MARKING CRITERIA AND CLASSIFICATION FRAMEWORK FOR TAUGHT POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES
(for non-Greenlands cohorts entering Autumn Term 2008 and thereafter)
(for Greenlands cohorts entering Autumn Term 2014 and thereafter)

Please note that this document relates to students entering in the Autumn Term 2008 and thereafter with the exception of those on Greenlands based programmes where this document relates to students entering in Autumn Term 2014 and thereafter.

Students who entered their programme in the period between the Autumn Term 2003 and the Summer Term 2005 are subject to Marking Criteria and Classification Framework for Taught Postgraduate Programmes (for cohorts entering in Sessions 2003/04 and 2004/05).

Students who entered their programme in the period between the Autumn Term 2005 and the Summer Term 2008 are subject to Marking Criteria and Classification Framework for Taught Postgraduate Programmes (for cohorts entering in Sessions 2005/06 and 2007/08).

The University conventions for undergraduate programmes on setting, submission, penalties for late submission, moderation, external examining etc apply mutatis mutandis to postgraduate taught programmes.

1. Marking

1.1. Marking shall be carried out by appropriately qualified and properly appointed persons. It should be noted that peer assessment may be used for formative purposes and a marker’s determination of a formal mark may be informed by peer marking.

Work will be assessed on a University-wide conventional scale, as follows.

**Passing categories:**

- $\geq 70$ Work of distinction standard*  
- 60-69 Work of merit standard  
- 50-59 Work of good standard

* Please note that, in order to encourage staff to use the whole of the mark range, the distinction category will normally be characterised by ‘big step’ marking. That is, for work judged to be of distinction standard one of the following must be awarded, subject to the exemption stated in Appendix 2: 72, 75, 80, 85, 90, 95, 100. Guidance on the application of step-marking is offered in Appendix 2.

**Failing categories:**

- 40-49 Work below threshold standard (BTS)  
- <40 Unsatisfactory Work

The assessment for each module and for the dissertation will normally be reported as a single mark on the University’s conventional scale.

In exceptional cases a module may be designated as assessable on a PASS/FAIL basis provided that it has been agreed at scrutiny that the only relevant consideration in assessing the module is the acquisition of a threshold competence in the skills or knowledge being assessed.

1.2. Criteria
1.2.1. **General Criteria**

The underlying assessment criterion for marking will be evidence of successful study at the appropriate level.

For all assessed elements (dissertation and taught modules), original work is expected in the sense that the synthesis of the material is original to the student.

Originality in the application of knowledge is an essential criterion for the degree as a whole and must be a criterion in the work of at least one assessed element (dissertation or module).

For work for taught modules and non-research based dissertations, the construction of original ideas, the formation of new knowledge or the collection of original data are of themselves not necessary criteria for reaching the pass standard, but when present and properly presented they will be rewarded.

For a dissertation which is required to be research-based or which must include a research project, the underlying assessment criteria will be evidence of study and research. Original work is expected in that not only is the synthesis of the material original to the student but also an account of original research carried out by the student is to be included.

Appropriate level will vary with the nature of material, in particular between study at an advanced level of material commonly or typically found in the undergraduate programme(s) normally required as an entry qualification for the postgraduate programme and study of material introduced ab initio in the postgraduate programme.

There is no stringent norm referencing; each piece of work is marked independently on its merits.

1.2.2. **General learning outcomes**

The programmes and their assessment will be designed to produce graduates who are able to:

- deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgements in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences;
- demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level;
- continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level;

and will have:

- the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
  - the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility,
  - decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations, and
  - the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.

1.2.3. **Specific criteria for each category of award**

The following criteria will apply; but no criteria can cover all eventualities at this level and the examiners reserve the right to reward creativity, originality and work of particular merit however presented.

Furthermore, the appropriate combination of the qualities needed to fulfil the criteria depends on the subject, and the criteria and descriptors need to be interpreted in terms of the attributes required by each subject.

