

Credit Framework for Taught Programmes

Information for Students, Teachers and Examiners

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Outline of Credit Framework	2
3.	Courses.....	2
4.	Time limits.....	4
5.	Award of credits.....	4
6.	Progression	5
7.	Interim awards and alternative exit awards.....	7
8.	Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)	8
9.	General credit	9
10.	Conventions for award and classification of qualifications	9
11.	Special dispensation.....	14
	Annex 1: Glossary of Terms	15
	Annex 2: Qualification Level Descriptors.....	18
	Annex 3: Limits on Credit Transfer and/or RPL	22
	Annex 4: Minimum Credit Requirements for Awards	23
	Annex 5: Alternative Exit Awards	24
	Annex 6: Marking.....	25
	Annex 7: <i>Viva Voce</i> Examinations.....	32
	Annex 8: Applications for Mitigation.....	33
	Annex 8: Appendix 1.....	39
	Annex 8: Appendix 2.....	42
	Annex 9: Academic Discipline	44
	Annex 10: ECTS and US Credit equivalences	53
	Annex 11: Appeals against Recommendations of Boards of Examiners	54

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Credit Framework for Taught Programmes, as described in this document, applies to all taught programmes of study leading to LAMDA Higher Education awards.
- 1.2 All LAMDA Higher Education modules, even if not taken as part of a programme of study leading to a LAMDA award, are regarded as credit-bearing and are subject to the requirements of the Credit Framework.
- 1.3 The Credit Framework will be reviewed from time to time by Academic Board and LAMDA reserves the right to modify the Framework in the light of such reviews.
- 1.4 This document is intended to provide information about the Credit Framework to students, teachers and examiners. Any queries should be addressed in the first instance to Academic Services.
- 1.5 For information on quality assurance of programmes of study, see the LAMDA Academic Regulations and Quality Assurance Procedures (*the Academic Regulations*). For information about Meetings of Boards of Examiners see section 11 of the Academic Regulations and for information about the role and responsibilities of External Examiners see section of the Academic Regulations.

2. Outline of Credit Framework

- 2.1 In order to be eligible for an award of LAMDA, a student must take an approved course of study, obtain a specified number of credits, the number required depending on the award in question, and meet such other requirements as may be specified for the course in question. Each course comprises a number of modules, sometimes at different levels and each worth a specified number of credits. In order to be awarded the credits for a module, the student must normally demonstrate, via assessment, that they have achieved the learning outcomes specified for the module. Limited credit may also be awarded where assessment has been affected by illness or where the student has demonstrated in other modules that all programme learning outcomes have been achieved (see section 11.4 of the Academic Regulations).
- 2.2 Most courses can be divided into stages, usually equivalent to one academic year of full-time study. A student must satisfy prescribed requirements for each stage of a course before being permitted to proceed to the next stage.
- 2.3 Many courses lead to 'classified' awards. For example, most undergraduate degrees are awarded with First Class, Upper Second Class, Lower Second Class or Third- Class honours while postgraduate degrees may be awarded with Merit or with Distinction. (See Course Specifications for specific details).
- 2.4 The remainder of this document describes the Credit Framework in detail. A glossary of terms used may be found at Annex 1.

3. Courses

Each course comprises an approved set or sets of modules. Each module is at a specified level (of study) and a student is awarded a specified number of credits at that level following successful completion of the module. LAMDA defines these terms as follows:

3.1 Credits

One credit corresponds to approximately ten hours of 'learning time' (i.e. including all taught or supervised classes and all private study and research). Therefore obtaining 120 credits in an academic year of 30 weeks requires 1200 hours of learning time, equivalent to 40 hours per week.

3.2 Module

A module is a self-contained component of a course or courses, with defined learning outcomes, teaching and learning methods and assessment requirements. LAMDA modules are normally valued in multiples of 5 credits i.e. to 5, 10, 15, etc. credits.

Modules shall be described in programme and module specifications only as either 'compulsory' or 'optional'.

3.3 Level

Each module must be at one, and only one, of the following levels:

- Level 3 Foundation
- Level 4 Undergraduate Stage 1
- Level 5 Undergraduate Stage 2
- Level 6 Undergraduate Stage 3 (Honours)
- Level 7 Postgraduate taught

The level descriptors adopted by LAMDA for these levels can be found in Annex 2. Where there are modules at different levels which have the same or similar curriculum, they may share some or all their teaching but will normally have different learning outcomes and assessment.

3.4 Stage

Courses can be divided into a number of stages, in which case students must achieve specified requirements in each stage except the final stage before being permitted to progress to the next stage. For undergraduate honours degree courses, a stage will normally consist of modules amounting to 120 credits. Courses comprising 120 credits or less will normally consist of a single stage.

3.5 Awards

In order to be eligible for the award of a certificate, diploma or degree by LAMDA, a student must obtain at least the minimum number of credits specified for that award at the specified levels. These requirements are set out in Annex 4. Individual courses or groups of courses will normally specify additional requirements which must be met for the award of the qualification in the subject concerned, for example by requiring the student to take and obtain credits for specified modules.

3.6 Award titles

Qualifications at LAMDA will be limited to single subjects. There is no provision for major/minor combinations, for instance, or for joint honours degrees.

3.6.1 Awards for courses including a pathway

A programme of study may include one or more pathways. Where a programme is designed to include a pathway, in order to allow for specialism within a particular subject, the pathway will be defined in the programme specification(s) by the articulation of programme-level learning outcomes that are exclusive to the pathway concerned. The programme specification will state which modules must be taken in order to satisfy the requirements of the pathway. The pathway will be reflected in the title of the programme of

study by the addition of a subject-related defining term in parentheses, indicating the distinctive nature of the pathway's content and learning.

It is suggested, though not required, that all the pathways of a programme are set out in a single specification, in order to make explicit the pathway variants. Programme learning outcomes that apply to specific pathways should be clearly indicated as such (e.g. by the subheading 'Additional learning outcomes for the pathway in X').

4. Time limits

4.1 Courses

In order to remain eligible for an award, students must complete their courses within the maximum time limits set out below. These time limits include any periods of intermission and any period of time in which a student is repeating part of the course, and apply to both full time and part time students. Course specifications state the normal period of time over which the course will be completed.

Foundation Degree	5 years
Bachelor's Degree with Honours	7 years
Postgraduate Certificate	3 years
Postgraduate Diploma	4 years
Master's Degrees (graduate entry)	5 years

4.2 Modules

Credits awarded for successful completion of a module will remain eligible to contribute towards an award for a prescribed period and up to a maximum of 8 years from the date on which the credits are awarded. Module specifications, particularly in rapidly developing subjects, may specify that credit obtained will remain eligible to contribute towards an award for less than 8 years. Where the module specification does not specify any period of eligibility, this will be taken to be 8 years.

5. Award of credits

5.1 Successful Completion of Module

Students who successfully demonstrate via assessment that they have achieved the specified learning outcomes for a module will be awarded the number and level of credits prescribed for the module. Assessment methods vary between modules. Assessment is designed so that achievement of the pass mark or above will demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes. Normally individual assessments hold the same pass mark as the pass mark of the module. Module specifications will state if the pass mark has to be achieved overall and/or in prescribed elements of assessment. In certain modules, assessment may be on a Pass/Fail or a Fail/Pass/Merit/Distinction basis, and numerical marks will not be awarded. For all modules at levels 3 to 6 the pass mark will be 40%. For all level 7 modules the pass mark will be 50%.

- 5.1.1 Unless a student has made a successful claim for mitigating circumstances, failed modules passed on a second attempt will be graded in the normal way, but the mark recorded will be capped at the pass mark.

5.1.2 Where modules are marked on a Pass/Fail or a Fail/Pass/Merit/Distinction basis, the following shall apply:

- i. Programmes graded in this way need not result in a classified award.
- ii. Where classification is permitted:

‘with Merit’:

a mark of merit or above for more than 50% of the credits obtained in the modules contributing to classification

‘with Distinction’:

no module marks of ‘pass’ and a mark of distinction for more than 50% of the credits obtained in the modules contributing to classification

- iii. Failed modules passed on a second or third attempt will be awarded a mark of ‘pass’.
- iv. Honours degrees may not be classified by this algorithm.

5.2 Mitigating Circumstances

Where a student fails a module or modules but claims that this was due to illness or other mitigating circumstances, the Board of Examiners may allow such failure and award credits for the module(s), up to a limit of 25% of each stage of a programme of study (see section 11.5 of LAMDA Quality Procedures and Academic Regulations) and with the possible application of additional measures (see section 11 of LAMDA Academic Regulations and Quality Procedures), provided that there is evidence to show that the student has achieved the programme learning outcomes and provided that the student has submitted written medical or other evidence to substantiate any claim of illness or other mitigating circumstances. The marks achieved for such modules will not be adjusted to take account of the mitigating circumstances, but transcripts issued to the student will indicate modules for which credits have been awarded via this process. To ensure that the application for mitigating circumstances does not disadvantage a student when an award is classified, where credit for a module is awarded by allowance, the mark awarded for that module should be excluded from the calculation of the classification of the award. Programme specifications specify modules in which failure cannot be allowed.

Note: The above does not preclude a Board of Examiners from adjusting a module mark where a student has failed to complete assessment requirements for good reason, as described in LAMDA Credit Framework Annex 6: Marking.

5.3 Concurrent Application of the Mitigating Circumstances and Trailing Provisions

The application of mitigating circumstances or trailing provisions is limited to a maximum cumulative total of 25% of the credit available for any stage.

5.4 Application of the Mitigating Circumstances and Trailing Provisions

The provision allowed for the Mitigating Circumstances or for the trailing and retrieving of credit should only be applied with respect to students who fail modules amounting to 25% or less of the credit available for the stage.

6. Progression

6.1 When a student has completed a stage of a programme of study other than the final stage, the appropriate Board of Examiners will decide whether the student may progress to the next stage of the programme of study, or to another programme of study.

6.2 The normal requirement for progression from one stage of a programme of study to the next is that the student should have obtained 100% of the credits for the stage. Where a student has failed to obtain 100% of the credits for the stage, but has obtained at least 75% of the credits and has obtained credits for those modules which the programme specification

indicates must be obtained before progression is permitted, the appropriate Board of Examiners might require the student to repeat or resit the failed modules, or it might give permission for the failed modules to be compensated, condoned or trailed into the next stage.

- 6.3 When a student has completed a year of study but has not completed a stage of a programme of study, the Board of Examiners will recommend whether the student may continue with their studies (see section 11 of LAMDA Quality Procedures and Academic Regulations).

6.4 Resit

- 6.4.1 Where a student is not permitted to progress to the next stage of a programme, or at the end of a year of study other than the end of a stage of a programme has failed a module or modules, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to undertake further assessment in failed modules. The Board of Examiners will specify which elements of assessment the student is required to undertake. Except in cases where students have been informed in advance that alternative assessment will not be permitted, elements of assessment that are unrepeatable, e.g. seminar contributions, should be substituted by other assignments testing the same learning outcomes. In cases where alternative assessment is not permitted or cannot be arranged, students failing unrepeatable elements may only retrieve credit by repeating the entire module. Marks already obtained for elements of assessment which the student is not required to undertake again will be carried forward unless the Board of Examiners specifies otherwise. One resit opportunity per module will be permitted.
- 6.4.2 A student who is required to re-sit may elect to repeat the module before progressing to the next stage of the programme, provided that it is being taught in the year in question, or may choose to take a different module, provided that the requirements of the programme of study are still met, but must do so before progressing to the next stage of the programme.
- 6.4.3 In cases where a student has failed to obtain half or more of the credit required to progress to the next stage of study, it is advisable for the Board of Examiners to recommend that the student be required to repeat these modules in attendance during the following academic year, rather than simply undertake further assessment. This recommendation is based on academic judgement and there are, therefore, normally no grounds for appealing against the recommendation. Where, however, sufficient mitigating circumstances exist to appeal against the recommendation, the student is permitted to submit such an appeal, provided it is supported by objective evidence.
- 6.4.4 A candidate who is referred in the dissertation element of a taught postgraduate programme may resubmit the dissertation on one occasion only in a revised form, not later (except in cases of illness or other good cause) than twelve months after the decision to allow resubmission has been made by the Board of Examiners. Such resubmissions will be capped at the pass mark. Where the Board of Examiners require only minor corrections to the dissertation, it will not be regarded as a resit and the original mark allocated will stand.

6.5 Trailing and Retrieving Credit

Where a student is permitted to progress to the next stage of a programme but has not been awarded full credit for the previous stage, the student will still need to obtain credits for modules for which they have so far not been awarded credit in order to meet requirements for the award of the certificate, diploma or degree for which they are registered. The student may be permitted to 'retrieve' such credits, up to a maximum of 25% of the credits for the stage, in one of two ways, as follows:

Either

- 6.5.1 By undertaking further assessment, for example a resit examination, before the start of the next academic year. A student who is permitted to retrieve credit in this way may elect to repeat the module, provided that it is being taught in the year in question, or may choose to take a different module, provided that the requirements of the programme of study are still met.

Or

- 6.5.2 By progressing to the next stage of the programme and simultaneously undertaking such further requirements as the Board of Examiners specifies in relation to the failed modules. This is known as trailing credit. Where credit is trailed, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to repeat the failed module(s) provided it/they are available and the timetable permits, or to take an alternative module as permitted by the programme specification, or may specify assessment to be undertaken satisfactorily for the award of the credits in question. Credit may not be trailed to the next stage of the programme e.g. students will not be permitted to progress to Level 6 of a programme unless they have obtained all Level 4 credits and met the minimum progression requirements in Level 5.
- 6.5.3 Only one such retrieval opportunity per module will be permitted.

6.6 Deferral

Where a student has failed due to circumstances such as illness, and where there is written evidence to support this, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to undertake some or all of the assessment for some or all of the failed modules comprising the stage at a later date either (i) as if for the first time, i.e. without incurring the penalty of a capped mark or a reduction in the number of permitted attempts; or (ii) as if for the second time, i.e. with a capped mark but without incurring a further reduction in the number of permitted attempts. Where the student has met requirements for progression to the next stage of the programme, they may be permitted to 'trail' the deferred assessment, i.e. to proceed to the next stage and simultaneously undertake the deferred assessment as for the first time or, where appropriate, the second time (see 6.5.2 above).

Please note that it would be appropriate and necessary to offer a deferral as if for the second time only in the circumstances where a student had been referred in a previous attempt at the module(s) in question. Under such circumstances it would be inappropriate to offer a student the possibility of an uncapped module mark. Any deferred attempt, however, would not further reduce the number of resit opportunities.

- 6.7 Students may be permitted to take a Stage 2 module before completing Stage 1 or a Stage 3 module before completing Stage 2 provided:
- i. that the Head of the relevant Teaching Department has approved the arrangement in advance;
 - ii. that such higher stage credit should not be used for the purposes of progression or be permitted to contribute to an award until the progression requirements for the current stage have been confirmed by the Board of Examiners and;
 - iii. that any relevant prerequisite module for the current stage has been successfully completed by the student concerned.

7. Interim awards and alternative exit awards

- 7.1 LAMDA does not award interim qualifications. Thus, for example, a student who is taking a programme of study leading to an Honours degree will not automatically be awarded a Certificate when the credits required for a Certificate have been obtained. However, in some programmes, students register initially on a Certificate programme, may then proceed to a Diploma programme and may then proceed to a degree programme. In these

circumstances, successful students are awarded all three qualifications.

