



University Assessment Regulations

Taught Programmes

Academic Session 2024 - 25

Prepared By	Quality Assurance and Enhancement
Approved By	APC 21 May 2014/Senate 13 June 2014 APC 17 May 2015 APC 11 May 2016/Senate 3 June 2016 APPC 10 May 2017/Senate 2 June 2017 APPC 9 May 2018/ Senate 1 June 2018 APPC 1 May 2019/ Senate 31 May 2019 APPC 6 May 2020/ Senate 8 June 2020 APPC 15 September 2021 APPC 14 September 2022 Senate 13 December 2023

Source Location [Quality Assurance and Enhancement](#)

Published Location <https://www.gcu.ac.uk/aboutgcu/supportservices/qualityassuranceandenhancement/regulationsandpolicies/universityassessmentregulationsandpolicies>

Other documents referenced These are listed in section 2 of the document.

Version	Date issued	Author	Update information
V1.0	14.07.2014	Governance and Quality Enhancement	First Published version
V1.1	10.10.2014	Governance and Quality	Typographical amendment to section 19.
V 1.2	07.11.2014	Governance and Quality Enhancement	At 25.6a text changed from “non-General Student visa (student visitor visa)” to “appropriate visa”.
V 1.3	07.05.2015	Governance and Quality Enhancement	Correction to contents page and referencing under section 20 <i>Oral Assessments</i> .
V2.0	25.08.2015	Governance	Text incorporating Integrated Masters in the Undergraduate Assessment Regulations added in paragraphs 1.1, 1.4, 1.5 and 13.1.5 (paragraphs 1.4-1.6 become 1.5-1.7).
V2.0	25.08.2015	Governance	At 2.10 Associated policy retitled <i>Policy and Procedures for Examination Papers</i>
V2.0	1.09.2015	Governance	At 2.5 <i>Regulations Regarding Plagiarism and Cheating</i> changed to <i>Code of Student Conduct</i>
V2.0	15.09.2015	Governance	At 13.3 and 13.3.1 parentheses added to allow for nullification at level 11 in Integrated Masters Programmes
V2.0	15.09.2015	Governance	Clarification clause added at 13.2.3 “ <i>and where no more than 20 credits have been failed at that level.</i> ”
V2.0	30.09.2015	Governance	At 25.6a text changed from “appropriate visa” to “Short Term Study Visit Visa”.

Version	Date issued	Author	Update information
V3.0	15.09.2016	Academic Quality and Development	<p>At 9.5, Section (f) added to require module handbooks for exchange/mobility modules to make explicit arrangements for calculation and reporting of marks achieved.</p> <p>At 25.3, the ability to progress on a generic degree pathway is removed.</p> <p>Revision to Section 11.1, 11.2, 11.4-7 to clarify the wording and expectation of double marking and moderation.</p> <p>Revision to Section 11.3 in relation to marking of all questions answered in coursework or examinations.</p> <p>Page 6, footnote 2, minor amendment to reference to GCU Credit Control and Debt Management Policy.</p> <p>Departmental Titles/Role titles updated</p> <p>Section 13, amendments and guidance as to the use of nullification regulations.</p>
V3.1	01.09.2017	Academic Quality and Development	<p>Section 13.3, further amendments and guidance as to the use of nullification regulations.</p> <p>Section 25, amendments made to school-based generic awards</p> <p>Reference to new GCU Moderation Policy made at 2.17</p>
V3.2	01.09.2018	Academic Quality and Development	<p>Section 13.3, amendments and guidance with regards to the implementation of threshold minimum marks for all elements of assessment at SCQF level 7 (new students) and SCQF level 11.</p> <p>Section 19, Minor textual updates to Merit or Distinction for unclassified awards with regards to Exceptions to the University Assessment Regulations.</p>
V3.3	01.09.2019	Academic Quality and Development	<p>Section 13.2, amendments and guidance with regards to the implementation of threshold minimum marks for all elements of assessment at SCQF level 8.</p> <p>Minor textual updates to 2. Specific Policies and Procedures.</p>

Version	Date issued	Author	Update information
V3.4	01.09.2020	Academic Quality	<p>Minor textual update to 7. Maximum Period of Registration</p> <p>Section 13.2, amendments and guidance with regards to the implementation of threshold minimum marks for all elements of assessment at SCQF level 9.</p> <p>Minor textual update to 14. Maximum number of attempts at a module</p>
V3.5	01.09.2021	Quality Assurance and Enhancement	<p>Section 13.2, minor textual updates to reflect that threshold minimum marks for all elements of assessment applies to SCQF levels 7-10 and that the implementation has now reached a steady state.</p>
V4	01.09.2022	Quality Assurance and Enhancement	<p>Merger of existing undergraduate and taught postgraduate assessment regulations into a single set of Assessment Regulations.</p> <p>Minor text re-frame to Fit to Sit Policy and terminology updates (replacing Consideration of Mitigating Circumstances Policy).</p> <p>Section 7, minor change to include reference to reasonable adjustments to the maximum period of study made in line with the Equality Act 2010.</p>
V4.1	01.09.2023	Quality Assurance and Enhancement	<p>Minor inclusion at, 'Classification of Honours Awards (Undergraduate programmes)', Section 19, to advise students entering year one (SQF level 7) that the way in which Honours degrees are calculated will change.</p>
V4.2	13.11.2023	Quality Assurance and Enhancement	<p>Minor clarifications, 19.2.3, to remove ambiguity around the number of credits to be used in calculations for Merit and Distinction awards.</p>

Version	Date issued	Author	Update information
V4.3	13.12.2023	Quality Assurance and Enhancement	Addition of Section 14.2, which outlines circumstances where a PAB has the discretion to consider an extra-ordinary attempt for taught Postgraduate students at final stage, where all normal attempts on a single module have been exhausted.