Supplementary descriptors, indicating the kinds of evidence and qualities expected to support meeting the criteria for the mark ranges and classification standards, are included in the Appendix. While it is not expected that every piece of work will show all the attributes indicated for each mark range, work will show a preponderance of these attributes, interpreted within the context of the particular discipline.
>=70 Distinction standard

This range is reserved for work of high quality which shows evidence of a deep understanding of and insight into the full range of ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question and independence of thought. It demonstrates a full and systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, at or informed by the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

60-69 Merit standard

This range is for work which shows evidence of a very good understanding of the main ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question coupled with some insight and the expression of some independent thought. It demonstrates a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

50-59 Good standard

This range is for work which shows evidence of appropriate study, presented clearly and adequately marshalled to illustrate the most significant of the main ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question and to demonstrate a sound grasp of them. It demonstrates a good understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

40-49 Below threshold standard (BTS)

This is a failing category. The range is reserved for work that is lacking in some respects or contains flaws which are noticeable and serious enough to warrant the award of a failing grade, but nonetheless essentially approaches the criteria necessary for the good category sufficiently for it of itself not to prevent the award of an overall pass.

<40 Unsatisfactory standard

This is a failed category. It is for work which fails to meet or in significant ways does not approach the criteria described for a good grade.

2. Awarding

2.1. For awarding categories, the following definitions apply:

Dissertation
A module comprising a substantial piece of independent work (which may include a project in scientific disciplines) which has been designated by the relevant Board of Studies and the Faculty Board for Teaching and Learning as a ‘dissertation’ for the purposes of the classification framework. A student’s programme should not normally include more than one module which has been designated as a ‘dissertation’.

Absolute Weakness
For Masters and PG Diploma programmes: A mark below 40 in modules totalling more than 30 credits or a mark below 50 in modules totalling more than 55 credits.

For PG Certificate programmes: A mark below 40 in modules totalling more than 10 credits.

Significant Weakness
A mark below 40 in any modules agreed during scrutiny and validation as being of special significance to the programme.

**Dominant Quality**
The class which best represents the profile; that is, the highest class which at least half of the marks, weighted according to their number of credits, fall either in or above.

Hence:

- If the marks for at least half of the credits are in the range 70-100, the Dominant Quality is Distinction Standard.

- If the Dominant Quality is not of Distinction Standard and the marks for at least half of the credits are in the range 60 and above, the Dominant Quality is Merit Standard.

- If the Dominant Quality is not of at least Merit Standard and the marks for at least half of the credits are in the range 50 and above, the Dominant Quality is Good Standard.

- If the Dominant Quality is not of at least Good Standard and the marks for at least half of the credits are in the range 40 and above, the Dominant Quality is Below Threshold Standard.

All programmes will use the same method for calculating the Weighted Average Mark, i.e. the average of a student’s module marks weighted according to the number of credits.

Where it has been agreed at validation that a programme includes a module assessable on a PASS/FAIL basis, the calculation shall exclude such modules.

Where it has been agreed at validation that a Master’s, Diploma or Certificate programme be based on more than 180 credits, 120 credits or 60 credits respectively, the calculation shall be adjusted accordingly.

All programmes will use the same method of profiling to determine Dominant Quality:

Dominant Quality shall be based on a profile recording the total number of credits for modules marked in each category; for example, for a Masters programme a student’s profile might be as follows:

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction marks</td>
<td>(at least 70)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit marks</td>
<td>(60-69)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good marks</td>
<td>(50-59)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Threshold Standard marks</td>
<td>(40-49)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail marks</td>
<td>(&lt;40)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this example, the Dominant Quality of the set of marks is Merit Standard.

All programmes will use the same ranges for determining candidates within a borderline, viz:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Borderline BELOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>68.0 – 69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>58.0 – 59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>48.0 – 49.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Awarding is made by the Examiners exercising judgement of the category which best represents the candidate’s achievement based on the overall level of performance (the weighted average of the marks), on the profile of marks overall, and on any specific restriction which may apply (for accreditation or other proper purposes), taking into account any relevant special circumstances. The Examiners’ judgement will be guided by the following.
Candidates with Absolute and/or Significant Weakness should normally be Failed.