- 7.2 A student who successfully completes an appropriate volume of credit as part of a programme of study, but who does not successfully complete the whole programme, will be entitled to receive an alternative exit award from the relevant Board of Examiners, for example, the award of a Certificate, Diploma or non-Honours degree, where he/she has achieved sufficient credit at the appropriate award required for the award concerned and has satisfied any further requirements for the particular programme of study where such have been specified in the relevant approved programme specification.

For full details refer to Annex 5: Alternative Exit Awards of the Credit Framework.

8. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

- 8.1 Except in cases where the programme specification prohibits this, a student who can provide evidence of previous relevant successful learning, either at LAMDA or elsewhere, may, within specified limits, be exempted from part of a programme of study. Annex 3 sets out, for each award, the minimum number and levels of credits which must be obtained by taking part of the programme of study leading to the award concerned. Where the prior learning has taken place at a UK HEP it will be regarded as RPL and may be processed as below.

- 8.1.1 Admissions Officers, in consultation with the appropriate Heads of Department, are authorised to approve requests for RPL within the limits specified in Annex 3 which are supported by official transcripts or equivalent provided that they are satisfied that the applicant has achieved learning outcomes equivalent to those of the stage(s) or module(s) from which exemption is to be granted. The level and volume of credits from which the applicant is granted exemption may be less than those on which the application is based. A record of all such decisions and a copy of the evidence on which they were based will be kept by the Admissions Officer concerned. These records will be reported by the Admissions Officer to the relevant Examination Board for sampling and monitoring purposes.

- 8.2 Where a student is granted exemption from part of a programme of study on the basis of RPL, the marks obtained by the student for such prior learning will not be used for classification purposes i.e. for determining an Honours classification or in deciding whether an award should be made with Merit or with Distinction except where it is agreed as part of an inter-institutional agreement that they should be so used.

8.3 'Spent' Credit

- 8.3.1 LAMDA will permit a limited volume of credit "spent" on the achievement of an award to be "re-spent" on a second award of an equal or lower level subject to the following conditions:
- i. That the maximum volume of spent credit that might be permitted to contribute to an award should be governed by the limits established in Annex 3 of the Credit Framework;
 - ii. That with regard to importing credit spent in the award of undergraduate Honours degrees such spent credit may only be used to gain exemption from the requirements of Level 4 of the relevant programme specification;
 - iii. That, except where programmes share a common title for separate awards (i.e. PGCert/PGDip/Master's in X), credit spent on a LAMDA award may not be re-spent on another LAMDA award of the same or lower level where the credit derives from modules shared by the programmes leading to the awards in question;
 - iv. That such credit may not be "re-spent" on more than one occasion.
- 8.3.2 Applications for the re-use of such credit should be governed by the procedures for RPL set out in Section 16 of LAMDA's Academic Regulations. See also the material published by SEEC at <https://www.seec.org.uk/for-learners/> (last accessed June 2021).

9. General credit

9.1 General Credit may be defined as follows:

All assessed learning can be awarded credit. The credit gained is a general recognition of assessed learning at specified levels. It is general credit. When the credit is recognised through the admissions procedure of an HEP as directly contributing to a programme, it becomes specific. The change in designation from general to specific relates directly to the relevance of the learning to the proposed programme.

General credit therefore represents the whole of the learning achieved on an accredited programme of study. An honours degree would have a General Credit value of 360 credits. Specific Credit is the volume and level of credit which can be used from the General Credit value for Recognition of Prior Learning into another programme.

For example: a student gains a qualification in Acting, worth 120 credits at level 4, from a UK Higher Education Provider. The General Credit value of this qualification is 120 credits at level 4. If the applicant requests RPL on the basis of this to a similar LAMDA degree programme, it is probable that all of the General Credit value could be recognised. However, if the applicant requests RPL with the same Level 4 qualification to a LAMDA degree programme in Directing, only a limited amount of the credit might be recognised. This would be determined by the academic staff mapping between the external and LAMDA programme/module learning outcomes to identify how much credit could be used for RPL. It may be that 60 credits of one qualification could be used for another part of the first year of a separate programme. These 60 credits would be the Specific Credit value.

9.2 A General Credit value can be awarded to the RPL Portfolio submitted. If appropriate, the General Credit value can then be used in its entirety if it can be mapped to the learning outcomes of the module(s) for which credit is being claimed. It may be that only a specific amount of the General Credit can be mapped to the learning outcomes of the module(s) for which credit is sought.

9.3 For all RPL claims it should be noted that the LAMDA Credit Framework and programme rules may limit the amount of credit than can be applied for.

9.4 LAMDA recognises the validity of studies undertaken at other UK Higher Education Providers; therefore, it will normally recognise the General Credit value of qualifications obtained from these providers. Note, however, that it cannot be assumed that the General Credit value can automatically be fully recognised as credit into a LAMDA award. A mapping must first be carried out to determine what level and volume of credit can be used.

The Specific Credit value can never exceed the General Credit value of the qualification being used to apply for RPL.

10. Conventions for award and classification of qualifications

10.1 Award of Certificates, Diplomas and Degrees

A student may only be recommended for the award by LAMDA of a Certificate, Diploma or Degree in a specified subject if:

10.1.1 they meet the minimum requirements in terms of the number and level(s) of credits for the award in question as set out in Annex 4 below, except where the student has been granted limited exemption from these requirements through credit transfer or the recognition of prior learning (RPL)

and

- 10.1.2 they meet the requirements of the programme of study which has been approved as leading to the award in question, except where the student has been granted limited exemption from these requirements through credit transfer or the recognition of prior learning (RPL).

For further information see section 16 of LAMDA Quality Procedures and Academic Regulations.

10.2 Referral

Where a student, on completion of a programme of study leading to a named award, fails to meet the requirements for that award, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to undertake further assessment in failed modules. The Board of Examiners will specify which elements of assessment the student is required to undertake. Except in cases where students have been informed in advance that alternative assessment will not be permitted, elements of assessment that are unrepeatable, e.g. seminar or rehearsal contributions, should be substituted by other assignments testing the same learning outcomes. In cases where alternative assessment is not permitted, students failing unrepeatable elements may only retrieve credit by repeating the entire module. Marks already obtained for elements of assessment which the student is not required to undertake again will be carried forward unless the Board of Examiners specifies otherwise.

A student who is so referred in a module may be required to, or may elect to, repeat the module, provided that it is being taught in the year in question, or may choose to take a different module provided that the requirements of the programme of study are still met. One such opportunity per module will be automatically permitted. Marks for modules in which a student has been referred or which a student has repeated or in which a student has attempted to retrieve an initial failure should be treated as set out in Annex 6 (Marking).

A student who is referred in the dissertation element of a taught postgraduate programme may resubmit the dissertation on one occasion only in a revised form not later (except in cases of illness or other good cause) than twelve months after the decision to allow resubmission has been made by the Board of Examiners. Such resubmissions will be capped at the pass mark. Where the Board of Examiners require only minor corrections to the dissertation, it will not be regarded as a referral and the original mark allocated will stand.

For further information see section 11 of LAMDA Academic Regulations and Quality Procedures.

10.3 Deferral

Where a student has failed due to circumstances such as illness, and where there is written evidence to support this, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to undertake some or all of the assessment for some or all of the failed modules concerned at a later date either:

- i) as if for the first time, i.e. without incurring the penalty of a capped mark or a reduction in the number of permitted attempts; or
- ii) as if for the second time, i.e. with a capped mark. Please note that it would be appropriate and necessary to offer a deferral as if for the second time only in the circumstances where a student had been referred in a previous attempt at the module(s) in question. Under such circumstances it would be inappropriate to offer a student the possibility of an uncapped module mark. Any deferred attempt, however, would not further reduce the number of resit opportunities

10.4 Classification of awards

Students who successfully complete an Honours degree programme will be awarded a degree with First Class, Upper Second Class, Lower Second Class or Third Class honours. Students who successfully complete a programme of study leading to the award of a Certificate or Diploma may be awarded a Certificate or a Diploma with Merit or with

Distinction. Students who successfully complete programmes of study leading to the award of a Foundation degree or Master's degree may be awarded the degree with Merit or with Distinction. The requirements for such awards are set out below.

10.4.1 General requirements

- 10.4.1.1 Marks obtained for all modules taken as part of the programme of study will contribute to the classification of an award, except in the case of Honours degree programmes where classification will be based only on Stages 2 and 3 and, where relevant, Stage 4, i.e. marks obtained in the first year of a three year full-time honours degree programme and marks obtained in any foundation year will not contribute to Honours classification.
- 10.4.1.2 The volume of credit to be awarded for the successful completion of student placement years, whether taken in industry or in academic institutions overseas as part of an approved undergraduate programme, will be 120 credits. The level of the credits will be stated in programme specifications. While such credits will contribute to the total volume of credits required for an award, they should not be included in any calculations of final degree classifications.
- 10.4.1.3 Where a student fails to achieve the required credits for successful completion of a year in industry or a year at an academic institution overseas, the student will be required to recover the failed credits. Where the year in industry or year abroad is not integral to the subject matter of the qualification overall, the student might alternatively be awarded a degree with no 'year in industry' or 'year abroad'.
- 10.4.1.4 While modules taken on a pass/fail basis contribute towards the volume of credit required for an award, they should be discounted when calculating overall average marks.
- 10.4.1.5 Where a student is exempted from part of the programme of study on the basis of credit transfer, marks obtained for such prior learning will not be used for classification purposes except where it is agreed as part of an inter-institutional agreement that they should be so used.
- 10.4.1.6 In order to ensure that the application of mitigating circumstances does not disadvantage a student when an award is classified, where credit for a module is awarded via mitigation, the mark awarded should normally be excluded from the calculation of the classification of the award. The marks on the transcript will not be adjusted.
- 10.4.1.7 Where a student fails a module at the first attempt and subsequently passes the module, or takes and passes an alternative module in place of a module which has been failed, the minimum pass mark will be used for classification.
- 10.4.1.8 Boards of Examiners have discretion to make recommendations notwithstanding the conventions in exceptional cases provided that such recommendations do not lower the classification arising on the application of the conventions and provided always that the student has obtained at least seven eighths of the credits normally required for the award of the qualification in question (including credits awarded via mitigation). "Exceptional" in such cases should be interpreted as having reference to the unique and severe mitigating circumstances of individual candidates.
- 10.4.1.9 The views of the External Examiner(s) shall be particularly influential in the case of disagreement on the final classification for a particular candidate.
- 10.4.1.10 The signature of all the External Examiners present shall be appended to the final list of results as evidence that they endorse the classifications.

10.4.1.11 Students who successfully complete the stated requirements are entitled to receive the award for which they are registered at LAMDA. Where programmes of study allow for 'incremental registration', a successful student will therefore pick up each award in turn. The classification of such awards will be managed as follows:

- i. Undergraduate programmes: where students are permitted to register on an incremental programme basis (Certificate > Diploma > Degree) they should normally be classified for their degree not only on the basis of their performance in the degree, but also with regard to their performance in the diploma programme. Such students will, therefore, be classified over two 'stages' (diploma and degree).

Note: This regulation does not apply to students entering LAMDA for the final stage of a degree programme from another institution, or to students taking 'top-up' degrees, or students progressing into the final stage of a degree programme from a Foundation Degree (i.e. the marks obtained at another institution or in the final stage of a FD cannot be factored into a calculation of degree classification).

- ii. Postgraduate programmes: where students are permitted to register on an incremental programme basis (PG Certificate > PG Diploma > Master's Degree, or PG Diploma > Master's Degree) they should normally be classified for their award on the following basis:
 - a) PG Certificate – students to be classified on the basis of their performance on the PG Certificate.
 - b) PG Diploma – classification will be made on the basis of student performance across both the PG Cert and PG Dip 'stages'; or, where the PG Dip consists of a single 120 credit stage, across the PG Diploma as a whole.
 - c) Master's – award to be made on the basis of either student performance across the PG Cert, the PG Dip and the Master's 'stages'; or, where the PG Dip consists of a single 120 credit stage, on the basis of student performance on the PG Dip and the Master's together.

10.4.2 Stage Weighting

10.4.2.1 Undergraduate Degree Programmes

10.4.2.1.1 The standard weighting of stages for three year undergraduate degree programmes will be 40% for Stage 2 and 60% for Stage 3.

10.4.2.1.2 The standard weighting of stages for four year undergraduate degree programmes (i.e. degree programmes leading either to Bachelor's or integrated Master's awards) will be 20% for Stage 2, 30% for Stage 3 and 50% for Stage 4.

10.4.2.1.3 Where a student completes Stages 1 to 3 of a four stage Bachelor's or undergraduate integrated Master's degree programme, but does not complete Stage 4 and, therefore, qualifies for the award of an approved alternative exit Bachelor's degree, the standard stage weighting in such cases will be 40% for Stage 2 and 60% for Stage 3.

10.4.2.1.4 With regard to stages or terms taken in placement either abroad or in industry, the following rubric will apply:

- i. where the student's mark or marks have not been awarded by LAMDA staff, the placement will be graded on a pass/fail basis and will therefore be zero-weighted with respect to classification;

- ii. where the student's mark or marks have been awarded by LAMDA staff, the mark or marks achieved will be recorded and will carry such weighting towards classification as has been approved by Academic Board;
- iii. Where a stage includes a term abroad, that stage will make a contribution to the final classification in the normal way. The standard weighting of 40/60 will apply in such cases.

10.4.2.1.5 Where individual assessment elements of any module are marked by a non-LAMDA marker the principle of point (i) above will also apply.

10.4.2.1.6 Schools seeking to apply non-standard weightings to stages may only do so with the approval of Academic Board. Such applications should demonstrate that there is sound pedagogical reason for applying the non-standard weighting or provide evidence that the non-standard weighting meets a PSRB requirement.

10.4.2.2 Foundation Degrees and Postgraduate Taught Programmes

For the purpose of classification, modules and/or stages may have different weightings as approved by Academic Board.

10.4.2.3 Classification of Awards other than HNC/Ds or Honours Degrees and of Stage 1 of Honours Degrees

The following classification rules apply to all Certificates and Diplomas, including Certificates and Diplomas of Higher Education, Graduate Certificates and Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates and Diplomas, to Foundation Degrees and Master's degrees other than 'Extended Master's' degrees (which are awarded with Honours following successful completion of an extended undergraduate Honours degree programme), and to Stage 1 of Honours degree programmes.

Note: Some programmes leading to the award of a Master's degree do not make provision for the award to be made 'with Merit' or 'with Distinction' while others make provision for the degree to be awarded 'with Distinction' but not 'with Merit'.

10.4.2.3.1 The 'Average' Method of Classification will be applied, as follows:

'with Merit': an average mark of 60 or above but less than 70.

'with Distinction': an average mark of 70 or above.

10.4.2.4 Classification of Honours Degrees

Undergraduate degree programmes will be classified by the 'average' method.