University Assessment Regulations

Taught Programmes

CONTENTS

1.	GENERAL	2
2.	SPECIFIC POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	3
3.	NOTES OF GUIDANCE	4
4.	ASSESSMENT AND ACADEMIC JUDGEMENT	4
5.	ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSESSMENT	5
6.	ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS	5
7.	MAXIMUM PERIOD OF REGISTRATION	5
8.	WITHDRAWAL OF A STUDENT FROM A PROGRAMME	6
9.	SCHEME OF ASSESSMENT	6
10.	COURSEWORK – LATE SUBMISSION AND FAILURE TO SUBMIT	8
11.	MARKING AND MODERATION	9
12.	ENTRY OF MARKS	10
13.	AWARDING OF CREDIT FOR MODULES	11
14.	MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ATTEMPTS AT A MODULE	14
15.	FAILURE AT THE FIRST DIET	15
16.	FAILURE AT THE RE-ASSESSMENT DIET (UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS).....	16
17.	ACCUMULATED CREDIT AND REPETITION OF MODULES.....	16
18.	AWARDS	17
19.	MERIT OR DISTINCTION FOR UNCLASSIFIED AWARDS	17
20.	ORAL ASSESSMENT	21
21.	ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.....	21
22.	VALID REASONS FOR POOR PERFORMANCE AT ANY LEVEL	21
23.	AEGROTAT AWARDS	22
24.	STUDENTS NOTIFIED BY THE FINANCE OFFICE AS DEBTORS	22
25.	SCHOOL-BASED GENERIC AWARDS – REPLACEMENT OF MODULES.....	22

1. General

1.1 All Programme and Progression and Award Boards must follow the Assessment Regulations of Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU) unless any exceptions from (or, in the case of integrated Masters, additions/modifications to) these regulations have been approved. Programme Boards must state in their programme specification and programme documentation, either:

i) 'there are no exceptions from the University's Assessment Regulations';

or,

ii) 'there are exceptions from the University's Assessment Regulations, and that these are detailed in sections.....';

or, in the case of integrated masters,

iii) 'there are additions and/or modifications to the University's Assessment Regulations, and that there are detailed in sections.....';

For the purposes of this document, Programme Assessment Regulations are defined as: University Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate Programmes plus any approved exceptions, or, in the case of Integrated Masters programmes, University Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate Programmes plus any approved additions and/or deviations.

1.2 All exceptions from the University Assessment Regulations must receive formal approval by the University Committee. Any proposed Exceptions are first submitted to the Department of Quality Assurance and Enhancement for consideration and advice. Thereafter they may be submitted to the University Exceptions Committee for consideration. The date and reference of each approved exception from the University Assessment Regulations must be included in the programme documentation.

1.3 All exceptions from the University Assessment Regulations must be specified in sufficient details to ensure that consequential exceptions from the University Assessment Regulations are specified.

1.4 In the case of Integrated Masters undergraduate degree programmes, it is likely that there will be departure from the University Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate Programmes, such as the pass mark for SCQF level 11 modules, classification of the award, and progression to the final stage of the programme. The Programme Assessment Regulations for Integrated masters will therefore comprise: The University Assessment Regulations plus approved additions/deviations to the University Assessment Regulations for Undergraduate Programmes. The process for approval of additions/deviations will be submission to the Department of Quality Assurance and Enhancement for consideration and advice, and then approval, either by Academic Policy and Practice Committee or a Programme Approval event. As in the case of exceptions (1.3), the additions/deviations must be specified in sufficient detail to ensure that consequential deviations from the University Assessment Regulations are specified.

- 1.5 Staff must ensure that students have available to them the University Assessment Regulations and, in the programme documentation, any exceptions, or, in the case of Integrated Masters programmes, any additions and/or deviations from the regulations that are specific to their programme. Students have a responsibility to be aware of such regulations.
- 1.6 The University Assessment Regulations may be subject to over-riding requirements from agencies of relevance to the operation of the university.
- 1.7 The University reserves the right to make reasonable changes to the regulations where in the opinion of the University those changes will assist in the proper delivery of education. The University will normally maintain the Assessment Regulations for students within an academic session. However, the University reserves the right to introduce changes during the academic session when it reasonably considers those changes are: either, for the maintenance of academic standards; or, required to secure the University's good operation and legal or regulatory compliance. Appropriate prior notice of changes will be given.

2. Specific Policies and Procedures

- 2.1 There are several specific [Policies and Procedures](#) forming part of the Assessment Regulations.
- 2.2 Progression and Award Boards will be constituted and will operate as specified in the [Terms of Reference and Standard Operations of PABS and Associated Groups](#).
- 2.3 The Appointment and duties of External Examiners is specified in the [Academic Quality Policy and Practice, Section 10: External Examiners](#).
- 2.4 The procedure for the [Fit to Sit Policy](#) is outlined in the Fit to Sit Policy
- 2.5 Situations involving potential Plagiarism and Cheating will be processed under the [Code of Student Conduct](#).
- 2.6 A student who wishes to exercise their right to appeal must do so in line with the [Academic Appeals Policy and Procedures](#).
- 2.7 The [Credit Control and Debt Management Policy](#) contains regulations that an integral part of the Assessment Regulations.
- 2.8 Written Examinations will be conducted in line with: the [Scheme of Invigilation](#); and [Regulations for the Conduct of Examinations](#).
- 2.9 Special Examination Arrangements are detailed in: *Policy for* [Alternative & Special Examination Requirements](#).
- 2.10 The [Policy & Procedures for the Examination Papers](#) specify procedures for written examinations including the procedure for anonymous marking of formal written examinations and the retention of completed assessment material.

- 2.11 The [Graduation and Awards Regulations](#) specify the regulations and processes of Graduation.
- 2.12 The [Policy on Project and Dissertation Supervision](#) specifies the processes that should be followed.
- 2.13 Whilst the [Student Attendance Monitoring Policy](#), and the [Student Performance Feedback Policy](#) extend beyond the regulations, they have a direct impact on student assessment.
- 2.14 Any exemptions for these Assessment Regulations must be approved by the Exceptions Subcommittee of the Academic Policy and Practice Committee. Guidance is in [Procedures for applying for an exception to the University Assessment Regulations](#).
- 2.15 Glasgow Caledonian University's [Recognition of Prior Learning Policy \(RPL\)](#) describes how RPL credit may be used to contribute to an award.
- 2.16 Regulations for registration, suspension of studies and withdrawal are detailed in [Taught Student Registration, Suspension of Studies and Withdrawal](#).
- 2.17 The [GCU Assessment and Moderation Policy](#) contains regulations that are an integral part of the Assessment Regulations.

3. Notes of Guidance

- 3.1 Notes of Guidance set out examples of good practice, approved by Senate. Whilst they are not viewed as necessarily part of the assessment regulations, all staff must consider such guidance.
- 3.2 Relevant Guidance is contained in [Assessment Preparation Guidance for Academic Staff](#) as follows:
- Guidance Notes on Assessment Loading.
 - Notes of Guidance to Academic Staff on Information to be provided to Students to assist their preparation for assessments.