Otherwise, the Weighted Average Mark should be initially used to place the candidate in a category, subject to the following conventions.

Where a programme includes modules which are marked on a Pass/Fail basis, the Programme Specification will specify the standard which a candidate is required to achieve in the module in order to fulfil the requirements for the award of the degree.

A statement clarifying the conditions under which Examiners might properly exercise discretion to agree a classification at variance with the algorithm contained in the Framework was agreed by the University Board for Teaching and Learning in February 2006, and is included as Appendix 3.

2.2.1. For Masters Degrees**

**Distinction:**  
[A Weighted Average Mark of 70 or more over 180 credits  
AND  
a mark of 60 or more for the dissertation  
AND  
no mark below 40.]

**OR**

[A Weighted Average Mark of 68 or more over 180 credits  
AND  
a mark of 70 or more in 90 credits\(^\wedge\)  
AND  
a mark of 60 or more for the dissertation  
AND  
no mark below 40.]

**Merit:**  
[A Weighted Average Mark of 60 or more over 180 credits  
AND  
a mark of 50 or more for the dissertation  
AND  
no mark below 40.]

**OR**

[A Weighted Average Mark of 58 or more over 180 credits  
AND  
a mark of 60 or more in 90 credits\(^\wedge\)  
AND  
a mark of 50 or more for the dissertation  
AND  
no mark below 40.]

**Passed:**  
[A Weighted Average Mark of 50 or more over 180 credits  
AND  
a mark of 50 or more for the dissertation  
AND  
no Significant Weakness (i.e. no mark below 40 in modules agreed at validation to be of special significance to the programme)  
AND  
no Absolute Weakness (i.e. the total credit value summed for all modules marked below 40 does not exceed 30 credits and for all modules marked below 50 does not exceed 55 credits).]
OR

[A Weighted Average Mark of 48 or more over 180 credits
AND
a mark of 50 or more in 90 credits^  
AND
a mark of 50 or more for the dissertation
AND
no Significant Weakness (i.e. no mark below 40 in modules agreed at validation to be of special significance to the programme)
AND
no Absolute Weakness (i.e. the total credit value summed for all modules marked below 40 does not exceed 30 credits and for all modules marked below 50 does not exceed 55 credits).]

Failed: A performance which fails to fulfil the criteria for the above classifications.

** Where it has been agreed at validation that a Masters programme does not include a dissertation, the above conventions omitting all references to the dissertation will apply.
Where it has been agreed at validation that a Masters programme consists of modules worth a total of more than the minimum requirement of 180 credits, the Weighted Average Mark should be calculated over the agreed greater total of credits.

^ Where the weighted average mark is calculated on a different number of credits from the standard 180, the number of credits in which this level of performance is required will be half the number of credits forming the weighted average.

2.2.2. For PG Diplomas

Distinction: [A Weighted Average Mark of 70 or more over 120 credits#
AND
no mark below 40.]

OR

[A Weighted Average Mark of 68 or more over 120 credits#
AND
a mark of 70 or more in 60 credits^^
AND
no mark below 40.]

Merit: [A Weighted Average Mark of 60 or more over 120 credits#
AND
no mark below 40.]

OR

[A Weighted Average Mark of 58 or more over 120 credits#
AND
a mark of 60 or more in 60 credits^^
AND
no mark below 40.]

Passed: [A Weighted Average Mark of 50 or more over 120 credits#
AND
no Significant Weakness (i.e. no mark below 40 in modules agreed at validation to be of special significance to the programme)
AND
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no Absolute Weakness (i.e. the total credit value summed for all modules marked below 40 does not exceed 30 credits and for all modules marked below 50 does not exceed 55 credits).]  

