consultation. With the prior agreement of the Chair, an alternate may be nominated to attend or be available for consultation in place of an Internal Examiner. In the event that a meeting is inquorate, the meeting should be postponed and reconvened at the earliest opportunity. In the event of postponement due to inquoracy, the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean and the Head of Exams and Graduation should be informed immediately. In exceptional circumstances, the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean has the power to suspend the quoracy of the Programme Examiners' meeting.

It is a requirement that the External Examiners contribute to the Programme Examiners' meeting which determines the final recommendations of results. In the case of unavoidable absence, the External Examiners may convey their views to the Programme Examiners' meeting by correspondence or email.

26.1.4 Procedures

Advance notice of a Programme Examiners' meeting should be given to those with a right to attend.

Information presented to the meeting and all discussion of candidates and results is strictly confidential to the meeting and to those staff of the University who have good reason to be provided with such information. Unless it is impracticable, students should remain anonymous until the results have been determined by the Programme Examiners' meeting. For more information on anonymity during marking and moderation, please refer to Section 10.1 of the *Assessment Handbook*.

Examiners and those attending the meeting are required to disclose to the meeting any conflict of interest. It should be noted that the University does not permit any member of staff who is in an intimate relationship with or closely related to a student to be directly professionally involved in assessing or examining that student. Provisions relating to such cases are included in Section 4.3 of the *Assessment Handbook*.

The meeting will receive any relevant decisions of the University Standing Committee on Special Cases (USCSC), in accordance with the *Policy on and procedures relating to exceptional circumstances* (Section 13 of the *Assessment Handbook*).

The Programme Examiners should have access to: the *Assessment Handbook*, and in particular the sections that relate to the classification rules for the awards under consideration and any relevant

Assessment Handbook: Section 26

programme-specific classification conventions. Module-level and programme-level statistical data will normally be available to the Programme Examiners.

The meeting should be advised of any changes to procedures, any particular circumstances affecting a specific assessment for a module, and any generic issue relevant to the consideration of results.

The meeting should consider recommended results for all candidates under its purview, including those at branch campuses, and should give very particular attention to borderline cases and to those for whom the result of Fail/Failed is under consideration. The meeting should not decide a recommendation in respect of a candidate for whom a full set of moderated and confirmed marks is not available; such a candidate will be recorded as Result Not yet Available. In such circumstances, the Chair should normally be authorised to approve a recommendation for a result, on behalf of the meeting, following appropriate consultation which must include consultation with the External Examiners. Where the provisions in the event of major disruption apply, as specified in the *Assessment Handbook*, section 16.9, the meeting should decide recommendations for classification in accordance with those provisions.

The meeting should consider recommendations from the USCSC for the award of an Aegrotat or for a variation in the weighting of Parts in the determination of the result for the award; the recommendation should be accompanied by a full academic record for the student.

Where the Examiners exercise their discretion to recommend a classification which is higher than the classification implied by the array of marks (see *Assessment Handbook*, section 16.4), the reasons for raising the classification must be noted in the formal record of the meeting. Such recommendations are subject to the approval of the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean before submission to the University Awarding Board. The recommendation to the University Awarding Board must be accompanied by an account of its rationale.

In the case of any student who has a tuition debt of £50 or more, the meeting should decide a recommended result and submit the recommended result to the Exams and Graduation Office, but should note that no recommendation will be submitted to the Senate until the debt has been cleared or reduced to a sum of less than £50. The recommended result should not be disclosed to the candidate.

Decisions on recommended results in respect of all candidates should be recorded on the recommended provisional results list, which should be signed by the Chair of the Examiners' meeting and the relevant External Examiners, and which should be submitted to the Exams and Graduation Office by a specified deadline. A copy should be attached to the formal record of the meeting as an annex.

The meeting should agree any subsequent action which may be required, for example in respect of recommendations for combined programmes.

The meeting should make decisions on the award of any prizes for which it is responsible.

It is a requirement that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that assessed work by students (including examination and in-class test scripts and coursework) is available to Programme Examiners' meetings.

A formal record must be kept of Programme Examiners' meetings, which should be held by the relevant Support Centre or Henley Business School Office on behalf of the School/Department.

Following the Programme Examiners' meeting, the School submits the list of recommended provisional results to the Exams and Graduation Office, which are recorded on RISIS. In June/July, students are then notified individually of their provisional results by email by the Examinations and Graduation Office (In November, notification of results follows the University Awarding Board.).

Please note the University's guidance on Examiners' discretion within awarding rules (Section 16.4 of the *Assessment Handbook*).

26.1.5 Joint programmes

In the case of joint programmes, the Programme Examiners may decide: (i) to hold a combined meeting to determine the results for joint programmes or (ii) to consider the result at both of the relevant Programme Examiners' meetings for the two subjects of the joint programme, with the result being formally approved at the later of the two Programme Examiners' meeting which a representative from the other Programme Examiners would attend.