4. Assessment and Academic Judgement

- 4.1 The purpose of assessment is to enable students to demonstrate that they have fulfilled the objectives of the programmes of study and have achieved the standard required for the award they seek. Progression and Award Boards are responsible to Senate, and Senate requires all programmes of study to be subject to assessment regulations. It is within these Programme Assessment Regulations that Progression and Award Boards make their judgement on student performance. Failure to adhere to the regulations may: i) put the University at unacceptable risk; ii) threaten the standards of its awards; iii) run counter to principles of natural justice; iv) be in breach of external legislation; v) be in breach of requirements imposed by external agencies; and, vi) jeopardise the quality of the student experience.

- 4.2 Within the constraints imposed by the Senate requirements of paragraph 4.1 above, Progression and Award Boards have academic discretion in reaching decisions on the awards to be recommended for individual students. Regulations cannot be expected to legislate for every eventuality. Progression and Award Boards are responsible for interpreting sensibly the assessment regulations for a programme if any difficulties arise. Academic judgements, which are properly justified and fully recorded in the minutes, may override strict regulatory interpretation. However academic judgement cannot be used as a justification to downgrade any credit, mark or degree classification achieved by all normal regulatory calculations or used to prevent progression or compensation permissible under the Programme Assessment Regulations¹.
- 4.3 Students have the right of Appeal regarding a Progression and Award Board decision. The conditions and process of Appeal are detailed in the [Academic Appeals Policy and Procedures](#).

5. Eligibility for Assessment

- 5.1 Students eligible for assessment are those who have complied in all respects with the conditions for admission and registration to the programme and/or all relevant modules within the programme. Such conditions include the payment of relevant fees² and compliance with such other requirements as may be prescribed from time to time. No person whose registration has lapsed, or who has failed to register for the appropriate programme and associated modules, is eligible as a candidate for assessment. Progression and Award Boards will withhold the marks of an assessment of any person who appears ineligible pending an investigation and may ultimately disregard the attempt.
- 5.2 All eligible registered students shall be entitled to enter the first diet of assessments on completion of the normal programme of study without a special entry procedure and without payment of an additional fee. Absence from any assessment without good cause and supporting evidence shall be deemed to be an attempt.

6. Attendance Requirements

- 6.1 Where a student has failed to meet the minimum attendance requirement (as detailed in module descriptor, programme regulations and student handbooks) the Progression and Award Board may decide that the student be required to re-enter the module with attendance or, on the basis of the individual's overall performance, that an alternative form of action may be more appropriate within the framework of the University Assessment Regulations.

7. Maximum Period of Registration

¹ Progression and Award Boards may obtain guidance on the interpretation of the regulations from the Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment and Exams) or the Department of Quality Assurance and Enhancement.

² The [Credit Control and Debt Management Policy](#) lists sanctions which may be applied to students with overdue debt.

- 7.1 The maximum period of study is:
- In the case of an award for which the period of study is specified as 2 years or less, the period can be extended by a maximum of 1 year; and,
 - In the case of awards for which the period of study is specified as more than 2 years, the period can be extended by a maximum of 2 years.
- 7.2 Regulation 7.1 applies to both full-time and part-time programmes. In the case of part-time programmes the specified duration of part-time study should be used as the basis for determining that maximum extension.
- 7.3 Reasonable adjustments to the maximum period of study may require to be made in line with the Equality Act 2010.

8. Withdrawal of a student from a programme

- 8.1 A Progression and Award Board may require an undergraduate student to withdraw from their programme provided that:
- i) either, the candidate has, on a previous occasion, failed to progress normally;
 - ii) and/or there is evidence that the student has failed to engage with the programme;
 - iii) and/or the board is fully satisfied, both on the basis of assessment evidence and of tutors' reports, that the student concerned would be unable to benefit from the programme.
 - iv) and/or the length of study has reached the maximum period of registration.

The Progression and Award Board minutes must show which of the above criteria has/have been applied.

- 8.2 A Progression and Award Board may, exceptionally, require a candidate to withdraw from a programme after a first diet. There must be clear grounds based on the criteria in 8.1 and the Progression and Award Board minutes must show which criteria has/have been applied.
- 8.3 In all instances where a candidate has been withdrawn from a programme, the student must be offered guidance, advice and support as to their future options. Such guidance, advice and support will normally be provided by the student's Personal Tutor, or where this is not possible, by another appropriate member of academic staff who is an officer of the programme concerned.
- 8.4 In line with regulation 4.3, a student has the right of Appeal of a decision of a Progression and Award Board regarding Withdrawal from a programme.

9. Scheme of Assessment

- 9.1 During each Academic Session (September-June) there will be a first and second diet assessment for all modules at all levels.

- 9.2 Modules will be assessed during the trimester(s) in which they have been completed.
- 9.3 Resit assessments for modules delivered in Trimesters A and/or B will be held prior to the start of the next session. For Taught Postgraduate programmes with a Trimester B start (i.e. non-standard start programmes), Trimester C will be utilised for first Trimester resits.
- 9.4 Entry to an assessment on a second or subsequent occasion, whether or not at a second diet of assessments, shall be subject to such procedures as the Senate may approve from time to time and to such additional fees as the University Court may from time to time determine.
- 9.5 Programme and module handbooks shall specify for each level of the programme/module:
- a) the modules to be assessed;
 - b) where applicable, the percentage marks awarded to each discrete element of the assessment for each module;
 - c) the conditions necessary to satisfy the Examiners in any one module;
 - d) for undergraduate programmes, the approved criteria for progression whereby candidates will satisfy the Examiners at each level of the programme; and,
 - e) the number and level of the credit points earned for each module when the assessment criteria are satisfied;
 - f) that for modules undertaken for the purposes of mobility/exchange a handbook is issued to students. This handbook should also be issued to exchange/mobility coordinators. It is required that explicit arrangements for the calculation and reporting of the mark achieved (i.e. the equivalency to be applied at GCU for report to Progression and Award Boards for the purposes of progression and/or final award decision), are contained within the handbook.
- 9.6 Where appropriate, Progression and Award Boards may modify the form of assessment for individual students.
- 9.7 The Programme Board must be satisfied that, for each module, the coursework/laboratory schedule is made available to students at the beginning of each trimester and that students are informed of the submission dates for that module. Under normal circumstances, it is expected that the Module Leader will perform this duty, using the guidance contained within the Assessment Preparation Guidance for Academic Staff, as a template. It is the responsibility of the Module Leader to ensure that adequate arrangements are in place for the recording of the receipt of coursework from students.
- 9.8 Where there are sound academic and Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body reasons, Programme Boards may seek approval from the School Board for a minimum attendance requirement in respect of specific modules or for all, or parts of, a particular programme. The relevant Programme Boards must liaise to ensure that module, programme and student handbooks clearly identify where this regulation is to be applied and the penalty for failure to meet the minimum attendance requirement. In addition, Programme Boards must ensure that students are informed of any regulations, which specify penalties that may result from failure to meet the submission dates for coursework, at the beginning of the session.