OR  

[A Weighted Average Mark of 48 or more over 120 credits#  
AND  
a mark of 50 or more in 60 credits^^  
AND  
no Significant Weakness (i.e. no mark below 40 in modules agreed at validation to be of special significance to the programme)  
AND  
no Absolute Weakness (i.e. the total credit value summed for all modules marked below 40 does not exceed 30 credits and for all modules marked below 50 does not exceed 55 credits).]  

Failed: A performance which fails to fulfil the criteria for the above classifications.  

^^ Where the weighted average mark is calculated on a different number of credits from the standard 120, the number of credits in which this level of performance is required will be half the number of credits forming the weighted average.  

2.2.3. For PG Certificate  

Passed and Failed categories only will be awarded for PG Certificates as follows:  

Passed: [A Weighted Average Mark of 50 or more over 60 credits#  
AND  
no Significant Weakness (i.e. no mark below 40 in modules agreed at validation to be of special significance to the programme)  
AND  
no Absolute Weakness (i.e. the total credit value summed for all modules marked below 40 does not exceed 10 credits).]  

OR  

[A Weighted Average Mark of 48 or more over 60 credits#  
AND  
A mark of 50 or more in 30 credits^^^  
AND  
no Significant Weakness (i.e. no mark below 40 in modules agreed at validation to be of special significance to the programme)  
AND  
no Absolute Weakness (i.e. the total credit value summed for all modules marked below 40 does not exceed 10 credits).]  

Failed: A performance which fails to fulfil the criteria for the above classifications.  

^^^ Where the weighted average mark is calculated on a different number of credits from the standard 60, the number of credits in which this level of performance is required will be half the number of credits forming the weighted average.  

# Where it has been agreed at validation that a programme consists of modules worth a total of more than the minimum requirement of 120 credits for PG Diploma or 60 credits for PG Certificate, the Weighted Average Mark should be calculated over the agreed greater total of credits.  

3. Resits and Resubmissions (please note that in the following the word resit includes resubmission)
3.1 **Resits for Taught Modules**

Provision should be made for any candidate who fails a taught module to resit the assessment during the normal period of the programme. In practice, this means that resits for taught modules will take place before the awarding for the programme as a whole, and the awarding can be made on the outcome both of first attempts and of any second attempts which may be necessary. It further means that a candidate who fails the programme as a whole has exhausted the right of resit in any module for which a resit has been offered during the programme.

3.1.1. A candidate who scores below 50 marks on the summative assessment of a taught module will be permitted to resit on one occasion at an appropriate point in the programme schedule as determined by the Examiners. Schools will be responsible for administering this procedure, i.e. for

1. consulting the External Examiner as appropriate;
2. identifying those who fail and seeking approval from the Chair of the relevant Faculty Examiners’ Meeting;
3. determining the dates for resit (which will usually be done as part of planning the schedule for the programme);
4. informing the candidates of the failure and of the arrangements for resitting;
5. to do so, Schools should report candidates who fail a module through the Examinations Office to the relevant Faculty Examiners’ Meeting for approval and confirmation of resit arrangements. When it is necessary to hold the resit before the next Faculty Examiners’ Meeting, Schools should submit the list of candidates who fail a module to the Chair for approval; on receiving approval, Schools should forward for information the approved list to the Examinations Office, together with an assurance that resit arrangements have been made and the candidates informed.
6. administering the re-examination (unless the resit is of a written examination falling within a normal examination period administered by the Examinations Office);
7. recommending the mark to go forward for award, indicating any candidate who has failed the module for a second time.

3.1.2. Where a candidate has failed a taught module and the resit falls within a period scheduled for preparation of a dissertation, an extension of one month will normally be granted to the submission date for the dissertation.

3.2. **For awarding purposes**

The mark forwarded for classification will be the HIGHER of the original or the resit mark, subject to a cap of 50 where the candidate reaches passing standard on resit.

Awards will be based on the profile of marks forwarded for classification regardless of how many modules have been resat.