Where there is clear evidence that there is a PSRB requirement for an undergraduate programme of study to be classified by a different method, the prior approval of Academic Board must be obtained.

i. Weighted Average Mark

The final weighted average mark for classification purposes will be determined by the application of weighting to the average marks achieved for each relevant stage of the degree programme.

ii. 'Average' Method of Classification

A candidate who has met the requirements for the award of an Honours degree will be placed in an Honours class based on the rounded weighted average mark, with modules weighted as agreed by Academic Board and calculated to one decimal place, over all modules in Stages 2, 3 and, where relevant, 4 of the programme of study according to the following table:

First Class Honours	70 and above
Upper Second Class Honours	60 – 69.4
Lower Second Class Honours	50 – 59.4
Third Class Honours	40 – 49.4

11. Special dispensation

- 11.1 Academic Board is authorised to approve exceptions to the requirements of the Credit Framework for Taught Programmes in individual cases under special circumstances provided that it is satisfied that there is good reason to do so. Such special circumstances would encompass extreme events beyond the control of the student concerned and which caused severe difficulty.
- 11.2 Where an exemption to the requirements of the Credit Framework is sought, the procedure to be followed is:
- i. The relevant teaching department should determine whether there is good reason for an exemption and that there is support for making the request. If it is determined at this stage that there is not good reason and/or support for the exemption the student should be so informed and the matter will be closed. Note that without support from the teaching department, the request for an exemption will not be considered further.
 - ii. If it is determined that there is good reason and support for the request, the details and a rationale for the required exemption should be forwarded to Academic Services. Confirmation will be obtained concerning the particular requirements of the Credit Framework for which the exemption is sought and a review will take place to assess whether the rationale addresses those requirements.
 - iii. Academic Services will submit the request and rationale to the Chair of Academic Board (or their nominee) with any accompanying comments. The Chair will approve or not approve the exemption request on the basis of this submission. Academic Services will communicate the outcome to those concerned.
 - iv. Exemption approvals will be reported to the next meeting of Academic Board.
 - v. The approval or non-approval of an exemption request is a discretionary power and no appeal is permitted.

Annex 1: Glossary of Terms

Alternative Exit Awards

A qualification which may be awarded to a student who meets the requirements for this award but does not meet the requirements for the award for which he/she is registered.

Assessment

The process by which LAMDA establishes whether or not students have achieved the learning outcomes required for the award of credit or of a Certificate, Diploma or Degree and determines the appropriate classification of such awards.

Average Method

One of the methods by which the classification of an award may be determined, based on the average mark obtained by the student over all modules comprising the programme of study or over all the modules taken in specified stages of the programme.

Award

A qualification given to a student following successful completion of a programme of study.

Classification

Signifies the level of achievement of a student who receives an award. For example, Certificates and Diplomas may be awarded 'with Merit' or 'with Distinction' while Honours degrees may be awarded with First Class, Upper Second Class, Lower Second Class or Third-Class honours.

Credit

A measure of volume of learning. LAMDA defines one credit as corresponding to approximately ten hours of learning time i.e. including all taught or supervised classes and all private study and research. Each module corresponds to a specified number of credits.

Deferral

Permission to undertake assessment at a later date than is normal and as for the first time following absence or failure to submit or failure. Deferral can only be permitted where there is evidence of illness or other mitigating circumstances.

Distinction

Certificates, diplomas and some degrees may be awarded 'with Distinction' to students whose performance is considered to be of an exceptionally high standard.

Extended Masters

Degrees awarded following successful completion of a programme of study beginning at level 4 and ending at level 7, typically requiring four years of full time study or equivalent.

Fail

A student will be deemed to have failed a module if he/she does not provide evidence via assessment that he/she has achieved the learning outcomes specified for the module. A student will be deemed to have failed a programme of study, or a stage of a programme of study, if he/she does not obtain all the required credits for the programme or stage.

Fall-back Award

A qualification which may be awarded to a student who meets the requirements for this award but does not meet the requirements for the award for which he/she is registered.

Honours

The classification system used for most undergraduate degrees which may be awarded with First Class honours, Upper Second-Class honours, Lower Second Class honours or Third Class honours according to the level of performance of the student.

Interim Award

A qualification awarded following successful completion of part of a programme of study and where the student progresses to the following stage i.e. the student is entitled to both the interim award and the final award. LAMDA does not make interim awards.

Intermission

Interruption of study for a prescribed period of time. Intermission must be formally applied for and permission granted.

Learning Outcomes

Statements of what a student is expected to know, understand and/or be able to demonstrate after successful completion of the learning process concerned.

Level

An indicator of relative difficulty, complexity, depth of study and learner autonomy. Each module is at a specified level.

Level Descriptor

A statement which describes the characteristics of teaching and learning at that level.

Merit

Certificates, diplomas and some degrees may be awarded 'with Merit' to students whose performance is considered to be of a very high standard but not sufficiently high for an award 'with Distinction'

Mitigating Circumstances

The process by which credit may be awarded for failed modules where there is evidence that failure was due to illness or other mitigating circumstances and that programme learning outcomes have been achieved.

Module

A self-contained component of a programme or programmes of study with defined learning outcomes, teaching and learning methods and assessment requirements.

Pass

A student will be deemed to have passed a module if he/she has demonstrated achievement of the learning outcomes of the module. A student will be deemed to have passed a programme of study, or a stage of a programme of study, if he/she has obtained all the required credits required for the programme or stage.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of reproducing in work submitted for assessment material derived from work authored by another person, or by the student themselves in other work, without clearly acknowledging the source.

Programme of Study

A schedule of modules and a set of learning outcomes approved as leading to the award of a Certificate, Diploma or Degree. Also commonly referred to as 'Course' in recruitment literature and on LAMDA Vision.

Programme Specification

A detailed description of a programme of study prepared in accordance with an agreed template and providing information about the programme of study to students, teachers and other interested parties.

Progression

Permission to proceed from one stage of a programme of study to the next stage.

Resit

The opportunity to undertake further assessment following failure of a module or modules.

Repeat

The opportunity to take for a second time a module or modules which have been failed.

RPL

The process by which students are exempted from part of a programme of study on the basis of previously acquired credit, either through undertaking formally assessed learning at the same or another provider or via accreditation of prior learning or accreditation of prior experiential learning.

Stage

Programmes of study are divided into a number of stages and students must achieve specified requirements in each stage except the final stage before being permitted to progress to the next stage.

Subject

Each programme of study and each qualification awarded is in a named subject or subjects which describe, in general terms, the academic area(s) of study to be undertaken.

Trailing

Undertaking further assessment in a failed module or modules while simultaneously progressing to the next stage of the programme of study.

Validation

The process by which LAMDA approves its own programmes; revalidates its own programmes and approves major changes to modules. This includes the process where LAMDA permits other providers to devise and deliver programmes of study leading to awards of LAMDA. LAMDA retains responsibility for approval and quality assurance of such programmes except in the case of accredited providers.

Viva Voce Examination

An interview of a student by an examiner or examiners intended to assist examiners in determining the outcome of assessment

Annex 2: Qualification Level Descriptors

Each module and programme within LAMDA Credit Framework must be at one and only one of Levels 3 through to 7.

LAMDA has adopted, as the definitions of Levels 4 to 7, the qualification level descriptors as set out in *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies* found in Part A: Setting and Maintaining Academic Standards of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education (October 2014), published by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), and which are reproduced in Table A below.

See <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/qualifications-frameworks.pdf>

The QAA describes qualification level descriptors as:

“Descriptors exemplify the nature and characteristics of the main qualification at each level, and comparison demonstrates the nature and characteristics of change between qualifications at different levels. They provide clear points of reference at each level and describe outcomes that cover the great majority of existing qualifications.”

Table 1

Level	Qualifications at the level indicated are awarded to students who have demonstrated:	Typically, holders of a qualification at the level indicated will be able to:	And will have:
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) a limited factual and conceptual knowledge base, with some appreciation of the breadth of the field of study and the relevant terminology; ii) an ability to apply the skills of analysis, synthesis, evaluation independently in relatively simple and familiar contexts, or with guidance or structure when working with greater complexity; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) apply knowledge and skills within a defined context and evaluate own strengths and weaknesses within criteria largely set by others; b) within a defined context, manage information and collect data from a range of straightforward sources c) apply given tools/methods to a well-defined problem and show emerging recognition of the complexity of associated issues; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) the qualities and transferable skills to enable them to operate in predictable, defined contexts that require use of a specified range of standard techniques.

Level	Qualifications at the level indicated are awarded to students who have demonstrated:	Typically, holders of a qualification at the level indicated will be able to:	And will have:
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with their area(s) of study, and an ability to evaluate and interpret these within the context of that area of study; ii) an ability to present, evaluate, and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work; b) communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments; c) undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) knowledge and critical understanding of the well-established principles of their area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have developed; ii) ability to apply underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, including, where appropriate, the application of those principles in an employment context; iii) knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in their subject(s), and ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study; iv) an understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) use a range of established techniques to initiate and undertake critical analysis of information, and to propose solutions to problems arising from that analysis; b) effectively communicate information, arguments, and analysis, in a variety of forms, to specialist and non-specialist audiences, and deploy key techniques of the discipline effectively; c) undertake further training, develop existing skills, and acquire new competences that will enable them to assume significant responsibility within organisations; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making.

Level	Qualifications at the level indicated are awarded to students who have demonstrated:	Typically, holders of a qualification at the level indicated will be able to:	And will have:
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) a systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline; ii) an ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline; iii) conceptual understanding that enables the student: iv) to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a discipline; and to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline; v) an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge; vi) the ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (e.g. refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects; b) critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem; c) communicate information, ideas, problems, and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring: the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility; decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts; and the learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.

Level	Qualifications at the level indicated are awarded to students who have demonstrated:	Typically, holders of a qualification at the level indicated will be able to:	And will have:
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 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 their academic discipline, field of study, or area of professional practice; i) a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship; ii) originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline; iv) conceptual understanding that enables the student: to evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline; and to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 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; b) demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level; c) continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) 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.

Annex 3: Limits on Credit Transfer and/or RPL

LAMDA imposes limits on the extent to which a student may be exempted from part of a programme of study via credit transfer and/or recognition of prior learning (RPL). The table below shows, for each qualification, the minimum amount of credit which must be obtained at LAMDA by taking part of the programme of study concerned. It should be noted that credit transfer candidates will normally be required to take substantially more of their programme of study than the minimum shown below, either because their prior learning does not fully equip them for the maximum possible exemption, or because, for a particular programme of study, exemption from specified modules is not permitted. Exemption from part of a programme of study is, in all cases, at the discretion of LAMDA (see Chapter 16 of the Quality Assurance Procedures and Academic Regulations).

The minimum credit which must be obtained in order to be eligible for an award through taking part of a programme of study at the University is as follows:

Award	Minimum Credits to be Obtained on LAMDA Programme of Study
Certificate of Higher Education	60 credits at level 4 or above
BTEC Higher National Certificate (120 credits)	60 credits at level 4 or above
BTEC Higher National Diploma	120 credits at level 5 or above
Diploma of Higher Education	120 credits including at least 90 at level 5 or above
Foundation Degree	120 credits including at least 90 at level 5 or above
Non-Honours Degree	120 credits including at least 90 at level 6 or above
Honours Degree	120 credits including at least 90 at level 6 or above
Integrated Master's Degree	120 credits at level 7 or above
Graduate Certificate	30 credits at level 6
Graduate Diploma	60 credits at level 6
Postgraduate Certificate	30 credits at level 7
Postgraduate Diploma	60 credits at level 7
Taught Master's eg MA / MSc / LL.M / MBA / MFA	90 credits at level 7

Annex 4: Minimum Credit Requirements for Awards

In order to be eligible for the award of a certificate, diploma or degree by LAMDA, a student must obtain at least the minimum number of credits at the levels prescribed for the award in question, as set out below, and must meet any further requirements specified for the particular programme of study and award concerned unless he/she has been granted exemption from these requirements via credit transfer (see Annex 3).

It should be noted that programmes of study may require that the student should obtain more than the minimum number of credits specified below. For example, while most Honours degree programmes require three years of full time study of modules amounting to the minimum of 360 credits for an Honours degree, others may require four years of full time study of modules amounting to 480 credits and students taking such programmes are required to obtain 480 credits to qualify for the award.

Academic Board is authorised to approve exceptions to the requirements listed below of no more than 30 credits at each level, the total number of credits for the award remaining the same, provided that it is satisfied that there is good reason to do so.

The minimum requirements for awards are as follows:

Award	Minimum credits required	Levels
Certificate / Certificate of Higher Education	120	At least 120 credits at level 4 or above
Diploma	120	At least 90 credits at level 5 or above
Diploma of Higher Education	240	At least 90 credits at level 5 or above
Foundation degree	240	At least 90 credits at level 5 or above
Non-Honours degree	300	At least 150 credits at level 5 or above including at least 60 credits at level 6 or above at Stage 3
Honours degree	360	At least 210 credits at level 5 or above including at least 90 credits at level 6 or above at Stage 3
Honours degree top-up	120	At least 90 credits at level 6 or above, and awarded as part of the top-up degree itself
Integrated Master's degree	480	At least 330 credits at level 5 or above including at least 120 credits at level 7
Graduate Certificate	60	At least 40 credits at level 6
Graduate Diploma	120	At least 80 credits at level 6
Postgraduate Certificate	60	At least 40 credits at level 7
Postgraduate Diploma	120	At least 90 credits at level 7
MA / MSc / LLM / MBA / MFA	180	At least 150 credits at level 7

^a Where an honours degree programme is taken over four stages, at least 90 credits at level 6 or above must be taken in the final stage.

Annex 5: Alternative Exit Awards

1. A student who successfully completes an appropriate volume of credit as part of a programme of study, but who does not successfully complete the whole programme, will be entitled to receive an alternative exit award from the relevant Board of Examiners, for example, the award of a Certificate, Diploma or non-Honours degree, where he/she has achieved sufficient credit at the appropriate level required for the award concerned and has satisfied any further requirements for the particular programme of study where such have been specified in the relevant approved programme specification.
2. The minimum credit requirements for awards (i.e. volume and level) are set out in Annex 4: Minimum Credit Requirements for Awards.
3. Where students have met the requirements for a year abroad or other placement activity the title of the alternative exit award should reflect this achievement (for example, Diploma with a Year Abroad; Non-Honours Degree with a Year in Industry). It should be noted that, although the achievement of 120 credits for a placement stage may give a student the overall volume of credit required for a non-honours degree (300) or honours degree (360), these latter awards require the achievement of a stated volume of credit at level 6 and in Stage 3 (see Annex 4).
4. Where a student has passed a module or modules, but has not met the requirements for any award, LAMDA will issue the student with a transcript stating the modules passed and the marks and credits awarded.
5. The table below sets out the alternative exit awards available to students registered on specific programmes of study. The appropriate alternative exit award will be made where LAMDA's requirements and any stated programme requirements have been met.

Target Award / Credits Required	Available Exit Awards / Credits Required			
BA / BSc (Hons) 360	Non-Honours degree 300	Diploma of HE 240	Certificate of HE 120	
FdA / FdSc / Diploma of HE 240	Certificate of HE 120			
Integrated Master's degree 480	BA / BSc (Hons) 360	Non-Honours degree 300	Diploma of HE 240	Certificate of HE 120
Graduate Diploma 120	Graduate Certificate 60			
Master's degree (MA / MSc / MBA / MFA) 180	PG Diploma 120	PG Certificate 60		
PG Diploma 120	PG Certificate 60			

Annex 6: Marking

1. All examination scripts resulting from timed unseen examinations shall be anonymous for the purpose of marking. Candidates will be assigned random examination numbers in advance of the examinations and answer scripts will be identified by candidate number only.
2. Candidates' names and examination numbers shall be known to Boards of Examiners when considering medical and other concessionary evidence. The identities of candidates shall be withheld from examiners during any meeting convened for the purpose of making decisions on progression and/or classification (see section 11 of the Academic Regulations).
3. Candidates' names but not their examination numbers shall be known to the Examiners at *viva voce* examinations degrees except that the External Examiner may be informed of both a candidate's name and examination number.
4. For each student and each module, the outcome of assessment shall be recorded as a mark out of 100 except where it has been agreed that a module shall be assessed on a pass/fail or a fail/pass/merit/distinction basis.
- 4.1 Use of the categorical marking scales in the table at 4.1.1 below for relevant assessments is compulsory for all modules.