- 9.9 In cases where attendance at specific classes is essential, generally to satisfy Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements, the module handbook shall specify these classes. The Module Leader must ensure that all students are informed via the module handbook.
- 9.10 Students must not attempt to use the same substantive piece of coursework to meet the assessment requirements of another item of coursework, dissertation or project. In a situation where a Progression and Award Board believes there is evidence that a student has attempted to use the same substantive piece of work for more than one item of coursework, the matter will be dealt with as Plagiarism and pursued in line with the Code of Student Conduct. Both module tutors and students must be aware of this regulation and it is the responsibility of module tutors to ensure that assessment topics do not overlap significantly.

At SCQF level 8 and above the following statement should be incorporated into any piece of coursework submitted by a student:

“This piece of coursework is my own original work and has not been submitted elsewhere in fulfilment of the requirement of this or any other award.”

10. Coursework – Late Submission and Failure to Submit

- 10.1 In each of the following eventualities, it is the Module Leader who has the responsibility for determining a new submission date. It is the responsibility of all Module Leaders who grant a new submission date to liaise with the Programme Leader in cases of a significant extension (greater than 5 working days). No extensions may be granted that extend beyond the date students receive feedback on their assessment.
- 10.2 Failure by a student to meet any given submission deadline without good cause will result in a mark of zero for the coursework element concerned.
- 10.3 Where a student has good cause, supported by documentary evidence where appropriate, for a late submission and intimates this in advance of the submission deadline, a later submission date should be negotiated with the Module Leader, or, if unavailable, the Programme Leader. In the circumstances outlined in this paragraph, no penalty for late submission will be applied. It is expected that this regulation would apply in cases such as the following: serious domestic or personal problems or attendance at the doctor, dentist, hospital, court of law or funeral.
- 10.4 Where a student has, in circumstances that could not reasonably be foreseen (supported by documentary evidence where appropriate) good cause for late submission which they have not intimated in advance, they must notify the Module Leader, (or, if unavailable, the Programme Leader) as soon as possible. Provided there are valid reasons for the late notification, a later submission date should be negotiated with the Module Leader (or, if unavailable, the Programme Leader).

However, it is acknowledged that if the notification is too close to the Progression and Award Board, a late submission date may not be possible. In the circumstances outlined in this paragraph, no penalty for late submission will be applied. It is expected that this regulation

would apply in cases where the circumstances could not reasonably have been foreseen, such as the following: serious domestic or personal problems or attendance at the doctor, dentist, hospital, or funeral.

- 10.5 Where the coursework assessment requires attendance at a specialised teaching session, either at the University (e.g. a laboratory, seminar, or clinic) or elsewhere (e.g. an industrial or clinical placement, field exercise, or laboratory visit), and, where a student has good cause for non-attendance, in line with 10.3 and 10.4, a revised submission date should be negotiated. It is acknowledged that an alternative visit or laboratory exercise may not be possible, in which case Module Leaders have discretion to provide, for example, data from another source, or similar.
- 10.6 If, in the cases of 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5 it has not been possible to arrange a late submission date, the student may use the Fit to Sit Policy, up to two days after the submission date, to advise the University, in circumstances where they were not fit to sit/submit.
- 10.7 Where it has been impossible to make alternative arrangements, and the case for the non-submission has been accepted under 10.6, Progression and Award Boards have discretion to allow an average mark for a similar exercise(s) to be used in calculating the final mark for that module. Clearly in clinically-based/workshop-based/laboratory-based modules there is a limit to the number of assessments that can be missed and the student still deemed to have reached a satisfactory standard. Where such criteria need to be satisfied, these criteria should be included and specified in the programme/module documentation and approved at Programme Approval or Review and/or by the Exceptions Subcommittee.

11. Marking and Moderation

This section should be read in conjunction with the [*GCU Assessment and Moderation Policy*](#)

- 11.1 All final level Projects and Dissertations will be marked by two independent examiners, neither of whom is aware of the views of, or the marks being awarded by, the other examiner³. In cases where the two markers are unable to produce an agreed mark, it shall be the responsibility of the Dissertation/Project Coordinator to organise further assessment of the dissertation/project by a third appropriately experienced marker in order that a mark can be determined. In such cases, the third marker will determine the final mark to be awarded.
- 11.2 Scripts and coursework relating to assessments across all SCQF levels will be moderated⁴; this will include borderline assessments, all fails and representative samples⁵. In cases where the marker and the moderator are unable to produce an agreed mark, it shall be the responsibility of the Module Leader to organise further assessment of the script by a third appropriately experienced marker in order that a mark can be determined. In such cases the third marker

³ This is often referred to as blind double marking

⁴ In this context **moderation** is taken to mean an assessment of the mark by a second marking who is aware of marks and comments made by the first marker.

⁵ In this context, a representative sample will be 10% across all bands.

will determine the final mark to be awarded. All individuals involved with marking or moderating scripts and determining a mark will initial the assessment script. In the case of final stage assessments the External Examiner(s) will be involved and may also scrutinise sufficient other assessment scripts in any subject area for which they are responsible to satisfy themselves of the general standard of assessment by Module Leaders. Module Leaders will negotiate with External Examiners to ensure that they are given sufficient time to scrutinise all scripts for the assessments for which they have responsibility. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply to all assessment diets.

- 11.3 Where a student has answered more than the required number of questions in any coursework or examination paper and has not indicated which answers are to be excluded from marking, the Module Leader must ensure that only the first questions answered are marked. For example, if a paper requires five questions to be answered and the student has attempted seven, where the student has not clearly indicated which answers should be excluded, only the first five questions answered will be marked and used to calculate the overall mark for the paper. In cases where the examination paper or coursework has more than one section, the same procedure as described above will apply to each section.
- 11.4 Module marks can only be considered as provisional prior to the meeting of the Progression and Award Board.
- 11.5 Where the provision of paragraphs 11.1 and 11.2 are not followed in their entirety, the Progression and Award Board must be provided with a full explanation for any exception in process and that explanation must be recorded in the Minutes of the Meeting.
- 11.6 Where it is considered that an irregularity in the module assessment has occurred, guidance will be sought from the Department of Quality Assurance and Enhancement.