3.3. **Failing the programme**

Failure at the first attempt at programme level leads to the Examiners recommending the resit requirements for approval by the Faculty Examiners’ Meeting, based on the principle that a candidate has the right to two attempts at any assessment. If a candidate who fails the programme at the first attempt has already been offered a resit for any modules, he or she will have had opportunity for the two assessments at such modules and will only have the right to resit modules which he or she has not previously been offered the opportunity to resit.
Candidates who fail the dissertation at the first attempt and whose other results are such that a second attempt at the dissertation might lead to the award of the degree of Master will be permitted to resubmit the dissertation within twelve months from the original submission date as determined by the Faculty Examiners’ Meeting.

Candidates whose results from the taught component of the programme, including second attempts where they have been permitted, are such that they are unable to fulfil the criteria for the award of the degree of Master will not be permitted reassessment in the dissertation.
APPENDIX 1: Supplementary descriptors relating to the criteria for categories of award

Criteria for each category of award supplemented with indicative descriptors

The following criteria will apply for each category of award; but no criteria can cover all eventualities at this level and the examiners reserve the right to reward creativity, originality and work of particular merit however presented. Furthermore, the appropriate combination of the qualities needed to fulfil the criteria depends on the subject, and the criteria and descriptors need to be interpreted in terms of the attributes required by each subject.

>=70  Distinction standard

This range is reserved for work of high quality which shows evidence of a deep understanding of and insight into the full range of ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question and independence of thought. It demonstrates a full and systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, at or informed by the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

The following descriptors indicate the kinds of evidence and qualities expected to support meeting the criteria for distinction. While it is not expected that every piece of work will show them all, distinction work will show a preponderance of these attributes, interpreted within the context of the particular discipline.

There is plenty of evidence of a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to research, advanced scholarship or performance in the discipline or field of study. Where applicable, originality is shown in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how most established techniques of research, enquiry, performance or presentation are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. The work displays evidence of critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies in the discipline, and the capacity to develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses or interpretation. There should normally be very good judgement in selecting material from extensive study, with careful presentation and critical evaluation of the selected material. The work should clearly focus on the circumstances to which it refers, and show sensitivity to the constraints within and peculiarities of the relevant matters to which it applies, including (where appropriate) successful matching of techniques to problems or insight in relating theory and practice. There should be an effective and thorough synthesis of ideas clearly argued and leading to well justified conclusions.

In addition for a dissertation which is required to be research based or which must include a research project, the dissertation report should show a reflective account of the research methods deployed and either the results of the student’s own research with well-reported original data appropriately analysed and deployed to arrive at well justified conclusions or the results of the student’s original analysis of well selected secondary data, deployed to arrive at well justified conclusions.

60-69  Merit standard

This range is for work which shows evidence of a very good understanding of the main ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question coupled with some insight and the expression of some independent thought. It demonstrates a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

The following descriptors indicate the kinds of evidence and qualities expected to support meeting the criteria for merit. While it is not expected that every piece of work will show them all, merit work will show a preponderance of these attributes, interpreted within the context of the particular discipline.

There is strong evidence of a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to research, advanced scholarship or performance in the discipline or field of study. Where applicable, some originality is shown in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how most established techniques of research, enquiry, performance or presentation are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. The work displays
evidence of some critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies in the discipline, and indicates the capacity to develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses, interpretation and/or applications to professional practice. There should normally be a logical and analytical discussion, or presentation, drawn from wide study, a coherent synthesis of ideas set within an appropriate context, including (where appropriate) pertinent matching of techniques to problems or relating theory and practice, and leading to conclusions with some justification.

In addition for a dissertation which is required to be research based or which must include a research project, the dissertation report should show an account of the research methods deployed and either the results of the student’s own research with clearly reported original data appropriately analysed and deployed to arrive at conclusions with justifications or the results of the student’s original analysis of well selected secondary data, deployed to arrive at conclusions with justifications.