4.1.1

Numerical Grade	BA/BSc degree class	Fd class	PG degree class
100, 95	1st class	Distinction	Distinction
85, 78			
75, 72			
68	Upper second class	Merit	Merit
65			
62			
58	Lower second class	Pass	Pass
55			
52			
48	Third class		Fail
45			
42			
35, 38	Fail	Fail	
25, 32			
10, 20			
0			

- 4.1.2 Course teams are strongly encouraged to devise assessment criteria that map on to the respective classification bands. The marking scale contains a fixed number of percentage points in each class band, one of which might be assigned by a marker for a piece of assessed work. Markers should award the appropriate mark from the scale to assessed work as best fits student performance in relation to the assessment criteria. Use of the scale is intended (i) to encourage markers to make firm decisions about assessed work in relation to class band grade criteria (i.e. such work may no longer be regarded as borderline); and (ii) to encourage markers to use the full range of the marking scale, particularly in the first class band.

The scale should be regarded as readily lending itself to use with respect to single pieces of work that currently attract a mark out of 100, such as essays, dissertations, reports, individual examination questions or any similar assessment that requires a qualitative judgement by the marker against criterion referenced standards. Examples of assessed

work that may not be suitable to be marked with reference to the categorical marking scheme include assessments that take the form of tests of complex calculation or knowledge that allow for an accumulation of marks on an objective basis, or which are composed of a large number of questions, or questions where there is a single correct answer (such as numerical questions). In such cases markers will not be restricted to its use. Where the format of assessment precludes use of the scale, markers are encouraged to consider whether they can avoid awarding marks that fall immediately below a class boundary.

5. Where an Internal Examiner considers a script to be illegible the case must be referred to the second marker or moderator, who will act as arbiter. If the second marker or moderator agrees that a script is illegible, the script may:
 - i) be transcribed at the student's expense and under conditions laid down by the Faculty, overseen by administrative staff who will ensure anonymity is maintained in the marking process (see 5.1 below). The transcript will be used alongside the script in marking.
 - or
 - ii) where the student has not responded within a specified period, a mark of zero may be awarded
- 5.1 (a) The department shall set a short appropriate time limit for the transcription, which shall be made clear to the student
(b) Section 5 applies to whole scripts, i.e. where there is a small element of an answer that has been deemed to be illegible by both the marker and the second marker/moderator a mark of zero may be entered for that element.
6. For each module, except for modules within Honours degree programmes for which the marks obtained do not contribute to the Honours classification, and for each student, at least 80 per cent of the work required for assessment must be marked either by two Internal Examiners or by one Internal Examiner subject to moderation by a second Internal Examiner in accordance with the requirements of 6 and 7 below. Marking arrangements shall be made explicit in Course Handbooks.
- 6.1 Where work is subject to moderation, the moderation will be undertaken by a second Internal Examiner in accordance with the following:
 - The moderator will review the marking of the work of ten per cent of the candidates, or of at least six candidates if there are fewer than sixty candidates in total or of all the candidates if there are fewer than six candidates in total. The work seen by the moderator should form a representative sample and should include those awarded the highest and the lowest marks. It is open to first markers to seek advice from the moderator on the marking of work by particular candidates.
 - The moderator will vouch for the accuracy and consistency of marking. Where he or she cannot, the matter will be referred to the Chair of the Board of Examiners concerned. The Chair will arrange for all the work to be double-marked, normally by the moderator, but, where the Chair deems there to be good reason, by a third party.
 - Where marking has been carried out by more than one marker, the sample of the work for moderation should be drawn from each marker. Should a concern be identified regarding the accuracy and consistency of marking undertaken by any particular marker, only that work need be referred to the Chair of the Board of Examiners for double-marking.
 - Where differences of opinion between the first and second marker cannot in this circumstance be resolved, recourse should be made to the External Examiner.

- The basis for the moderator's assessment of the accuracy and consistency of marking will be the published criteria for assessment alongside the detail of the learning objectives of the assessment modes contained in the module descriptor.

6.2 Further, to ensure the accuracy and consistency of marking:

- Moderation should normally be undertaken by experienced examiners.
- Course teams should determine whether students should be required to submit two copies of written coursework assignments.
- Samples of work, including coursework, for all modules should be made available to the External Examiner in the subject as part of the regular examining procedure.
- Chairs of Board of Examiners should ensure that statistical information on module marks is reviewed by the Board of Examiners to verify consistency of marking both between modules in any given year and between years. The Chair of the Board of Examiners will report to the Head of School any instances of inconsistent marking.

7. Where modules use continuous assessment (rather than fixed end-point assessments such as course work, portfolios, essays, journals or examinations), all staff involved in delivering a module shall be required to assess the element(s) they have taught. Moderation of marks for that module shall be achieved through the following process:

- a. Marks from all staff involved in module delivery shall be aggregated together;
- b. Based upon the aggregated marks, the module leader (usually the Head of Department, unless delegated to another senior member of staff) shall propose a final "HoD" mark for each student;
- c. Finalised HoD marks shall be agreed at an internal examination board;
- d. Where module delivery is contained within one term, the final HoD mark agreed at the internal examination board shall be confirmed as the module outcome;
- e. Where modules are delivered across more than one term, final HoD marks from each relevant term shall in turn be aggregated together to form the final module outcome.

8. An External Examiner should only change a mark awarded to an individual candidate where having seen all the work for the module in question, he/she has been invited by a Board of Examiners to consider a mark for an individual candidate, or (ii) where there is disagreement between two internal markers about the mark to be awarded. Alternatively, an External Examiner may ask that the marks for all candidates for a module be systematically adjusted where, having seen either all relevant work or a sample of work, he/she considers this to be appropriate.

9. In the case of a disagreement on the mark to be awarded for a particular module between two independent Internal Examiners, the dispute shall be referred to the appropriate Chief Examiner for resolution. Where it is still not possible to reach a resolution, the appropriate External Examiner will be the final arbiter on the matter.

10. The External Examiner has the right to see all work submitted for assessment except for work submitted for modules within Honours degree programmes for which the marks obtained do not contribute to the Honours classification and should see at least a selection of such work. In those cases where it is agreed that the Chair of the Board of Examiners should make a selection of scripts to be seen by an External Examiner, the principles for such selection should be agreed in advance.

11. Where a selection is made, External Examiners should normally see a reasonable sample of assessed work taken from each class band, and all fails.

12. The following percentage marks shall be used in relation to the marking of individual modules within Honours degree programmes and for which the marks obtained contribute to the Honours classification except where it is agreed that a module is to be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis only:

First Class Honours	70 and above
Upper Second Class Honours	60 – 69
Lower Second Class Honours	50 - 59
Third Class Honours	40 – 49
Fail	Below 40

13. Modules within programmes for which the marks obtained contribute to qualifications which may be awarded with Merit and with Distinction except where it is agreed that a module is to be assessed on a Pass/Fail basis only:

Distinction	70 and above
Merit	60 – 69
Pass	Pass mark - 59
Fail	Below pass mark

14. In the case of four-year degrees for which marks are received from other universities and used for the purpose of degree classification, Academic Board shall have approved Special Conventions relating to the conversion of such marks.
15. The pass mark for all level 7 taught modules, regardless of programme of study, will be 50 (refer to section 4.1.1 above).

Rounding and Display of Marks

16. With respect to the rounding and display of marks, the following rubric applies:
- i) The overall mark awarded for any coursework component of a module should be rounded to the nearest integer;
 - ii) The overall mark awarded for any project element of a module should be rounded to the nearest integer;
 - iii) The overall mark awarded for any examination element of a module should be rounded to the nearest integer;
 - iv) With regard to modules taken as part of an undergraduate programme, and noting the exception to this rule given at point v. below, the aggregated overall mark awarded for the module (the summation of the already rounded different components) should be rounded to the nearest integer;
 - v) With regard to modules taken as part of an undergraduate programme, and noting the exception to this rule given at point vi. below, where the aggregated but as yet unrounded overall mark awarded for the module falls within one mark of the boundary for a higher class band (e.g. a raw mark of 39, 49 [where applicable], 59, or 69), the mark will be rounded up to the nearest integer;
 - vi) With regard to calculating the overall mark awarded for the module as per point v. above, where an element of assessment in a module has been failed for which a pass was compulsory, any aggregated but as yet unrounded overall mark awarded for the module that falls within one mark of the boundary for a higher class band (e.g. a raw mark of 39, 49 [where applicable], 59 or 69), the mark will NOT be rounded up to the nearest integer;
 - vii) With regard to modules taken as part of a postgraduate programme, the aggregated overall mark awarded for the module (the summation of the already rounded different components) should be rounded to the nearest integer;

- viii) The aggregated overall rounded mark awarded for the module should be displayed on composite marksheets, student transcripts and to students on the student record system as a whole number after confirmation at the Board of Examiners;
- ix) The overall weighted average mark for classification purposes should be calculated and displayed to a single decimal point on composite marksheets and student transcripts
- x) With respect to undergraduate programmes, where the overall weighted average mark for classification purposes falls within 0.5 % of the boundary for a higher class band (i.e. a mark that falls in the ranges of 39.5 - 39.9; 49.5 - 49.92; 59.5 - 59.9 or 69.5 - 69.9), it will be rounded up to the nearest integer.

Unfinished Examination Scripts

- 17. Where the required number of questions on an examination paper has not been answered, the questions answered should be marked and the examiner should indicate how many questions have been answered. A mark of zero should be recorded for any missing answer and the overall mark for the paper determined in the normal way. The attention of the External Examiner, where appropriate, and the Board of Examiners should be drawn to such cases by the annotation of a 'u' (unfinished) against the mark given.
- 18. Where a question has been started but not completed, the examiner should use discretion in judging whether the answer deserves to be marked. If the examiner does not award a mark, the paper must be dealt with under 14 above; if a mark is awarded for the question, the mark should take account of the fact that the answer has not been completed and the overall mark for the paper should be determined in the normal way. Such a paper should not be distinguished by the annotation 'u'.

Failure to Sit an Examination

- 19. In the case of failure to sit an examination or submit an extended time examination paper or an extended essay which has the status of a full paper by the deadline notified, without due cause, the candidate shall be regarded as having missed the examination, and an examination mark of zero will be awarded.

Late Submission or Failure to Submit Work for Assessment

- 20. A deadline shall be set each term as the deadline by which staff must return all marks for coursework. Module leaders, mindful of the institutional deadline for the return of marks and of the requirement in section 27 below to return work to students within three calendar weeks, shall be responsible for setting deadlines for the submission of items of coursework.
- 21. Candidates shall be required to submit work for assessment by the deadlines which shall have been notified to them.

Note: The Regulations state that if a student provides evidence of illness or other misfortune which prevented the submission of written work by the due date, the Board of the Faculty may extend the period of time for submission of the work by so long as it thinks fit.
- 22. In the case of late or non-submission of work without reasonable cause, candidates will forfeit the proportion of the total marks assigned to the piece or pieces of work in question. Where coursework is incomplete, it will be marked in accordance with 16 and 17 above.
- 23. In the case of failure to submit required work in accordance with 19 above, a mark of zero will be recorded for that work. Where an application for mitigation has been made, the Mitigation Committee shall decide whether a case has been made and, if it so decides, shall proceed in accordance with Section 11 of the LAMDA Academic Regulations and Quality Procedures, and Annex 8 of this Credit Framework.

In the case of failure to submit a required piece of coursework or a project due to illness or other reasonable cause, a mark of zero should be recorded for the missing piece of work and the final mark calculated in the normal manner. Evidence relating to the illness or other cause should be dealt with in the normal manner.

24. Where a student has failed to complete all assessment requirements for a module, for example by failing to attend an examination or failing to submit required work, but claims that this was due to illness or other mitigating circumstances, the Board of Examiners may adjust the student's overall mark for the module provided that it is satisfied that the adjusted mark properly represents the student's achievement in the module as a whole and that the student has submitted written medical or other evidence to substantiate any claim of illness or other mitigating circumstances. Marks will be adjusted normally according to objective criteria such as the exclusion of the piece or pieces of assessment affected by the illness or other mitigating circumstances from the calculation of the final module mark.
25. Where a piece of coursework has been submitted late (but within a reasonable period of time, i.e. a week) the work in question should be marked in order for feedback to be provided to the student (as stated above, a mark of zero will be recorded for the work in question).

Return of Coursework

26. Staff members will return written work that students have submitted in accordance with published requirements and deadlines unless the work is to be held for further examination as part of the assessment process. Work will normally be returned within three calendar weeks of the published deadline, except where this period is interrupted by the Winter or Spring vacations, in which circumstance the work in question will be returned by the end of the first week of the following term.
27. Individual modules may be permitted a deadline for the return of marked work outside of the standard three week period, subject to the following:
- Any such variation will be on an exceptional basis only and must be agreed in advance by the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners;
 - The agreed variation for the return of marked work must not be excessively different from the norm;
 - The agreed variation for the return of marked work must be in place and students must be given clear notification of the new deadline at the commencement of the module in question.

Feedback Policy

28. LAMDA's policy on providing feedback to students is set out in each Course Handbook.

Resit Marks

29. Where a student resits a module or modules, the marks obtained should be used as set out in the table below. Assessment on repeating a module or taking an alternative module following initial failure of a module will be treated as a resit unless it has been agreed, in a particular case, that the result of the earlier assessment should be set aside.

Initial Result	Resit Result	Marks to be used for award of credit, progression, transcript
Fail	Fail	Best Mark
Fail	Pass	Minimum Pass Mark

30. Where credit for a failed module is awarded via the mitigation process, the mark shown on the transcript will be the mark achieved. However, calculation of the degree outcome will be done using the minimum pass mark
-

Note

This Annex approved at Learning, Teaching & Quality Committee, Feb 2020

Annex 7: *Viva Voce* Examinations

1. LAMDA does not use *viva voce* examinations as a means of clarifying examination boards' decision making in respect of candidates who find themselves at the borderline between different degree classifications.
2. The use of the *viva voce* examination is restricted to two areas:
 - a) As a part of the approved diet of assessment for a module, as for example:
 - Extended pieces of work such as dissertations/projects/theses may be partly assessed by an oral examination.
 - Oral examinations are generally used in language modules to test communication skills.
 - To test the achievement of professional competencies during or at the completion of a vocational placement

These assessments should form part of the approved diet of assessment for the module, be designed to test specific module learning outcomes and should be taken by all candidates. External examiners are sometimes involved in these examinations.

- b) As part of disciplinary investigation

A disciplinary committee might require examiners to test students via oral examination in order to authenticate the authorship of pieces of work. Such examinations must take place under the auspices of a disciplinary committee established for this purpose and must not be conducted independently by examiners or by Boards of Examiners.