12. Entry of Marks

- 12.1 Marks are entered into the University Management Information System as a percentage. The various data cells required for each module will have been specified in accordance with the module descriptor, including the weightings of assessment components and elements, and the calculation of the aggregate module mark will be performed automatically. The automatic calculation will produce a rounded aggregate mark for the module, based on the following rules: aggregate mark $\geq xx.5$ round up; aggregate mark $< xx.5$ round down.
- 12.2 The module marks calculated by the University Management Information System will be used in the calculation of overall credit-weighted averages for the determination of: honours classification; distinction and merit; and, compensation. The rules regarding rounding are those that apply in 12.1.
- 12.3 The mark to be recorded at second and subsequent diets shall be the actual mark achieved by the student. The actual mark obtained at resit should be used in calculations to determine the candidate's eligibility to benefit from Compensation. Where the mark must be used for the

purposes of Honours Classification, the mark obtained at any resit should be regarded as the standard undergraduate pass mark - 40%.

12.4 Progression and Award Boards will have access to records which indicate whether the candidates:

- have previously entered a module or final stage assessment and with what result(s) (including compensation);
- in the case of undergraduate programmes, have repeated any level of the programme.

13. Awarding of Credit for Modules

13.1 Module pass criteria

13.1.1 In order to satisfy the examiners in any module, candidates must normally obtain the pass mark. For undergraduate programmes, the pass mark is normally 40%. For Taught postgraduate programmes, the pass mark is normally 50%. For modules assessed by coursework and examination, candidates must obtain a mark of no more than 5% below the overall pass mark in each element of coursework and examination.

13.1.2 If the coursework component is formed of two or more coursework elements, the coursework component mark used is the aggregated mark of the constituent elements, with minimum mark requirements for each element as outlined in 13.1.1.

13.1.3 In cases where certain elements of the coursework component are deemed essential, normally due to Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements, the module descriptor shall specify these elements and the required pass mark. The Module Leader must ensure that all students are informed of any such specific requirements via the module handbook. All such cases must be approved by the Exceptions Subcommittee.

13.1.4 In line with Regulations 1.3 and 1.4, any approved deviation from the pass mark of 40% for undergraduate programmes and 50% for Taught postgraduate programmes, must detail the consequential effects, such as the minimum marks to be used in 13.1.2 and 13.1.4. Normally, such minimum marks in components and elements will be 5 percentage points below the approved modified pass mark.

13.1.5 In some instances, normally where Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements must be met in professional and clinical modules, the exception from the normal pass mark is considerable, for example 80%. Whilst the criteria for passing the module will be detailed in the programme documentation, having been approved as an exception, the module marks used in assessing overall performance, such as in Compensation and Honours Classification are likely to distort the calculations. In such cases Normalisation of the module mark must be used.

The process, including the formula to be used in the Normalisation process, must be specified and approved as an exception.

13.2 Compensation

- 13.2.1 Compensation is to make provision for allowing, within specific limits, the overall performance of a student to compensate for failure in up to and including 20 credit points of module(s) at each level of the programme.
- 13.2.2 Compensation is not intended to accommodate situations where students have advised, through the Fit to Sit policy, that they were not fit to sit/submit. In these cases Progression and Award Boards must act in accordance with the procedures set out in the Fit to Sit Policy (Section 4).
- 13.2.3 Compensation may only be awarded following delivery and assessment of all of the modules which contribute to the eligibility for an award at any given programme level and where no more than 20 credits have been failed at that level.
- 13.2.4 Compensation will not be applied in respect of a final level undergraduate project or dissertation.
- 13.2.5 The actual marks attained by the student will be used in all calculations for compensation. The purpose of this regulation is to emphasise the need to use the most recently attained resit mark for the module which is to be considered, together with the actual marks attained for all other modules passed at the same level, to determine eligibility for compensation.
- 13.2.6 It is acknowledged that some Programme Assessment Regulations may be approved with the regulation that compensation may not be exercised in respect of specified modules, for example a core module(s) which underpins a final Honours module, or where Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies insist on a pass in a named module(s).
- 13.2.7 Progression and Award Boards will apply compensation when the following conditions are satisfied:
- i) A student obtains an overall module mark of no more than 5% less than the module pass mark and the mark for each element of assessment is at most 10% less than the normal pass mark for the module.
 - ii) The student has achieved an overall aggregate mark across all modules at that level of the programme of at least 5% greater than the pass mark for the module being compensated.
 - iii) In modules where certain elements of the coursework component have been approved by the Exceptions Subcommittee as requiring a specific mark, the

student must have attained a mark no more than 5% below the minimum mark in each of these specified elements of the coursework component.

- 13.2.8 Progression and Award Boards have discretion to raise a mark by 1 percent percentage point in order to achieve compensation. This may be applied, either, to the aggregate module mark; or, to one of the Component marks; or, in the case of an approved minimum mark for a coursework element, to a coursework element.
- 13.2.9 In line with 1.3, any approved exceptions from the pass mark must accommodate consequential effects in the statement, such as the marks to be used in 13.2.7. Normally such marks will maintain the same percentage points' difference between the normal pass mark and the pass mark as specified in the approved exception.
- 13.3 Nullification of the results of an assessment of a single module at SCQF levels 9, 10 and 11. Nullification applies to all candidates undertaking the module in question. It is accepted that circumstances may arise, where a module is delivered across several campuses, which impact on the performance of a majority of candidates at a single campus only. In such instances, the Progression and Award Board may wish to consider nullification of the results of an assessment for candidates at that campus. In all cases, the following regulations will apply.
- 13.3.1 In exceptional circumstances at SCQF levels 9, 10 and 11, with the exception of modules specified as essential in response to Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirements, where in the view of the Progression and Award Board, (fully supported by the External Examiner(s), circumstances prevail whereby the overall performance of a majority of candidates in one module is clearly and obviously out of line with the overall performance of the students throughout the Programme, the Progression and Award Board may consider nullification. In such instances, the Chair of the Progression and Award Board will refer any proposal to nullify the results of that module to the PVC (L&T) and the Department of Quality Assurance and Enhancement for advice and authorisation. This action will take place in advance of the meeting of the Progression and Award Board, with a full rationale provided in support of the proposal. In such circumstances, where a request to nullify is authorised, a final pass will be recorded on the student record and the students will be credited with the credit points to be accrued from that module for final award purposes. Such actions must be fully recorded, with a clear rationale for the action included within the minute. The Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the External Examiners will also be required to sign an assent form which clearly indicates that they fully concur with this action. The minute and the assent form will be drawn to the attention of the next meeting of the Learning Enhancement Subcommittee which will require to satisfy itself as to the circumstances underlying this action, to take such follow up action is deemed appropriate and report the matter to Senate accordingly through the Academic Policy and Practice Committee.
- 13.3.2 For the purposes of the determination of distinction or merit (or honours classification based on SCQF level 10 modules only), the average mark of the remaining modules should be substituted for the mark of the nulled module in all calculations. In the case

of an Honours classification based on the best 180 credits at SCQF level 10 and SCQF level 9, the average mark will be determined by: the best remaining 160 credits in the case of a 20 credit module; and, the best remaining 170 credits in the case of a 10 credit module.