**50-59 Good standard**

This range is for work which shows evidence of appropriate study, presented clearly and adequately marshalled to illustrate the most significant of the main ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question and to demonstrate a sound grasp of them. It demonstrates a good understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of the discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice.

The following descriptors indicate the kinds of evidence and qualities expected to support meeting the criteria for a pass standard. While it is not expected that every piece of work will show them all, passing work will show a preponderance of these attributes, interpreted within the context of the particular discipline.

There is evidence of a good understanding of techniques applicable to research, advanced scholarship or performance in the discipline or field of study. Where applicable, the capacity for originality in the application of knowledge is shown, together with a practical understanding of how the principal established techniques of research enquiry, performance or presentation are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Displays some evidence of the capacity for critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies in the discipline, and some indication of the capacity to develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses, interpretation and/or applications to professional practice. The work should be accurately reported and appropriately referenced. It should demonstrate some appreciation of context related to an application of the ideas to particular circumstances, including (where appropriate) an awareness of matching of techniques to problems or an appreciation of a relationship between theory and practice or an ability to draw upon practical experience, to present a coherent development supporting a conclusion.

In addition for a dissertation which is required to be research based or which must include a research project, the dissertation report should contain a description of the research and/or analytical methods used and a presentation of results in appropriate form. It should develop an argument based on information, some of which must be obtained from the student’s own research or re-analysis of secondary data, to illustrate the major themes of the dissertation and the conclusions to be drawn from the research project.

**40-49 Below threshold standard (BTS)**

This is a failing category. The range is reserved for work that is lacking in some respects or contains flaws which are noticeable and serious enough to warrant the award of a failing grade, but nonetheless essentially approaches the criteria necessary for the good category sufficiently for it of itself not to prevent the award of an overall pass.
<40 Unsatisfactory standard

This is a failed category. It is for work which fails to meet or in significant ways does not approach the criteria described for a good grade.

This may be because there is not adequate evidence of sufficient study or that there are serious inaccuracies in presenting the material. It may be that there is evidence of not understanding one or more of the key ideas, principles, themes and/or techniques in question or of a lack of coherence in the organisation of the material and the work’s structure resulting in the candidate’s not making effective use of study.
APPENDIX 3: Examiners’ discretion within the classification framework

The University’s present awarding rules for both undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes lay down guidelines for the award of the degrees and the various classifications within them. The examiners are asked to use their professional judgement in setting, marking and moderating students’ work to ensure that the marks awarded for the various components conform to descriptors in the Framework for Classification and Progression for First Degrees or the Marking Criteria and Classification Framework for Taught Postgraduate Programmes, as appropriate. These give verbal descriptions of the sort of performance required for the award of a mark in the various classes.

In awarding the various degree classes for first degrees and Merits and Distinctions for taught postgraduate degrees there is inevitably a need to balance the components where a student’s performance is not completely uniform. The University’s classification rules are in place to ensure, as far as possible, that students are treated equally across the University. This does not remove the Examiners’ need for judgement but the requirement for equity inevitably reduces their freedom of action.

The Examiners need to be content that the modules have been appropriately marked, and these marks form the basis of subsequent calculations. Even where this is the case, there will occasionally be cases where the proposed overall result of a candidate does not match with the Examiners’ judgement. In such cases the Examiners may wish to look at the marks for those components which have the greatest influence on the overall outcome, and satisfy themselves that the individual performances correspond to the marks awarded. Having done this, the Examiners may still judge that a candidate’s overall result does not correspond to the qualitative description of the proposed award. Where this is the case, the Examiners have the discretion to raise the class awarded, provided their reasons are clearly stated in the minutes of the examiners meeting and that the criteria justifying this decision are applied to all candidates. The Examiners may not award a class lower than that calculated by the awarding procedures. The reasons for varying an award should be academically justified and may be based on accepted practice in the sector. They may not be based on the Examiners’ preference for a different set of awarding procedures.
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