Annex 8: Applications for Mitigation

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Boards of Examiners (via the Mitigation Committee) will consider applications from students for mitigation with regard to any extenuating circumstances that have affected their performance in assessed work. Such circumstances must be beyond the student's control and have had a negative impact that has caused the student to perform less well in their assessed work than they may otherwise have been expected to (in comparison to their performance with their other work on a particular module or stage).
- 1.2 As set out in Section 11 of LAMDA's Academic Regulations and Quality Assurance Procedures, the Chair of the Board of Examiners shall convene the Mitigation Committee, which shall comprise a small number of internal members of the Board of Examiners (i.e. normally no more than three members, to include the Chair, one Head of Department or Senior Tutor, a third member and, typically, with the Student Wellbeing Officer in attendance) to assess the severity of the impact on student performance of relevant extenuating circumstances. The Mitigation Committee will be chaired by the Chair of the Board of Examiners or by their nominee, drawn from the members of the Mitigation Committee. Any such nominee must also be a member of the relevant Board of Examiners.
- 1.3 All students have a responsibility to manage their learning, preparation, revision and assessment activities throughout the duration of each term or assessment period. Students are partners with LAMDA in their studies and training and are expected to plan carefully and manage their workload; they should not leave coursework, learning, preparation, revision or similar activities until too late.
- 1.4 Students with Learning Agreements (LAs) are expected to manage their studies and training in accordance with their LA, to make use of the recommendations and provisions of their LA, and to act in partnership with the support services available and to contact them if their needs change.

2. Applications for Mitigation

- 2.1 Where an application for mitigation is required, it is the responsibility of the student to submit at the earliest opportunity, and not later than the deadlines given below, evidence of illness or other circumstances that have impacted negatively on assessed work or academic performance in order that this may be brought to the attention of the Board of Examiners via the Mitigation Committee. The following are indicative of the kinds of circumstance that will normally be considered valid, where the evidence and timing are available to support the claim:

- Serious personal illness
- Serious personal accident or injury or hospitalisation;
- Significant adverse personal or family circumstance;
- Worsening or acute episode of an established medical condition (see 5.2 – 5.3 for guidance on the nature of the evidence required in such cases).

Students are required to submit any such applications to the Academic Services Office in accordance with the procedures set out below at Section 3.

- 2.2 LAMDA will not consider applications for mitigation in cases where the student was directly responsible for the circumstances or where a student could reasonably have avoided the situation or acted to limit the impact of the circumstances. The following are examples of circumstances which would *not* be considered appropriate for mitigation (the list is not exhaustive):

- Completing coursework too late and missing deadlines because of computer or transport difficulties.
- Losing work not backed up on computer disk.

- Failure to make alternative travel plans in the face of known disruptions.
- Normal employment commitments.
- Failing to read a timetable correctly.

- 2.3 LAMDA accepts that a student may exceptionally have a legitimate reason beyond their control for missing a coursework deadline or a scheduled onsite or scheduled online assessment (including formal examinations) which would not normally fall under the scope of the mitigation process, such as participation in a high level (e.g. national) sporting event, a medical appointment that cannot easily be rearranged, a job or placement interview, or the refusal of an employer to release a part-time student from work commitments at the relevant time (the list is not exhaustive). As such external commitments should be known to the student in advance it is open to them to request under the procedures set out in this annex either that an extension be granted or that the onsite/online assessment be rescheduled. Documentary evidence of the external commitment should be provided.
- 2.4 Where a request to miss a coursework deadline or a scheduled onsite/online assessment due to external commitments is accepted the appropriate response would be to allow an extension to the coursework deadline or reschedule the onsite/online assessment for a non-penalised attempt. Where rescheduling would not be appropriate, it may be considered legitimate to disregard the coursework or the scheduled onsite/online assessment, provided that the relevant learning outcomes are tested elsewhere in the module in question.
- 2.5 Where such a request is accepted and would entail missing a formal examination, the School should advise the student that the re-sit examination will take place at the next available opportunity and will be taken as if for the first time (except where it would be appropriate to offer the re-sit attempt as if for the second time due to a previous failed attempt). In order that they may be reported to the student in a timely fashion, such decisions may be taken by Chair's Action and should not wait until the end of year meeting of the Board of Examiners for resolution.

3. Submission Procedures

3.1 Applications for mitigation relating to:

- i) failure to submit coursework;
- ii) failure to submit coursework by the applicable deadline (where an extension has not been granted by Chair of the Mitigation Committee [or nominee] under powers set out in Appendix 2);
- iii) failure to sit an examination; and/or
- iv) impaired performance in either coursework or examination will be considered only if submitted:
 - by means of the Mitigation Application Form available from SharePoint or from the Student and Academic Services team
 - With a clear and concise account of the mitigating circumstances and the impact on the student's studies.
 - With all necessary documentary evidence.
 - Within the applicable deadline

Applications for extensions to coursework deadlines on grounds of extenuation should be considered under the procedures set out in Appendix 2 of this Annex.

- 3.2 Students need to ensure the completeness of their submissions, including the submission of the accompanying Mitigations Application Form. The Mitigation Committee may be unable to consider the application without the information provided on the form. (n.b. It is acknowledged that an application [e.g. in letter format] may be permitted to proceed without the Mitigations Applications Form where the nature of the extenuating circumstances has directly prevented its submission.)

Deadlines

- 3.3 Applications for mitigation relating to the non-submission or the late submission of coursework should be made as close to the deadline for that work as is practicable. It is acknowledged that the nature of some circumstances may hinder the submission of an application at the time of their occurrence or that the negative impact of some extenuating circumstances on student performance may only become apparent later in the academic year. In such cases, the application should be submitted as soon as is practicable to do so. All applications for mitigation, however, must be submitted no later than the set deadline published by the School for them to be considered by the Mitigation Committee on behalf of the Board of Examiners.
- 3.4 Where a piece of late-submitted assessed work (including dissertations) is the subject of an application for mitigation, the decision on whether the work in question will be accepted for marking should be made and reported to the student in a timely fashion. Such decisions may be taken by Chair's Action. Such outcomes should not wait until the end of year meeting of the Board of Examiners for resolution. Appropriate records should be retained and reported to the Mitigation Committee.
- 3.5 Applications for the mitigation of the failure to attend a scheduled onsite/online assessment or for impaired performance in such assessments (including formal examinations) must be submitted normally no later than five working days after the assessment to which they relate. The Chair of the Mitigation Committee may consider exceptions to this deadline where the student has suffered a sudden illness or hospitalisation.

4. Medical Certificates and Other Supporting Documentation

Self-Certification for Absence

- 4.1 With regard to periods of absence students may self-certify for up to seven days with respect to illness or other relevant extenuating circumstances (e.g. bereavement), in keeping with the policy on students' attendance and engagement with their studies. Students should inform LAMDA of their absence on the first day that they are unable to attend.
- 4.2 While no limit is placed on the number of occasions that self-certification for absence is permitted in any academic year, students whose overall level of non-attendance becomes a cause for concern will be offered support in the first instance to help them get back on track with their studies. Following this initial intervention, students whose attendance continues to fall below warning levels may trigger procedures for gathering evidence for the purpose of suspending the student's studies. Should formal disciplinary or Fitness to Train procedures be initiated, students will be expected to attend meetings and provide evidence to support their continued study.

Restriction Where Self-Certification Coincides with Coursework Assessment Deadlines

- 4.3 Without limiting the overall number of occasions that a student might self-certify, where periods of illness or unavoidable absence coincide with coursework assessment deadlines the number of self-certifications permitted to cover such periods will be restricted to two in any academic year. This restriction is intended to ensure that, should a pattern of self-certification around assessments become evident, the student in question is signposted to Student Support and Wellbeing for guidance and support, as such a pattern may be indicative of an underlying issue for which the student requires assistance (see 4.4 below).
- 4.4 For the avoidance of doubt, please note that self-certification is not permitted with respect to In-Course Tests (ICTs) or Examinations.
- 4.5 Where a student's application to self-certify for periods of absence that coincide with coursework assessment deadlines is accepted, the appropriate response will be to permit an extension to the original submission deadline. This extension will:
- i) cover any item of coursework that has a deadline within the self-certification period;
 - ii) be of equal duration in working days to the period of absence.

- 4.6 Where students have already self-certified for periods that coincide with coursework assessment deadlines on two occasions in the academic year, any further applications for mitigation relating to assessment must be accompanied by medical or other relevant documentation, which must:
- i) relate specifically to the dates and duration of the illness or incident;
 - ii) contain a clear medical diagnosis or opinion provided by an appropriately qualified practitioner;
 - iii) provide documentary evidence confirming any other relevant extenuating circumstances, as appropriate.
- 4.7 Acceptable supporting evidence other than medical documentation includes an original document written on headed notepaper, including name and contact details of the provider, and signed by an appropriate third party, giving details of the circumstance, its duration, and, where possible, its impact. An appropriate third party would be one who knows the student in a professional capacity or one who can verify the circumstances from a position of authority (e.g. member of teaching staff, Students' Union representative, GP, Counsellor or LAMDA Student Wellbeing Officer) and who is in a position to provide objective and impartial evidence. Letters from family members or fellow students will not be acceptable.
- 4.8 Medical certificates and other supporting documentation should be provided in English. It is the responsibility of the student to submit a formal translation provided by an accredited organisation.
- 4.9 Where a student discloses a disability or ongoing personal/health circumstances, any application for the extenuation of mitigating circumstances should be considered and, in addition, the student must be signposted to Student Wellbeing to ensure that ongoing support is implemented, including the creation of an Learning Agreement, if appropriate.
- 4.10 Where, following the conclusion of a period of self-certificated absence, a student returns to their studies on a date which falls prior to one or more assessment deadlines, the Chair of the Board of Examiners (or nominee) may exercise their discretion and permit an extension for these assessments should they accept that it is reasonable to assume that the period of self-certificated absence has impacted negatively on the student's ability to prepare for and complete the assessments in question by the original deadline. In such cases, no further evidence of illness will be required, other than the already provided self-certification for absence. In exercising their discretion, the Chair of the Board of Examiners (or nominee) will take into account the student's number of certified absences to date. Where an extension is granted under these circumstances it will count towards the maximum number of two occasions in any academic year that a student might self-certify for periods of absence that coincide with coursework assessment deadlines.

5. Individual Learning Agreements

- 5.1 Students with individual Learning Agreements (LA) are expected to manage their studies in accordance with their LA, to make use of the recommendations and provisions of their LA, to act in partnership with the support services available and to contact them if their needs change. Similarly, departments should help students with LAs to manage their studies by proactively implementing the adjustments required, noting that many adjustments of this kind may in fact lead to improvements for all students. An LA should be recognised in itself as evidence of a condition or circumstance for which an adjustment is necessary.
- 5.2 While LAs are intended to ensure that students managing long-term conditions are assessed on a level playing field with their peers and therefore should not need to submit an application for mitigation, LAMDA recognises that such submissions may be required under the following circumstances:
- i) They experience an acute episode or worsening of their condition which means that the reasonable adjustments specified in the LA are no longer sufficient; and/or:
 - ii) There was a shortcoming or failure in the support arrangements which means that the

reasonable adjustments were not implemented in time or as specified in the LA.

- 5.3 Where students holding an LA with respect to a fluctuating condition wish to apply for mitigation with respect to an acute episode or worsening of their condition, they are not required to submit fresh medical or other evidence related to the condition.
- 5.4 While LAMDA does not require the resubmission of evidence already provided for an existing LA, students may be required to submit evidence relating to conditions or extenuating circumstances that are not covered by that established arrangement.

6. Consideration of Applications for Mitigation

- 6.1 Applications for mitigation relating to the non-submission or late submission of coursework, absence from examination/s, and to impaired performance in coursework or assessments are normally considered by Mitigation Committees on behalf of Boards of Examiners. The Committees make recommendations to the relevant Board of Examiners.
- 6.2 Applications for mitigation relating to coursework extension requests (see Appendix 2), missing scheduled onsite or scheduled online assessments or the late submission of coursework are normally considered by the Chair of the Mitigation Committee (or nominee) on an ad hoc basis as required, in order that such matters might be resolved in a timely fashion.
- 6.3 Where a student submission for mitigation indicates that they will be unable to attend an examination, the Mitigation Committee (or the Chair of the Mitigation Committee acting on its behalf) is authorised, as it sees appropriate, to grant permission in advance for the absence and report this to the meeting of the Board of Examiners. Students should be made aware that, where the mitigation is accepted, missing an examination will normally lead to their deferral.
- 6.4 All information and evidence submitted as part of a claim for mitigation should be treated as sensitive personal data under GDPR legislation ('special category data') and processed as such. The materials should be kept secure, with access restricted to those staff who have a legitimate reason for accessing it.
- 6.5 When assessing claims for mitigating circumstances, the Mitigation Committee will consider:
- i) whether the circumstances underlying the claim are suitable for extenuation in line with the definition set out at 1.3 above;
 - ii) the severity of the impact of the mitigating circumstances on student performance in (a) meeting attendance requirements, and/or (b) undertaking assessment;
 - iii) the documentary evidence;
 - iv) the time period affected;
 - v) whether making a recommended adjustment would compromise the achievement of learning outcomes for the module and the maintenance of academic standards.
- 6.6 Based on the submission provided by the student the Mitigation Committee will accept or reject the claim for mitigation.
- 6.7 Claims for mitigation should be resolved and a final outcome determined during the academic year in which they were submitted. Should examiners wish to revisit decisions made in earlier academic years, they should only do so where new evidence suggests there is good reason to do so or where the circumstances subsequently indicate that the mitigation undertaken in the previous year was inadequate to resolve the impact on the student's performance.
- 6.8 Schools must acknowledge in writing to students that their application for mitigation has been considered by the Mitigation Committee.

7. Falsified Evidence

- 7.1 Where there are grounds to consider that documentary evidence submitted in support of an application for mitigation has been falsified, the Chief Examiner will disregard such evidence and the application will thereafter be considered on the basis of the remaining evidence. The submission of falsified evidence will be referred for consideration under the Regulations on

Student Discipline in Relation to Non-Academic Matters.

8. Academic Appeals

8.1 Students wishing to appeal against the recommendations of Boards of Examiners in response to applications for mitigation may do so on the following grounds:

- i) Procedural error: Where there is evidence that the application for mitigation was submitted within the prescribed time limit but was not properly considered by the Board of Examiners; or
- ii) Where there is evidence of illness or other circumstances beyond the student's control that have impacted negatively on academic performance and which the student was, for good reason, unable to submit by the published deadline:
- iii) Where there is evidence of prejudice or bias or the perception of prejudice or bias against the student.

8.2 Appeals on these grounds must be submitted in line with the procedures set out in Annex 11 of the Credit Framework: Appeals Against the Recommendations of Boards of Examiners.