13.4 Special Circumstances outwith the Control of the Students

13.4.1 In exceptional cases where it is decided by the Progression and Award Board that an irregularity in the module assessment has occurred, the Board may either: i) re-assess the module, either in full or in part, without adding to the number of attempts; or, ii) in the case of a module at SCQF Level 9, 10 or 11, consider nullification of the module assessment in line with 13.3.

13.4.2 Actions taken must be fully recorded, with a clear rationale for the action included within the minute. The Chair of the Progression and Award Board and the External Examiners will also be required to sign an assent form which clearly indicates that they fully concur with this action. The minute and the assent form will be drawn to the attention of the next meeting of the Learning Enhancement Subcommittee which will require to satisfy itself as to the circumstances underlying this action, to take such follow up action as is deemed appropriate and report the matter to Senate accordingly through the Academic Policy and Practice Committee.

13.4.3 Where it is considered that an irregularity in the module assessment has occurred, guidance will be sought from the Department of Quality Assurance and Enhancement in advance of the meeting of the Progression and Award Board (see 11.6).

14. Maximum Number of Attempts at a Module

14.1 Subject to the Progression and Award Board's discretion to act in accordance with Regulation 8.2 (withdrawal from a Programme), a candidate is permitted the following number of attempts at a module:

- i) Where the candidate is studying at Levels SCQF 7, SCQF 8 & SCQF 9 - up to and including three attempts;
- ii) Where the candidate is studying at Levels SCQF 10 & SCQF 11 - up to and including two attempts.

The maximum number of attempts shown relates to the SCQF level of the candidate's year of study, irrespective of the SCQF level of module being undertaken.

14.2 Discretionary Attempt (Postgraduate Taught Programme)

Where a student studying on a Postgraduate Taught Programme has reached the final stage of their programme but has failed and exhausted all normal attempts on a single module, the PAB will have discretion to allow the student an extra-ordinary additional attempt at the

failed assessment. The student must have successfully completed the assessment criteria for all other modules within the programme and must meet all of the following criteria;

- i. This discretion can only apply where a student has exhausted all normal attempts at a single 15 credit module, having successfully completed all other elements;
- ii. The student must have fully engaged with the module and attempted all assessment elements of the failed module;
- iii. The Project/Dissertation module for the programme is excluded from this regulation;
- iv. The failure cannot be as a result of sanctions imposed for academic misconduct;
- v. The student must submit/re-enter the failed assessment at the next available opportunity (which will be based on the next normal opportunity, based on the delivery schedule of the module) but cannot exceed the standard maximum period of registration for the programme;
- vi. Where a programme has Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body accreditation, there may be core elements of assessment where this discretion cannot apply.

15. Failure at the First Diet

- 15.1 Candidates who fail to satisfy the Progression and Award Board at a first diet, will, subject to regulation 8.2 (withdrawal from a Programme), be required to re-enter the relevant modules at the re-assessment diet offered within the same session. Candidates on non-standard start Taught Post-graduate programmes will undertake resits after the first Trimester of study, in line with Regulation 9.3.
- 15.2 The Progression and Award Board may, however, if there is substantive evidence that the student has failed to engage with the module, require a candidate to undertake a further formal programme of study, which may include repeating the work of the individual module, either with or, exceptionally, without a requirement to attend.
- 15.3 Where a candidate fails to satisfy the Progression and Award Board in any assessable element of a module, the Examiners may amend the form of assessment to be re-entered, provided adequate notice is given to the candidate of the amended form of assessment to be set.
- 15.4 Where a candidate was unable to enter an assessment for good cause and has submitted a declaration under the Fit to Sit Policy, the Progression and Award Board will act in accordance with the procedures set out in the [Fit to Sit Policy](#).
- 15.5 Where a candidate on a Taught postgraduate programme has failed to satisfactorily complete module requirements and has 30 or more credits outstanding at the PgD exit point, the Progression and Award Board may exercise its discretion to require the student to complete any or all outstanding credit prior to undertaking the Masters Dissertation (or equivalent module).

16. Failure at the Re-Assessment Diet (Undergraduate Students)

- 16.1 Candidates are allowed to carry one 20 credit module and, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, up to 40 credits to the next level of a programme. The Progression and Award Board has the discretion to prevent this if the module has been identified in the programme documentation as a pre-requisite to a required module at the next level, and there is no opportunity for further re-assessment of the carried module prior to the required module at the next level being delivered.
- 16.2 Candidates are allowed to carry two 10 credit modules and, at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board, up to 40 credits to the next level of the programme. The Progression and Award Board has the discretion to prevent this for any 10 credit module that have been identified in the programme documentation as a pre-requisite to a required module at the next level, and there is no opportunity for further re- assessment of the carried module prior to the required module at the next level being delivered.
- 16.3 Students who are permitted to carry module(s) will be required to pursue such a programme of study in that module as the Progression and Award Board considers necessary and will be required to re-enter the assessment in that module on the next normal occasion, or when agreed by the Board. It will be the responsibility of the Programme Board to advise on appropriate levels of support to be provided to students carrying modules and the responsibility of the Dean of School to ensure this support is provided.
- 16.4 Candidates who are not permitted to proceed under the terms of 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3 will be required either to repeat the outstanding modules, normally with attendance or exceptionally without attendance.
- 16.5 The Progression and Award Board may allow a student to drop failed module(s) and take replacement module(s) at the appropriate level, provided the replacement module(s) ensure the delivery of the learning outcomes of the programme. The combined number of attempts that the student will be allowed for the original and the replacement modules shall not exceed that which would have been allowed for the original module.