The arrangements for Programme Examiners' meetings for joint programmes outlined in (ii) would normally follow the following pattern:

- (a) The Programme Examiners' meeting for one of the subjects (X) may be held several days before the Programme Examiners' meeting for subject (Y).
- (b) The Programme Examiners' meeting for X considers their single Honours students and their joint Honours students on the basis of the full array of marks. The Examiners for X form a view on the joint Honours students' performance, and nominate one of their Examiners to attend (briefly) the Programme Examiners' meeting for subject Y to represent the views of the Examiners for X in order that the result can be jointly determined. The formal record of the Programme Examiners' meeting for subject X captures the view which the Examiners for X have agreed, which is signed by the Chair of the Examiners and the External Examiner.
- (c) The Programme Examiners' meeting for Y considers their single Honours students and their joint Honours students. The Examiner nominated by the Examiners for X attends the meeting at an appointed time and represents the views of the Examiners for X. The Examiners jointly determine the result for joint students in XY. The Chair of the Examiners and the External Examiners for Y, and the nominated Examiner for X, sign the results list.

26.2 UNIVERSITY AWARDING BOARD AND UNIVERSITY PROGRESSION BOARD

26.2.1 Functions

The functions of the University Awarding Board are:

- In respect of undergraduate Final Examinations and postgraduate Examinations, to recommend to the Senate results for awards.

The functions of the University Progression Board are:

- In respect of undergraduate Foundation, Part 1, Part 2, and in the case of Integrated Master's degrees, Part 3, Examinations, and such Postgraduate programmes as have an approved progression requirement, to determine results for progression to the next Part of a programme and eligibility for the CertHE and DipHE where they are awarded on the basis of Part 1 or Part 2 of a degree programme.

26.2.2 Membership

The membership of the University Progression/Awarding Board comprises the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean (or a designated alternate) as Chair and one Internal Examiner from each School/Department, who by default will be the School/Departmental Assessment Lead and who will be able to offer an informed view on the range of programmes covered by the meeting. Other Internal Examiners have the right of attendance, External Examiners have the right to attend and to participate in meetings responsible for making awards, but are not required to do so. A representative of the Exams and Graduation Office and a representative of the relevant Support Centre or the Henley

Business School administrative team or the ISLI programme administrative team, as appropriate, shall attend the meeting.

26.2.3 Quorum

A meeting of the University Progression/Awarding Board shall normally be deemed quorate where the Chair and an Internal Examiner from each of the relevant Schools is present. However, the Chair may exercise their discretion not to proceed with a meeting if they consider that attendance is not adequate to ensure that decisions are appropriately informed.

In the event that a meeting is inquorate, the meeting should be postponed and reconvened at the earliest opportunity. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) should be informed. In exceptional circumstances, the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean has the power to suspend the quoracy of the University Progression/Awarding Board.

26.2.4 Procedures

The dates of University Progression/Awarding Board meetings are published in advance in the University's Meetings List.

Information presented to the meeting and all discussion of candidates and results is strictly confidential to the meeting and to those staff of the University who have good reason to be provided with such information.

Examiners and those attending the meeting are required to disclose to the meeting any conflict of interest. It should be noted that the University does not permit any member of staff who is in an intimate relationship with or closely related to a student to be directly professionally involved in assessing or examining that student. Provisions relating to such cases are included in Section 4.3 of the *Assessment Handbook*.

A list of recommended results will normally be circulated in advance to the relevant School/Departmental EAssessment Leads or other nominated School/Departmental representatives. Internal Examiners should have available at the meeting such information as may be relevant to their recommendations.

The meeting should be advised of any changes to procedures, any major circumstances affecting a specific assessment for a module or programme, and any other generic issue relevant to the consideration of results.

The meeting should consider the Examiners' recommendations, and should give very particular attention to those candidates who are recommended to fail, who are recommended for the award of an aegrotat, and, in the case of decisions relating to progression, those candidates whose marks imply failure or failure to qualify for an award or progression. Where the provisions for major disruption apply, as specified in the *Assessment Handbook*, section 16.9, the meeting may decide recommendations for classification in accordance with those provisions.

In respect of the University Awarding Board, the meeting should receive a report of any cases where, with the approval of the relevant Teaching and Learning Dean, the Examiners have exercised their discretion to recommend a classification which is higher than the classification implied by the array of marks. Those cases and the reasons for raising of the classification should be noted in the formal record of the meeting.

The University Awarding Board will not forward to the Senate any recommendation in respect of an undergraduate or postgraduate Finalist who has an outstanding tuition debt to the University of £50 or more.

A formal record of the decisions of the University Progression/Awarding Board should be taken.

Assessment Handbook: Section 26

The meeting should make decisions on the award of any prizes for which it is responsible.

The results list should be signed by the Chair of the meeting.

The Meeting should agree any subsequent action which may be required, and, where appropriate authorise the Chair to take action in respect of outstanding results.

All results should be published individually to the student's RISISweb portal by the publication date specified on the Exams and Graduation Office website.

26.3 SENATE

The Senate is responsible for approving all results recommended by the University Awarding Board, including all results of failure and all results which lead to an award in accordance with the provisions of Ordinance A3.

Document control

Version	Section	Keeper	Reviewed	Approving authority	Approval date	Start date	Next review
1.0	CQSD	KHSS		UBTLSE			
1.1	CQSD	KHSS	3 years	UBTLSE	03/11/21	19/04/2022	01/09/2024