Annex 8: Appendix 1

Conventions for the Mitigation of Extenuating Circumstances

1. Principles

- 1.1 Mitigation is a corrective measure that allows Boards of Examiners to make adjustments to module marks and award credit where student performance in assessment has been impacted negatively by extenuating circumstances beyond the student's control.
- 1.2 The purpose of making such interventions is to arrive at an outcome that properly reflects the student's level of achievement on the affected module(s) and therefore on the stage/programme of study as a whole.
- 1.3 In making such interventions examiners must determine that the extenuating circumstances have produced a demonstrably negative impact on student performance in particular assessments. Wherever possible, such judgements should be made on the basis of a comparison to the marks achieved by the student on other assessments in the module and/or on other modules.
- 1.4 It is important to note that mitigation is not concerned with assessing the severity of any particular set of extenuating circumstances. It is concerned with assessing the impact of extenuating circumstances on student performance on affected assessments. Where the reported circumstances are considered not to have impacted on student performance, no mitigating intervention is required.
- 1.5 Mitigation, therefore, does not involve awarding 'extra' marks to students as compensation for suffering misfortune. On the contrary, it involves finding ways to reward students for demonstrating learning by ensuring that the marks/credit awarded for that learning reflect their true level of achievement. Such interventions might involve allowing students a further attempt at an affected assessment or factoring an affected assessment or assessments out of the calculation of the overall mark awarded for the module(s) concerned.
- 1.6 Mitigation should not compromise academic standards. Examiners should be satisfied that the overall mark arrived at via mitigation reflects the student's level of achievement as a whole on the module in question and the core requirements for a pass to be awarded.
- 1.7 Although extension requests may only be submitted on grounds of extenuation, a distinction is made in this annex between such requests and applications for mitigation. Applications for mitigation are aimed at securing a corrective measure for impaired performance in, or failure to undertake, assessment, on grounds of extenuation (see clause 1.3, main Annex). These are retrospective submissions, looking to mitigate the negative impact of circumstances that have already taken place and/or are ongoing. These are considered by the Mitigation Committee. Extension requests are prospective, intended to secure more time to complete assessments, and may be considered by the Chair of the Mitigation Committee or nominee on an ad hoc basis. Appendix 2 of this Annex sets out the procedures for considering extension requests.
 - i) While the distinction between extension requests and applications for mitigation set out in 1.7 above remains an established and valid distinction, the implementation in 2019-20 of self-certification for student absence (including, on two occasions in any academic year, self-certification for absence that coincides with coursework assessment deadlines), has inevitably introduced an element of overlap between the two. Where students self-certify for periods of absence that coincide with coursework assessment deadlines they are doing so retrospectively as part of an application for mitigation. Self-certification provides the evidence in support of this application. Where these applications are accepted the standard response, however, will be to provide extensions for the submission of the affected coursework (see 4.2 – 4.2.1, main Annex). Schools should process such applications for mitigation along the same lines as standard extension requests, allowing them to be considered on an ad hoc basis by the Chair of the Mitigation Committee or nominee.

- 1.8 The licence introduced in 2019-20 to allow students, under specified conditions, the opportunity to re-sit a module passed at the previous attempt as if for the first time ('deferral on pass') is intended to be used as a mitigating adjustment on grounds of extenuation for a limited number of modules in any stage. Where student performance has been significantly affected in line with the specified conditions (while resulting in passes for the affected modules) for 50% or more of the credit required for the stage, students should be allowed the option to repeat these modules in attendance as if for the first time in the following academic year (see 3.3.1 – 3.3.10 of this Appendix, below).

2. Possible Interventions

Where mitigation of extenuating circumstances is considered necessary, the interventions set out below should be taken into account, as appropriate. All such interventions should be undertaken in response to the examiners' assessment of the severity of the impact of the extenuating circumstances on student performance and should be calibrated in order to arrive at the outcome for the affected module(s) that most accurately reflects the student's true level of achievement on those modules and with respect to the satisfaction of the requirements for a pass.

- 2.1 Overriding late submission penalties; granting time-limited extension; offering equivalent assessment, where appropriate (e.g. reschedule missed in-course test); AND/OR:

- 2.2 Disregarding affected assessments or c/w requirement for the affected module or modules, where these individually or in combination contribute less than 20% of the mark for the module(s) in question. Such adjusted marks should properly represent the student's achievement on the module as a whole;

AND/OR:

- 2.3 Disregarding individual assessments for the affected module or modules, including where these contribute 20% or more to the overall mark for the module(s) in question, provided that (i) the learning outcomes for the module(s) are achieved; and (ii) such adjusted marks properly represent the student's achievement on the module(s) as a whole;

N.b.1. Where the modules in question have been failed, the above disregard measures (2.2 & 2.3) may only be used either individually or in combination with respect to a maximum of 25% of the credit available for the stage;

N.b.2. Where the modules in question have been passed, the above disregard measures (2.2 & 2.3) may be used without restriction

AND/OR:

- 2.4 Where student has failed up to a maximum of 25% of the credit for the stage, consider condoning;

AND/OR:

- 2.5 Consider recommending deferral, especially where a student has failed 50% or more of the credit required for the stage.

AND/OR, where applicable:

- 2.6 Where a finalist has achieved seven-eighths of the credit required for the award (including credits awarded via condonement and/or compensation), consider use of the "notwithstanding" convention (see 3.4 below).

3. Definitions of Interventions

- 3.1 Disregarding of assessments: the exclusion of the piece or pieces of assessment affected by illness or other mitigating circumstances from the calculation of the final module mark;

- 3.2 Condonement: the award of credit for a failed module where student performance has been

impacted by illness or other mitigating circumstances and there is evidence to show that the student has achieved the programme learning outcomes; where credit for a module is awarded by condonement, the mark awarded for that module should be excluded from the calculation of the classification of the award. (Nb. the marks achieved for such modules will not be adjusted to take account of the extenuating circumstances, but transcripts issued to the student will indicate modules for which credits have been awarded via condonement).

3.3 Deferral: the decision on grounds of mitigation to allow a student to undertake reassessment for a module or modules as if for the first time (i.e. an uncapped retrieval attempt), or as appropriate, as if for the second time.

- i) A student may be deferred on a module or modules for reasons of extenuation under the following scenarios:
 - where the module(s) have been failed; or
 - where the module(s) have been passed but the final mark(s) achieved for the affected module(s) are significantly out of line with the final marks achieved for the student's unaffected modules.
- ii) Under the second scenario, the final module mark should be judged as 'significantly out of line' where it falls in a range that is at least two classification bands below the student's mean average level of achievement as derived from those modules that were unaffected by the mitigating circumstances reported;
- iii) Where a module has been passed it would be inappropriate to defer the student on that module as if for the second time (as the final module mark could not be improved upon under this scenario).
- iv) Students so affected are to be given the choice whether they will re-sit the assessments concerned or will accept the pass mark already achieved.
- v) Such reassessment opportunities will normally take place in the summer before the next academic year.
- vi) Where student performance has been significantly affected in line with the specified conditions specified under 3.3.2 above (while resulting in passes for the affected modules) for 50% or more of the credit required for the stage, students should be allowed the option to repeat these modules in attendance as if for the first time in the following academic year.
- vii) Where a student elects to take up the opportunity to re-sit or repeat in attendance a module that they have already passed, the mark achieved at the earlier attempt will be struck from the record. Students will not be given the opportunity to choose between the better of the marks achieved.

3.4 The "Notwithstanding" convention: recommendations by Boards of Examiners on the classification of awards made notwithstanding the conventions of the Credit Framework where a student who, despite suffering extenuating circumstances judged as having a severely negative effect on his/her performance, has nonetheless achieved at least seven-eighths of the credit normally required for the award in question.

Annex 8: Appendix 2

1. Extensions to Coursework Deadlines

- 1.1 Applications for extensions to coursework deadlines should be submitted to the relevant School Office via the appropriate pro forma as soon as possible and normally no later than 24 hours (i.e. one full working day) in advance of the deadlines to which they relate. Except where the student has self-certified for absence, relevant supporting evidence should be provided. Academic staff may not accept work for marking where it is submitted after the applicable deadline except where extenuating circumstances have prevented its submission on time (see Section 2, Main Annex).
- 1.2 Applications for extensions to coursework deadlines will be considered by the Chair of the Mitigation Committee or nominee, who has authority to extend the applicable deadline. This approval will be communicated in writing with a new submission date.
- 1.3 Students whose ILP states that they may apply for extensions for coursework deadlines as a reasonable adjustment should signal their intention to request an extension by submitting the relevant pro forma to their School. In such cases students will not be required to submit evidence in support of their application except where the extension request relates to conditions or extenuating circumstances that are not covered by the established ILP arrangement. The application form will indicate whether or not the extension request is ILP-related.
- i) The maximum extension period permissible for a postgraduate dissertation is three months, except in exceptional circumstances. Permission for such an extension may be authorised by the School Director of Graduate Studies.
 - ii) Permission for a subsequent extension period to a postgraduate dissertation must be sought from the appropriate Associate Dean (Graduate Studies), including provision of acceptable evidence of the extenuating circumstances.
 - iii) Approval will be communicated in writing with a new submission date.
 - iv) Where an extension is granted following acceptance of the evidence of extenuating circumstances, extension fees should not be charged.

2. Maximum period of extension allowed for each category of coursework assignment

- 2.1 LAMDA is committed to ensuring that students are able to keep up with their studies, assignments and exam preparation. Therefore, the maximum extension periods that can normally be granted for assessed work are listed in the table below:

UG and PG Taught

Maximum Extension period:	Category of coursework assignment:	Conditions	Supporting Evidence Required
1 week	Major piece of assessment - normally up to 1 week dependent upon the circumstances	As long as the extended deadline is before the date when work is moderated or marked work/answers are released to the main cohort of students	Supporting evidence required
2 weeks	Major piece of assessment – normally can be up to 2 weeks dependent on exceptional circumstances	As long as the extended deadline is before the date when work is moderated or marked work/answers are released to the main cohort of students	Supporting evidence required

PG Taught

Dependent on circumstances 3 month maximum period	Longer extensions may be granted for projects, dissertations worth 60 credits or more	Can only be granted on an exceptional basis but it is more likely than the concession route should be followed if circumstances have caused significant interference with a student's studies	Supporting evidence required
--	---	---	------------------------------

All Taught Students, Where an Extension is Granted for Coursework Assessment on Grounds of Self-certified Absence

Period of extension must be of equal duration in working days to the period of self-certified absence	Any piece of coursework assessment, other than that arising from scheduled onsite or online assessments, such as labs, practical sessions, group presentations, or other similar assessed work	As long as the extended deadline is before the date when work is moderated or marked work/answers are released to the main cohort of students	Self-Certified, on no more than two occasions in any academic year
---	--	---	--

The following would be considered as valid reasons for granting an extension or late submission:

- i) A Learning Agreement (LA) which recommends flexibility around deadlines;
- ii) Acceptable extenuating circumstances as per Annex 8, clause 1.3;
- iii) Temporary incapacitating medical condition or other negative circumstances that may have directly affected a student's ability to complete an assessment by the deadline*;

** Where coursework deadlines are affected, note the limit on the number of occasions student may self-certify absence for such conditions.*

Nb: If an extension request refers to ongoing matters relating to extenuation, the University's mitigation policy should be applied in addition to an extension. The mitigation policy should also be applied if it is not possible to provide evidence in good time for an extension request to be granted.

Applications for extensions will be unsuccessful in cases where the student could reasonably have avoided the situation or acted to limit the impact of the circumstances.

Note

This Annex and Appendices approved at Learning, Teaching & Quality Committee, Feb 2020

Annex 9: Academic Discipline

1. Academy Regulation 12: Academic Discipline

1.1 There shall be a Disciplinary Committee to consider alleged breaches of Academy Regulation 12, which shall consist of three academic members of staff, one of whom shall be the Executive Dean of the Drama School or their nominee and shall be appointed as Chair. Student & Academic Services shall provide a Secretary to the Committee. The Disciplinary Committee shall keep appropriate records of all such alleged breaches so considered.

1.2 Regulation 12 states that *Students are required to behave with honesty and integrity in fulfilling requirements in relation to assessment of their academic progress.*

The following are some examples of conduct which will be regarded as a breach of this regulation:

- **Cheating in examinations:** including the use of unauthorised materials, mobile phones and other prohibited electronic devices.
- **Attempting to influence an examiner or teacher improperly**
- **Plagiarism:** reproducing in any work submitted for assessment or review (for example, examination answers, essays, project reports, dissertations or theses) any material derived from work authored by another without clearly acknowledging the source.

It should be noted that LAMDA regards plagiarism a strict liability offence and so does not require evidence of intent to commit plagiarism in order to determine that an offence has occurred. However, where it is determined that the act of plagiarism has occurred as a result of poor academic practice, it is open to the Chair to interpret the matter as constituting a minor offence.

LAMDA makes available to students information about the definition and seriousness of plagiarism offences and it is the responsibility of the student to consider this carefully. Lack of understanding on behalf of the student will not be considered acceptable grounds in response to an allegation of plagiarism or when appealing a penalty imposed under the academic discipline procedures.

The identification of plagiarism is an academic judgement, based on a comparison across the student's work in general, and/or on knowledge of the sources, of practice in the discipline and of expectations for professional conduct. The Chair of the Disciplinary Committee, or the Committee itself, may therefore determine that plagiarism has taken place even if the source has not been identified.

- **Duplication of material:** reproducing in any submitted work any substantial amount of material used by that student in other work for assessment, either at LAMDA or elsewhere, without acknowledging that such work has been so submitted.
- **Conspiring with others** to reproduce the work of others without proper acknowledgement, including knowingly permitting work to be copied by another student.
- **Falsification of data/evidence**

Alleged breaches of Academy Regulation 16 will be dealt with in accordance with the procedures designated by the Academic Board, as set out below.

1.3 In the event of an alleged breach of Regulation 16, the student concerned and the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee shall be informed of the alleged breach. The Chair shall be provided with full details and supporting evidence.

1.4 If the Chair considers that the allegation is without foundation, he/she shall so inform the student and no further action shall be taken.

1.5 **Plagiarism First Offence – Determining Formal Warnings and Minor Penalties**

LAMDA acknowledges that at the start of a student's career, plagiarism may be inadvertent and a result of inexperience or poor academic practice. In recognition of this fact, the following procedures have been developed.

1.5.1 Where a first offence of plagiarism is suspected in a piece of work submitted by a stage 1 undergraduate student, discretion is afforded the Chair to treat the case as warranting only a **formal warning**.

Where a first offence of plagiarism is suspected in a piece of work submitted by a student other than a Stage 1 undergraduate student, the Chair has discretion to treat the case as warranting a **formal warning and a minor penalty**.

In either case this is provided that:

- The Chair is satisfied that the incidence of plagiarism is a result of poor academic practice;
- There is, therefore, no evidence of any intent to deceive;
- The piece of work in question constitutes the first such incidence of plagiarism for that student.

1.5.2 Such cases, as described in 1.5.1, will be conducted as per the procedures for uncontested minor offences and, if proven, will result in the Chair issuing a formal warning letter to the Student. The formal warning letter will set out the possible consequences of any further cases of plagiarism and will provide direction to sources of advice and guidance to prevent any future breaches.

1.5.3 In the case of a Stage 1 undergraduate student, the Chair, in consultation with the module leader, will determine if a mark may be returned for the piece of work based on the portion which is not plagiarised or whether the student should be permitted to re-submit the piece of work without penalty by an agreed deadline. Where, subsequent to the discounting of the plagiarised portion, the mark awarded is lower than the pass mark, the student may be given the opportunity to resubmit the work where it is considered appropriate to do so, by an agreed deadline.

In the case of a student other than a Stage 1 undergraduate student, the Chair, in consultation with the module convenor, will determine if a mark may be returned for the piece of work based on the portion that is not plagiarised. If the mark which is given is below the pass mark, then the student may be permitted to re-submit the work where it is considered appropriate to do so, by an agreed deadline **for a maximum of a pass mark**.

(Note: this opportunity to resubmit in term time prior to the next available resubmission opportunity does not apply to minor/serious offences – see paragraphs 2.2.4 and 2.2.5).

1.5.4 Such cases, as described in 1.5.3, will not - in isolation - be regarded as constituting a breach of academic discipline and will not be recorded on the student's transcript or academic reference. However, when considering any subsequent cases of plagiarism, the

Chair will take into account whether a formal warning has earlier been issued to the offender.