17. Accumulated Credit and Repetition of Modules

- 17.1 A student cannot re-enter a module that has already been passed in order to improve his/her marks for that module. Consequently, a student who has been required to repeat a level will only be required to re-enter those modules for which they have failed to record a pass mark. The Progression and Award Board shall have the discretion to determine the components/ elements of each module which should be re-assessed.
- 17.2 In certain circumstances, for example where a student has taken a significant amount of time out from their programme and there have been significant changes to the content of a module or programme, a Progression and Award Board may require a student (or a student may request) to re-take a module and/or its assessment prior to progression to a higher level.

- 17.3 A registered student may attend classes in order to improve their knowledge of a module that has already been passed. Such attendance will not involve any assessment or extra payment over and above that which has already been paid. The student must seek advice from their Personal Tutor or, where this is not possible, by another appropriate member of academic staff who is an officer of the programme concerned. The student must confirm in writing that they have received advice and that attendance at such classes is not detrimental to other modules which they may be taking.

18. Awards

- 18.1 The Definitive Programme Document and Programme Handbook, will specify the modules and their assessment components in which a candidate must satisfy the Examiners in order to be recommended for an award. The programme will have been approved/re-approved, including confirmation that it conforms to the [University Qualifications Framework](#).
- 18.2 University awards will only be conferred on students who are exiting the University with an appropriate number of credit points or who have successfully completed their programme of study.
- 18.3 The issuing of University awards shall be subject to such procedures as the Senate may approve from time to time and to the payment of such fees as the University Court may from time to time determine. These are detailed in the [University's Graduation and Awards Regulations](#).

19. Merit or Distinction for Unclassified Awards

- 19.1 When the Progression and Award Board is satisfied that a candidate has shown special performance in assessment, it may recommend that the award be granted 'with merit' or 'with distinction'.
- 19.2 The criteria for the award of 'with Merit' or 'with Distinction' are as follows:
- 19.2.1 Merit: i) overall credit-weighted average of the modules used in the calculation, as specified in 19.2.3, within the range 65% to 69%, and ii) passed all modules (irrespective of module level) undertaken in the final stage of the award at first attempt, and iii) passed all modules included in the calculation at the first attempt.
- 19.2.2 Distinction: i) overall credit-weighted average of the modules used in the calculation, as specified in 19.2.3, equal to 70% or greater, and ii) passed all modules undertaken at the level of the award at first attempt, and iii) passed all modules included in the calculation at the first attempt with a mark of 55% or greater and (iv) for Taught postgraduate awards with a project/dissertation module (or equivalent), the mark for that module is no less than 70%.

19.2.3 Modules to be used in the calculation of merit and distinction are as follows:

Award	Level	Credit points	Calculation
Certificate of HE	SCQF 7	120	All 120 credits
Diploma of HE	SCQF 8	240	120 credits - 90 credit points at SCQF 8, and 30 from the remainder
Bachelors Degree	SCQF 9	360	120 credits - 90 credit points at SCQF 9, and 30 credit points from either SCQF 9 or SCQF 8
Graduate Certificate	SCQF 9	60	All 60 credit points
Graduate Diploma	SCQF 9	120	All 120 credit points
Masters (following an integrated programme from undergraduate to Masters level study)	SCQF 11	600	All 120 credit points at SCQF 11
Postgraduate Certificate	SCQF 11	60	60 credits - A minimum of 40 credits at SCQF 11
Postgraduate Diploma	SCQF 11	120	120 credits -A minimum of 90 credits at SCQF 11
Masters	SCQF 11	180	180 credits - A minimum of 150 credits at SCQF 11
CPD awards	various	20	All 20 credit points

For the avoidance of doubt, candidates must have achieved the number of credits shown in the 'Credit Points' column above, to be considered for a GCU award with Merit/Distinction. Candidates with accepted RPL/RPiL claims cannot be awarded a Merit/Distinction award; such credit is ungraded, as outlined in the GCU Recognition of Prior Learning Policy.

Classification of Honours Awards (Undergraduate programmes)

For all students entering year one of an undergraduate programme from September 2023 onwards, on programmes where these Assessment Regulations apply, the way in which the University calculates Honours degrees will change. This change will be applicable to Honours degree awards from Academic Year 2026/27 onwards and further information is available [here](#).

19.3 The following Honours classification scheme should be applied to all programmes except where another scheme has been approved as an exception. Where an exception has been approved, the exception must draw reference to the replacement regulations in force to replace Section 19.4 and Section 19.6-19.9 (inclusive) of these Regulations.

- 19.4 In the first instance, students will be classified using an overall credit-weighted average mark of a Calculation Set⁶. This classification may be adjusted upwards in specific cases on the basis of profiling (19.8) and on the basis of a wider consideration of a student’s performance (19.9).
- 19.5 In no circumstance can the classification produced by the overall credit-weighted average mark be downgraded.
- 19.6 Where a module has been passed at a second or subsequent attempt, the pass mark for the module, rather than the actual mark awarded, will be used in the consideration of whether the module has to be included in the Calculation Set. For example, a mark at second attempt of 53% will be replaced by a mark of 40%, if that is the pass mark for that module.
- 19.7 Calculation of the credit-weighted average mark and the determination of classification are as follows:
- 19.7.1 The credit-weighted average mark to be used is that from a set of SCQF 10 and SCQF 9 modules that comprise 180 credits in total, and produce the highest credit-weighted average mark. The set of modules (termed the Calculation Set) must include at least 90 credits at SCQF 10, and include a Dissertation if it is part of the programme.
- 19.7.2 In the special case of the direct entry to level 4, the classification is based on the overall credit-weighted average mark of 120 credits, including at least 90 credits at SCQF 10 and the remainder at SCQF 9 or above.
- 19.7.3 The classification scheme based on the overall credit-weighted average of the Calculation Set is as follows:

Honours Classification	Credit-weighted average of the calculation set
First Class Honours	> = 70%
Second Class (upper division) Honours	60-69%
Second Class (lower division) Honours	50-59%
Third Class Honours	40-49%

- 19.8 In cases where the overall credit-weighted average used in the calculation is within 3% of attaining the 50%, 60% and 70% boundaries (i.e. 47-49%, 57-59%, 67-69%), the Progression and Award Board must also take into account the marks’ profile of the calculation set to establish if they are eligible for a raised classification. Please see Honours profiling guidance examples shown in the, [Examples of Honours Classification Profiling](#).

⁶ The calculation set for a candidate is specified in section 19.7, and is used for the determination of the credit-weighted average and the marks’ profile.