1.6 Determining Minor Offences/Serious Offences

Whether for a first or subsequent offence, where the Chair considers the evidence is substantive, he/she will determine if the breach should be regarded as constituting a minor or a more serious offence. In reaching this determination, the Chair will take into account such factors as the following:

- The contribution to the overall mark for a module made by the piece of work in which the instance of alleged plagiarism has been detected;
- The proportion of the piece of work that is plagiarised;
- Whether the student is in receipt of a formal warning, issued under section 1.5 of this Annex;
- The number of previous or contemporaneous offences, if any, with any instances of repeat offending normally to be regarded as constituting a more serious offence;
- Evidence of intent to deceive, with any such evidence normally to be regarded as requiring the treatment of the case as per a more serious offence;

The Chair may consult other members of the Disciplinary Committee about how to proceed with the case if he/she considers this appropriate.

1.7 Minor Offences

- 1.7.1 Where the Chair determines on the basis of the available evidence that the case should be treated as per a minor offence the Secretary will write to the student and set out the details of the allegation and the nature of the evidence against the student. The Chair will also propose a penalty for the offence; the Secretary will inform the student of the proposed penalty and that it will be automatically applied should the student either decide not to contest the allegation or fail to respond to the Secretary within the prescribed deadline (normally 14 days, though this may be a shorter period if this is necessary to ensure that the outcome can be made available to a meeting of the Board of Examiners).
- 1.7.2 If the student contests the allegation and/or the proposed penalty, the Chair will refer the case to the Disciplinary Committee. The student will be invited to submit representations in writing. An oral hearing will be convened where the Chair considers that there are sound reasons for doing so.
- 1.7.3 If the student does not contest the allegation and/or proposed penalty by the prescribed deadline, the Secretary will inform the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision of the Chair and confirm the outcome of the case to the student. The maximum penalty that may be applied by a Chair for an uncontested minor offence will be a mark of zero for the piece of work in question. The student shall be informed of his/her right to appeal against this decision as per the procedure set out at section 4 below.

1.8 Serious Offences

Where the Chair determines on the basis of the available evidence that the case should be treated as per a serious offence the Chair will ask the Secretary to convene the Disciplinary Committee to hear the case.

- 1.8.1 The student shall be informed by the Secretary of the date on which the Disciplinary Committee will consider the case; that they may submit evidence to the Committee in writing or, where the Chair considers an oral hearing appropriate, in person; that, except where the Chair decides that evidence provided by either party should be confidential to the Committee, they will each be provided with copies of the written evidence submitted by the other and, where an oral hearing is held, that they will both be permitted to hear the other's verbal evidence.

- 1.8.2 Where a student attends a hearing of the Disciplinary Committee, he/she may be accompanied by a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative. Such hearings are not legal proceedings and a student may not be accompanied by a legal representative, even if the legal representative is a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative.
- 1.8.3 A student who, where the opportunity is offered, does not attend a Disciplinary Committee hearing will have no further right of redress within LAMDA's appeals procedures. Where non-attendance is thought to be for reasons beyond the student's control, the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee will have discretion to proceed with the hearing in the student's absence or to reconvene the Committee at a later date.
- 1.8.4 The Chair of the Disciplinary Committee shall have the right to decide that evidence submitted verbally or in writing should be ignored by the Committee on the grounds that it is irrelevant or inappropriate and shall give reasons for doing so.
- 1.8.5 The Disciplinary Committee will meet privately to determine whether, in its view, there has been a breach of Regulation 16 and, if so, impose an appropriate penalty.
- 1.8.6 The Secretary shall inform the student and the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision of the Disciplinary Committee. The student shall be informed of his/her right to appeal against this decision as per the procedure set out in section 4 below.
- 1.8.7 The Secretary shall be responsible for ensuring that a confidential record is kept of all cases notified under 1.7 and 1.8 above. LAMDA is obliged to release details relating to academic discipline offences if these are explicitly requested by prospective employers as part of an academic reference or where disclosure is an obligatory professional requirement.

2. Penalties

Where a student is considered to be in breach of Regulation 16, the penalties to be imposed should be in accordance with the following guidelines. These penalties may however be varied where the Disciplinary Committee or the Chair (as appropriate to the case) feels that the suggested penalty would be too lenient or too harsh in the particular circumstances. In determining an appropriate penalty, the following factors may be taken into consideration:

- The severity of the offence
- Whether the student admits or denies the allegation;
- Evidence of intent to deceive;
- The number of previous or contemporaneous offences;
- Whether the student is in receipt of a formal warning, issued under section 1.5 of this Annex;
- The contribution to the overall mark for a module made by the piece of work in which the instance of alleged plagiarism has been detected;
- The proportion of the piece of work that is plagiarised;
- The effect of the intended penalty on the student's progression or (potential) award (the overall outcome should not be disproportionate to the offence).

The examples given in 2.1 – 2.4 below are not exhaustive and do not limit the application of this Regulation from other acts deemed to be in contravention of the Regulation.

2.1 Cheating in Examinations

2.1.1 Possession of Unauthorised Materials, Mobile Phones or Other Electronic Devices in Examination

First Offence: Penalised mark for the examination appropriate to the nature of the offence, or a warning about consequences of further offences where the offence is considered inadvertent.

Subsequent Offences: Mark of zero for examination in question.

2.1.2 Use of Unauthorised Materials/Mobile Phones/Electronic Devices in Examination

First Offence: Mark of zero for examination in question.

Subsequent offence(s): Terminate registration/ineligible for award or to resit examinations.

2.1.3 Communicating with another student

First Offence: Minimum penalty - warning about consequences of further offence(s).

Subsequent Offence(s): Mark of zero for examination in question.

2.1.4 Copying from another student

First Offence: Mark of zero for examination in question.

Subsequent offence(s): terminate registration/ineligible for award or to resit examinations.

2.1.5 Impersonating another student/conspiring to impersonation

Terminate registration/ineligible for award or to resit examinations.

2.1.6 Attempting to Influence a Teacher or Examiner Improperly

The penalty may range from a mark of zero for a single piece

2.2 Plagiarism/Duplication of Material

2.2.1 Where the work contains a component of plagiarised or duplicated material, but also contains sufficient evidence that the student has satisfied the requirements to Pass, **either:**

2.2.1.1 cap the mark *for the piece of work* at a minimum Pass; **or**

2.2.1.2 allocate a reduced final mark *for the module overall* proportionate to the offence, subject to a minimum mark of a minimum Pass, and return a mark for the piece of work based on the portion which is not plagiarised or duplicated.

2.2.2 Where the work contains a component of plagiarised or duplicated material which casts doubt on whether the student has satisfied the requirements to Pass, return the appropriate fail mark for that portion of the coursework that is unplagiarised.

2.2.3 The maximum penalty that may be applied by a Chair for an uncontested minor offence will be a mark of zero for the piece of work in question.

2.2.4 Where the application of a penalty for a minor offence results in the failure of a module, the Board of Examiners may grant the student the opportunity to resubmit as per normal resit rules.

2.2.5 For serious, substantial or repeat offences: termination of registration/ineligible for award or to resit examinations.

2.3 Conspiring with others to reproduce the work of others, including knowingly permitting work to be copied by another student

The penalty may range from a reprimand to a mark of zero for a piece of work, or for a number of pieces of work, depending on the circumstances of the case.

2.4 Falsification of Data

The penalty may range from a mark of zero for a single piece of work to termination of registration depending on the circumstances of the case.

2.5 Falsification of Evidence in Appeal

Where there are grounds to consider that documentary evidence submitted in support of an appeal has been falsified, the Head of Academic Services will disregard such evidence and

the appeal will thereafter be considered on the basis of the remaining evidence. The submission of falsified evidence will be referred for consideration under LAMDA's procedures for non-academic misconduct. The referral will include a recommendation as to whether the matter should be regarded as a 'minor' or 'major' offence.

- 2.6 In cases where the penalty of termination of registration has been applied by a School for academic discipline offences, the student will not be permitted to register on another programme of study at LAMDA.

3. Penalties Where Work has been Marked by a Different Programme

- 3.1 Where a module leader has marked the 'unplagiarised' part of coursework that has been deemed to include plagiarised work, and the student concerned belongs to a different programme from that of the module-owning department, that student's mark should not be increased, nor a resubmission granted by the home programme if the module-owning programme does not provide for this.
- 3.2 The home programme of the student concerned may, in such circumstances, consider the mark given by the module-owning programme and decide whether it would be appropriate for a greater penalty to be applied.
- 3.3 The module-owning programme may advise if it is appropriate for the student to be permitted an opportunity to resubmit coursework where plagiarism has been identified.
- 3.4 Where a disciplinary hearing is to take place, such hearings are the responsibility of the student-owning programme. The programme team should, however, take advice in consultation with the module-owning programme ahead of the hearing. The module leader should also be present at the resulting disciplinary hearing, but must never be a member of the hearing panel.

4. Appeals Against Decisions of Disciplinary Committees

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 Appeals against the decisions of Disciplinary Committees or of the Chairs of Disciplinary Committees will be considered by Academic Board as per these procedures, provided they are received no more than 21 days from the date of the letter notifying the student of the decision in question.
- 4.1.2 The submission of an appeal is no guarantee of its successful outcome. Where relevant to the case, deregistered students who have been permitted to continue with their studies pending the outcome of an appeal may be required to withdraw from LAMDA immediately should their appeal to Academic Board fail.
- 4.1.3 LAMDA staff members will treat in good faith any appeal which is brought forward by students under these procedures.

4.2. Grounds for Appeal

- 4.2.1 The student may appeal to the Head of Academic Services against the outcome and/or penalty imposed by the Disciplinary Committee on one or more of the following grounds:
- that there is evidence of a failure to follow the procedures set out in these regulations, or of other administrative error, which casts reasonable doubt on the reliability of the decision; and/or
 - that fresh evidence can be presented, which could not reasonably have been made available before the decision was made, and which casts reasonable doubt on the reliability of the decision; and/or
 - that the outcome and/or penalty were unreasonable or not justified given the evidence which was available at the time.

4.3. Procedures

4.3.1 Appeals will be considered only if submitted:

- by means of the Discipline Appeal Form
- accompanied by a letter explaining in full the grounds for the appeal and the remedial action sought from the Disciplinary Committee;
- providing all necessary documentary evidence substantiating the grounds of the appeal;
- within the applicable deadline (i.e. 21 days from the date of the letter notifying the student of the decision).

4.3.2 On receipt of an appeal the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager shall determine whether it meets the technical conditions outlined in section 4.3.1 above. If it does not, the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager shall inform the student in writing that there is no basis for continuing with the appeal and will explain the reason(s) why the appellant's submission does not satisfy the technical conditions for appeal. This may include an assessment by the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager that any new evidence provided in appeal by the appellant may reasonably have been provided at the time of the original decision against which the student is appealing.

4.3.3 Where the appellant's submission is judged to satisfy the technical conditions for appeal, it shall be submitted for consideration by the Head of Academic Services.

4.3.3.1 Procedural or Administrative Error

Where the Head of Academic Services determines that there is reasonable ground, supported by objective evidence, to believe that there may have been procedural or administrative error of such a nature as to have affected the decision of the Disciplinary Committee: the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager will investigate whether there has been such error and, where this is the case, refer for the case to be reconsidered by the Disciplinary Committee. The Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager will inform the student of the outcome of these enquiries.

4.3.3.2 Presentation of Fresh Evidence

Where the appeal claims there is fresh evidence available, which casts reasonable doubt on the reliability of the decision and which the student, for good reason, was unable to submit by the published deadline, the Head of Academic Services shall determine whether sufficient grounds for further review exists.

4.3.3.2.1 Where the Head of Academic Services determines that there are sufficient grounds for further review, the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager will forward the evidence to the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee to ask whether, in light of the fresh evidence, the Committee would wish to reconsider its original decision. In considering such a request, the Chair of the Committee will consult such other members of the Disciplinary Committee as deemed necessary in the circumstances.

4.3.3.2.2 Where the Head of Academic Services does not consider that there are sufficient grounds, the student shall be so informed.

4.3.4 Where as a result of the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager's investigation or the decision of the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee (as appropriate) the appeal is upheld, the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager shall so inform the student.

4.3.5 Where, with regard to 4.3.3.1 or 4.3.3.2, the outcome does not correspond to the remedial action sought by the student, the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager will refer the

case to the Head of Academic Services. The Head of Academic Services shall determine whether, on the basis of the evidence presented by the student and obtained by the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager, there are grounds for review. Where the Head of Academic Services determines that there are grounds, the Head of Academic Services will refer the matter for consideration by an Academic Board Review Panel, as per 4.4 below.

4.3.6 Where the Head of Academic Services determines that there are no grounds, the Head of Academic Services will ask the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager to inform the student that the appeal has been rejected and of the reasons for the decision.

4.3.7 Outcome and/or Penalty were Unreasonable or Not Justified

Where the Head of Academic Services determines that there are reasonable grounds, supported by objective evidence, to believe that the outcome and/or penalty imposed by the Disciplinary Committee may have been unreasonable or not justified given the evidence which was available at the time, the Head of Academic Services will refer the matter back to the School for reconsideration. If, following reconsideration of the matter, the School and the Head of Academic Services are unable to reach a joint decision the Head of Academic Services will refer the matter for consideration by an Academic Board Review Panel, as per 4.4 below.

4.4 Academic Board Review Panels

4.4.1 Where an appeal is referred for consideration by an Academic Board Review Panel:

4.4.1.1 The student and the Chair of the Disciplinary Committee shall be informed by the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager of the date on which the Review Panel will consider the appeal, that they may submit evidence to the Review Panel in writing and/or in person, that, except where the Chair of the Review Panel decides that evidence provided by either party should be confidential to the Review Panel, they will each be provided with copies of the written evidence submitted by the other and that they will both be permitted to hear the other's verbal evidence.

4.4.1.2 Where a student attends a meeting of the Review Panel, he/she may be accompanied by a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative. Review Panels are not legal proceedings and a student may not be accompanied by a legal representative, even if the legal representative is a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative.

4.4.1.3 A student who does not take up the opportunity of a Review Panel hearing will forego his/her right to such a hearing and will have no further right of redress within the appeals procedures. Where non-attendance is thought to be for reasons beyond the student's control, the Chair of the Review Panel will have discretion to proceed with the hearing in the student's absence or to reconvene the Review Panel at a later date.

4.4.1.4 The Chair of the Disciplinary Committee may appoint another member of the Disciplinary Committee to act on his/her behalf.

4.4.1.5 The Chair of the Review Panel shall have the right to decide that evidence submitted verbally or in writing should be ignored by the Review Panel on the grounds that it is irrelevant or inappropriate and shall give reasons for doing so.

4.4.1.6 The Review Panel will meet privately to reach a decision. The Review Panel shall be authorised to confirm or to vary the original decision of the Disciplinary Committee and will vary the decision only if it is satisfied that one or more of the grounds for appeal has been demonstrated.

4.4.2 The remit of the Review Panel will be to determine one of the following outcomes:

- Confirm the original outcome and/or penalty;
- Confirm that an offence has occurred, but adjust the penalty. It should be noted that, if in the view of the Review Panel, the evidence suggests that the offence was more serious than had been determined by the Disciplinary Committee or its Chair, a more severe penalty may be applied than had originally been proposed;
- Decide that an offence has not occurred, and remove the original penalty.

4.4.3 A written record of the hearing will be prepared by the Secretary and this will be approved by the Chair of the Review Panel.

4.5 Appointment of Review Panels

4.5.1 The Review Panel shall be appointed by Academic Board. Meetings of Review Panels should be provisionally arranged at times when it is anticipated that they will be required. Meetings may also be convened at short notice to consider individual cases as they arise.

4.5.2 Any member of the Review Panel who is a member of the Disciplinary Committee concerned in a particular appeal shall take no part in the Review Panel's consideration of that case and shall withdraw during consideration of the case.

4.5.3 Each appeal which is referred for consideration by a Review Panel must be considered by at least three members of the Review Panel.

4.6 Further Right of Appeal

Where an appeal against a decision of a Disciplinary Committee is considered by the Teaching, Learning and Quality Manager not to meet the technical conditions outlined in section 4.3.1, or where it is rejected by a Head of Academic Services or an Academic Board Review Panel, the student shall have a further right of appeal to the Principal, who will consider only whether the original appeal was considered in light of the approved procedure.

4.7 Falsified Evidence

Where there are grounds to consider that documentary evidence submitted in support of an appeal has been falsified, the Head of Academic Services of the Faculty will disregard such evidence and the appeal will thereafter be considered on the basis of the remaining evidence. The submission of falsified evidence will be referred for consideration by the Master of the student's College under the *Regulations on Student Discipline in Relation to Non-Academic Matters*. The referral will include a recommendation as to whether the matter should be regarded as a 'minor' or 'major' offence.

5 Anti-Bribery and Corruption Policy

LAMDA has an Anti-Bribery Policy which applies to the full range of the Academy's activities, both in the UK and overseas, including (but not limited to) financial transactions and contracts, the recruitment and admission of students, the award of academic credit and qualifications, the appointment of staff, research and the award of titles and honours. Any case of bribery by a student will be considered under Regulations on Student Discipline in relation to non-academic matters as a major offence and may result in termination of registration as a student or the withholding of an award of a degree, diploma or certificate. For the policy in full, see <https://www.lamda.ac.uk/about-lamda/policies-and-procedures>.

Annex 10: ECTS and US Credit equivalences

European Credit Transfer System (ECTS)

ECTS, the European Credit Transfer System, was developed by the Commission of the European Communities in order to provide common procedures to guarantee academic recognition of studies abroad. It provides a way of measuring and comparing learning achievements, and transferring them from one institution to another.

ECTS credits are a value allocated to module units to describe the student workload required to complete them. They reflect the quantity of work each module requires in relation to the total quantity of work required to complete a full year of academic study at the institution, that is, lectures, practical work, seminars, private work – in the library or at home - and examinations or other assessment activities. ECTS credits express a relative value.

60 ECTS credits are equivalent to the learning outcomes and associated workload of a typical full-time academic year of formal learning. In everyday practice, two credits awarded by a UK higher education institution such as LAMDA are equivalent to one ECTS credit.

US Credit hours

The US Department of Education defines a normal bachelor's degree course as having a value of 120 'credit hours'. Taken over three years, full-time, this then results in each year of study being valued at 30 credits. An MA in the USA will typically require 30 credits, and an MFA will typically require 60 credits.

UK – ECTS – US conversion

The following chart is a means by which UK credits may be converted into ECTS or US credits.

UK	ECTS	US
20	10	5
30	15	7
40	20	10
60	30	15

Annex 11: Appeals against Recommendations of Boards of Examiners

1. Introduction

The most effective route to resolution of an appeal is one in which all parties engage in a spirit of cooperation. LAMDA strives to ensure the fairness and objectivity of its procedures including the maintenance of academic standards. Guidance on procedures for appeals against recommendations of Boards of Examiners is provided by Academic Services, and further advice is available from Student Representatives.

2. Early Resolution

- 2.1 It is good practice to provide the opportunity for informal early resolution of student concerns before students enter into the formal appeal process, for instance allowing students the opportunity to raise a query. Such queries might be resolved by rechecking the total marks for a module or confirming that there were no computer errors in the calculation of a result.
- 2.2 LAMDA will respond to student concerns in a timely fashion, as the query and response will fall within the 21 day deadline in which students are permitted to submit an appeal. Students still have the right to appeal if they feel the matter has not been resolved, and must be advised accordingly.

3. Timing of Appeals

- 3.1 Appeals against the recommendations of Boards of Examiners will not be considered if they are received more than 10 days from the date of the publication of assessment results.
- 3.2 For the purposes of these procedures, the date of publication of assessment results means the date upon which the full transcript of the results under appeal are first made available to students, even if the results are subject to confirmation.
- 3.3 The submission of an appeal is no guarantee of its successful outcome. Where students have been advised to undertake further assessment in failed modules by Boards of Examiners and appeal against this decision, they must proceed to take the further assessment until the outcome of the appeal is known.
- 3.4 Staff members will treat in good faith and maintain confidentiality, according to the procedures, any academic appeal which is brought forward by its students.

4. Grounds for Appeal

- 4.1 Students may not appeal against the academic judgement of the examiners.
- 4.2 Appeals from students taking taught programmes of study against recommendations of Boards of Examiners will be considered in the following circumstances only:
 - 4.2.1 where there is reasonable ground supported by objective evidence to believe that there has been administrative, procedural or clerical error of such a nature as to have affected the recommendation of the Board of Examiners; and/or
 - 4.2.2 where there is evidence of illness or other misfortune such as to cause exceptional interference with academic performance and which the student was, for good reason, unable to submit by the published deadline; and/or

- 4.2.3 where there is evidence of prejudice or bias or the perception of prejudice or bias against the student.
- 4.3 Appeals that are based on mitigating circumstances which, without good reason, were not brought to the attention of the Board of Examiners through mitigation procedures at the appropriate time will not be considered.
- 4.4 Where the outcome to an appeal sought by a student goes beyond what LAMDA can reasonably provide or what is in its power to provide, the student will be so advised in writing as soon as possible.
- 4.5 In cases where a student is appealing against a decision that they (i) be denied progression to the next stage of his/her programme of study or (ii) be withdrawn from LAMDA, and the appeal is upheld after the end of the third week of the beginning of the stage of study, the appellant will be required to intermit. The Director shall be permitted to rule on individual cases in exceptional circumstances.

5. Submission of Appeal

- 5.1 Appeals against recommendations of Board of Examiners are submitted to Student & Academic Services.
- 5.2 Where an appeal includes new supporting evidence, the original evidence documentation must be submitted. If the original documentation is not in English the student is required to also submit a translation into English that has been provided by an accredited organisation.
- 5.3 Appeals may be submitted by post or by email, where the completed appeal form and other accompanying documents have been scanned. Where an appeal submitted by email includes the submission of new supporting evidence, the original evidence documentation must also be submitted by post before the appeal will be considered, as per 5.2 above.
- 5.4 Students will normally submit their appeals themselves. There may be occasions, however, when a student wishes or needs to be represented by a third party, for example a member of staff or a member of the Students' Union or a relative. Where the student is to be represented by a third party the student in question must give formal written permission for this representation and for LAMDA to discuss personal information with the third party representative. Where written permission is not provided, LAMDA will decline to accept a third party appeal submission.
- 5.5 Appeals are not legal proceedings and a student may not be represented by a legal representative, even if the legal representative is a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative.
- 5.6 Where an appeal affects more than one student, the students concerned may make a single appeal submission as a 'group' appeal. In the event of a group appeal, each student concerned must sign the appeal submission to confirm his or her participation in the appeal. The students concerned may wish to nominate one member of the group to act as the group representative during the appeal. If this is the case, it should be clearly stated in the group appeal submission.

6. Procedures

- 6.1 Appeals will be considered only if submitted:
- by means of the appeal form explaining in full the grounds for the appeal and the remedial action sought from the Board of Examiners, or by means of the appeal form

accompanied by a letter explaining in full the grounds for the appeal and the remedial action sought from the Board of Examiners;

- with all necessary documentary evidence substantiating the grounds of the appeal;
- within the applicable deadline.

6.2 On receipt of an appeal:

6.2.1 The Quality Officer shall determine whether it meets the technical conditions outlined in section 6.1 above. If it does not, the student shall be so informed. If it does, the appeal shall be submitted for consideration by the Head of Drama School or Head of Production & Technical Arts, as appropriate.

6.2.2 Administrative, Procedural or Clerical Error

Where the relevant Head determines that there is reasonable ground, supported by objective evidence, to believe that there may have been administrative, procedural or clerical error of such a nature as to have affected the recommendation of the Board of Examiners, the Quality Officer will investigate whether there has been such error and, where this is the case, arrange for such error to be rectified where this is possible. Where a student wishes to appeal because he or she believes concessionary evidence was not properly considered, this will be regarded as an appeal against procedural irregularity.

The Quality Officer will inform the student of the outcome of these enquiries.

6.2. Illness or Other Misfortune

6.2.3.1 Where the appeal claims there is evidence of illness or other misfortune such that it may have affected the recommendation of the Board of Examiners, which the student, for good reason, was unable to submit by the published deadline or that there is evidence relating to illness or other misfortune submitted under the mitigation procedures within the prescribed time limit which was not properly considered by the Board of Examiners, the Head of Drama School or Head of Production & Technical Arts shall determine whether there are sufficient grounds for further review.

6.2.3.2 Where the appropriate Head determines that there are sufficient grounds for further review, the Quality Officer will forward the evidence to the Chair of the Board of Examiners to ask whether, in the light of the evidence, the Board would wish to reconsider its original recommendation. In considering such a request, the Chair of the Board will consult with at least one internal member of the Board of Examiners, or more than one as deemed necessary in the circumstances.

6.2.3.3 Where the Dean does not consider that there are sufficient grounds, the student shall be so informed.

6.2.4 Prejudice or Bias

6.2.4.1 Where the appeal claims there is evidence of prejudice or bias or the perception of prejudice or bias against the student such that it may have affected academic performance, the appropriate Course Leader shall determine whether there are sufficient grounds for further review.

6.2.4.2 Where the appropriate Head determines that there are sufficient grounds for further review the Quality Officer will forward the evidence to the Chair of the Board of Examiners to ask whether, in light of the evidence, the Board would wish to reconsider its original recommendation. In considering such a request, the Chair of the Board will consult with at least one internal member of the Board of Examiners, or more than one as deemed necessary in the circumstances.

- 6.2.4.3 Where the Head does not consider that there are sufficient grounds, the student shall be so informed.
- 6.2.5 Where as a result of the investigation or the recommendation of the Chair of the Board of Examiners (as appropriate) the appeal is upheld, the Quality Officer shall so inform the student.
- 6.2.6 Where, with regard to 6.2.2 or 6.2.3 or 6.2.4, the outcome does not correspond to the remedial action sought by the student (either because the appeal has been rejected or because the appeal has been upheld, but the recommended remedial action differs from that sought by the student), the Quality Officer will refer the case to the Head of Drama School or Head of Production & Technical Arts (as appropriate). The appropriate Head shall determine whether, on the basis of the evidence presented by the student and obtained by the Quality Officer, there are grounds for review. Where the Head determines that there are grounds, the matter will be referred for consideration by a Appeals Review Panel. Where the Head determines that there are no grounds, the Quality Officer will be asked to inform the student that the appeal has been rejected or has been upheld, but the remedial action differs from that sought by the student and of the reasons for the decision.

6.3 Appeals Review Panels

- 6.3.1 Where an appeal is referred for consideration by a Review Panel the student and the Chair of the Board of Examiners shall be informed by the Quality Officer of the date on which the Review Panel will consider the appeal, that they may submit evidence to the Review Panel in writing and/or in person, that, except where the Chair of the Review Panel decides that evidence provided by either party should be confidential to the Review Panel, they will each be provided with copies of the written evidence submitted by the other and that they will both be permitted to hear the other's verbal evidence.
- 6.3.2 Where a student attends a meeting of the Review Panel, he/she may be accompanied by a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative. Review Panels are not legal proceedings and a student may not be accompanied by a legal representative, even if the legal representative is a member of staff or a student of LAMDA or a member of staff of the Students' Union or a relative.
- 6.3.3 A student who does not take up the opportunity of a Review Panel hearing will forego his/her right to such a hearing and will have no further right of redress within the appeals procedures. Where non-attendance is thought to be for reasons beyond the student's control, the Chair of the Review Panel will have discretion to proceed with the hearing in the student's absence or to reconvene the Review Panel at a later date.
- 6.3.4 Where a student attends a meeting of the Review Panel, that attendance will normally be in person. The student may alternatively attend the Review Panel meeting via video link where the student makes the request in good time before the hearing and where the student cannot reasonably be expected to attend the hearing in person. Where attendance is to be via video link the student shall make his or her own arrangements and at his/her own expense.
- 6.3.5 The Chair of the Board of Examiners may appoint another member of the Board of Examiners to act on his/her behalf.
- 6.3.6 The Chair of the Review Panel shall have the right to decide that evidence submitted verbally or in writing should be ignored by the Review Panel on the grounds that it is irrelevant or inappropriate and shall give reasons for doing so.

6.3.7 The Review Panel will meet privately to reach a decision. The Review Panel shall be authorised to confirm or to vary the original recommendation of the Board of Examiners and will vary the recommendation only if it is satisfied:

- that one or more of the grounds for appeal has been demonstrated; and
- where appropriate, that the Board of Examiners (or the Chair of the Board of Examiners acting on behalf of the Board of Examiners) did not act reasonably in exercising its discretionary powers in its consideration of evidence relating to illness or other misfortune submitted within the concessions and/or appeals proceedings.

6.3.8 Where the Review Panel recommends that the original recommendation of the Board of Examiners should be changed, its recommendation shall carry the weight of a recommendation of a Board of Examiners and will require approval as if it were the recommendation of a Board of Examiners. The student and the Chair of the Board of Examiners will be informed by the Quality Officer in writing of the decision and of the reasons for the decision.

6.3.9 A written record of the hearing will be prepared and this will be approved by the Chair of the Faculty Review Panel.

6.4 Appointment of Review Panels

6.4.1 Drama School shall have a Review Panel appointed by the Academic Board. Meetings of Review Panels should be provisionally arranged at times when it is anticipated that they will be required. Meetings may also be convened at short notice to consider individual cases as they arise.

6.4.2 Any member of the Review Panel who is a member of the Board of Examiners concerned in a particular appeal shall take no part in the Review Panel's consideration of that case and shall withdraw during consideration of the case.

6.4.3 Each appeal which is referred for consideration by a Review Panel must be considered by at least three members of the Review Panel.

6.5 Further Right of Appeal

Where an appeal against a recommendation of a Board of Examiners is considered by the Quality Officer not to meet the technical conditions outlined in section 6.1, or where it is rejected by the appropriate Head of School, a Chair of a Board of Examiners or a Review Panel, the student shall have a further right of appeal to the Director of LAMDA, who will consider only whether the original appeal was considered properly and fairly or that there is new evidence that could not have reasonably been submitted with the original appeal.

The submission of an appeal to the Director will be subject to the submission requirements set out at 6.1 above.

7. Falsified Evidence

Where there are grounds to consider that documentary evidence submitted in support of an appeal has been falsified, the Head of School will disregard such evidence and the appeal will thereafter be considered on the basis of the remaining evidence. The submission of falsified evidence will be referred for consideration under the regulations governing Non-Academic Misconduct.

Last review:

Academic Board, March 2019, unless otherwise indicated