19.8.1 Classification of an Honours award in terms of the profile of an individual's performance can be determined with each module in the Calculation Set being marked in accordance with the following scheme:

First class	70-100%
Second class (upper division)	60-69%
Second class (lower division)	50-59%
Third class	40-49%

19.8.2 In the case of a classification determined in line with 19.7.1, the classification will be upgraded from that calculated from the credit-weighted average, if:

i. a higher classification than that determined from the credit-weighted average of the Calculation Set is reached in 120 of the 180 credit points;

and,

ii. the classification in no more than 30 credit points of the Calculation Set is below the classification obtained from the credit-weighted average of the Calculation Set;

and,

iii. in the case of a potential upgrading to a First Class award, no modules taken in the final two levels of the programme have been compensated.

19.8.3 In the case of a classification determined in line with 19.7.2 (Direct Entry to Level 4), the classification will be upgraded from that calculated from the credit-weighted average, if:

i. a higher classification than that calculated from the credit-weighted average of the Calculation Set is reached in 80 of the 120 credit points,

and,

ii. the classification in no more than 20 credit points of the Calculation Set is below the classification from the credit-weighted average of the Calculation Set.

and,

iii. in the case of potential upgrading to a First Class award, no modules taken have been compensated.

19.9 If, following the application of 19.7 and 19.8 there are particular cases where a student's performance is close to a boundary, it may be necessary to view that student's performance

in any or all of the following before reaching a final decision as to whether an upgrading of a classification is appropriate:

- i. each element of the final assessments;
- ii. the student's complete undergraduate performance; and,
- iii. an oral assessment, in line with Section 20.1 below.

19.10 A candidate allowed to re-enter an Honours assessment may, where appropriate, be offered an exit award of unclassified degree; the candidate may choose not to accept the unclassified degree but, if the exit award is accepted, the candidate will not thereafter be eligible to re-enter the assessment for the Honours degree as part of a continuous programme.

20. Oral Assessment

20.1 In circumstances as described in 19.7, oral assessments for particular Honours candidates may be arranged. In these cases it is recommended that an informal meeting of the relevant Module Leaders prepare a list of borderline and other students to be assessed orally by the External Examiners, who must be consulted before the final list is agreed. Oral assessments must be arranged in sufficient time to allow the External Examiners to provide a considered assessment at the formal meeting of the Progression and Award Board. Oral assessments of students may be beneficial to External Examiners in assisting them to make recommendations as to whether an upgrading of classification is appropriate and therefore must be arranged in sufficient time to allow the External Examiners to provide a considered assessment at the formal meeting of the Progression and Award Board.

21. Additional Arrangements

21.1 In special circumstances or where a candidate is unable to satisfy the relevant Progression and Award Board in course work, laboratory work, formal exams or other work assessed during a module, the Progression and Award Board may require a student to present him/herself for oral, practical or other additional assessments at any stage of the programme. In situations where a formal examination has been declared invalid, for whatever reason, a Progression and Award Board may require a candidate or candidates to present themselves for an alternative assessment. The results of such assessments may be used by Progression and Award Boards to supplement assessed course work and other formal assessments.

22. Valid Reasons for Poor Performance at any level

22.1 In the case of individual students, where a student has used the Fit to Sit Policy to advise that they were not fit to sit/submit, the Progression and Award Board shall act in accordance with the provisions set out in the Fit to Sit Policy.

23. Aegrotat Awards

- 23.1 In the case of individual students, where there the Progression and Award Board is satisfied that the student would have qualified for the award for which they were a candidate had it not been for illness/personal difficulties or other cause, an aegrotat award may be recommended, e.g.:
- Aegrotat Certificate of Higher Education
 - Aegrotat Diploma of Higher Education
 - Aegrotat Degree
 - Aegrotat Honours Degree
 - Aegrotat Masters Degree (integrated programme from undergraduate to masters level study).
- 23.2 Such an award is should be recommended only exceptionally and normally in circumstances where reassessment within an acceptable timescale would not be possible for the candidate concerned.
- 23.3 Before a recommendation of the Progression and Award Board is confirmed under 24.1, the student concerned must have signified that he/she is willing to accept the aegrotat award.

24. Students notified by the Finance Office as Debtors

- 24.1 In cases where a School has received notification that a student owes outstanding debt to the University, the [Credit Control and Debt Management Policy](#) will apply.

25. School-based Generic Awards – Replacement of Modules

- 25.1 Students, with the exception of international students currently registered as GCU on a General Student visa (see 25.6 below), who require up to and including 40 credits for the completion of an exit award may transfer from their programme of study to the appropriate School-based Generic Award.
- 25.2 It will be at the discretion of the Progression and Award Board to determine the appropriateness of transferral to a School-based Generic Award, on a case by case basis, for any student with up to and including 40 credits outstanding from their programme of study. The Progression and Award Board shall have the discretion to either:
- i) Transfer the student to an appropriate School-based Generic Award, where the student will undertake up to 40 credits, an on successful completion, become eligible for a Generic Award⁷, or;

⁷ The option of transferral to a School-based Generic Award is not available at Honours Degree level for students who have failed the Honours project/dissertation associated with their original programme of study.

- ii) Require the student to exit from the University with such credit and awards as have been achieved on the student's original programme of study. Section 8.1 of the Assessment Regulations will apply and inform the Progression and Award Board's deliberations when considering this course of action.

In all cases, the supporting rationale for the decision taken by the Progression and Award Board will be fully documented in the Progression and Award Board minutes.

- 25.3 Notwithstanding the provisions elsewhere in these assessment regulations, students who transfer to school-based generic awards and undertake replacement modules will be permitted the number of attempts specified in Section 14 of the Regulations for completion of replacement modules. Students who fail to complete a replacement module within the permitted number of attempts will not be permitted to undertake any further modules as a replacement for the module not completed and will be required to exit, as appropriate, with such credit and awards as have been achieved.
- 25.4 The normal regulations governing compensation shall be applied within school-based generic awards.
- 25.5 Students undertaking school-based generic awards shall be subject to the same regulations governing distinction and honours classification as all other students. Replacement modules passed as a first attempt shall not be subject to capping and may count towards distinction and honours classification. In the case of honours classification for Undergraduate students, the classification scheme to be applied shall be that applied within the programme from which the student transferred.
- 25.6 International students currently registered at GCU on a General Student visa who have failed on their named programme of study, with a maximum of 40 credits outstanding, and who wish to exit with an award of the University, should be appropriately advised of their options. These are:
 - i) Returning to their home country to apply for a Short Term Study Visit Visa that will allow them entry to the UK for a short period of time to undertake up to a maximum of 40 credits for the award of an appropriate school-based generic degree;
 - ii) The possibility, if the provision exists, that they may be able to access a module/s in a distance learning mode from their home country.