

Annex A.1 Academic Regulations and Credit Framework for taught programmes of study

Policy owner:	Northern School of Contemporary Dance – Quality Office
Lead contact:	Head of Quality & Compliance
Audience:	Applicants/Students/Staff for Northern School of Contemporary Dance Courses of higher education
Approving body:	Northern School of Contemporary Dance: Senate
Date approved:	October 2025*
Policy Implementation date:	This policy takes effect from September 2025
Supersedes:	
Previous approved version(s) dates:	N/A
Review cycle:	Annually
Next review due date:	July 2026
Related Statutes, Ordinances, General Regulations	N/A
Related Policies, Procedures and Guidance:	Academic Misconduct Policy & Procedures Mitigating Circumstances Policy & Procedures Board of Examiners Policy & Procedures Academic Appeals Policy & Procedures Curriculum Design Policy
UK Quality Code reference:	QAA Quality Code Expectations for Quality; Advice and Guidance: Teaching, learning and assessment
OfS Conditions reference:	Condition: B & C conditions
Equality and Diversity Considerations:	Policy should be available in accessible format for all students.
Date Equality and Diversity Assessment Completed:	
Further information: *Degree awarding powers confirmed July 2025 after final Senate of 2024/25, these regulations were implemented from September 2025	

The Academic Framework regulations should be read in conjunction with the relevant School policies:
<https://www.nscd.ac.uk/policies-and-procedures/>

Contents

Section 1: Credit Framework	4
1.1. Introduction	4
1.2. Admissions	4
1.3. Programmes of Study.....	5
1.4. Levels of Study	5
1.5. Level Descriptors.....	6
1.6. Academic Delivery	9
1.7. Stages	9
1.8. Modules	9
1.9. Credits & ECTS	10
1.10. Duration of Study & Time Limits.....	10
1.11. Programmes of Study that include a Pathway	11
1.12. Proposals for New Programmes of Study	11
Section 2: Assessment Regulations	12
2.1. Introduction	12
2.2. Principles of Assessment.....	12
2.3. Marking Scale	13
2.4. Information Available to Students.....	14
2.5. Assessment Modes	14
2.6. Inclusive Assessment	16
2.7. Alternative Assessment	16
2.8. Re-sit Tasks	17
2.9. Marking	17
2.10. Principles of Moderation	18
2.11. Modes of Moderation	19
2.12. Feedback	20
Section 3: Award of Credit & Progression	22
3.1. Introduction	22
3.2. Successful Completion of a Module	22
3.3. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)	23
3.4. Compensation.....	23
3.5. Mitigating Circumstances & Concessionary Measures	23
3.6. Condonement (Concession)	24
3.7. Disregarding (Concession)	24
3.8. Trailing & Retrieving Credit (Concession)	24
3.9. Concurrent Application of Compensation & Concessionary Measures	25

3.10.	Resits	26
3.11.	Capped Resits	27
3.12.	Un-Capped Resits (Concession)	27
3.13.	Interruption of Studies	27
3.14.	Withdrawal of Studies	28
Section 4: Award Regulations		29
4.1.	Introduction	29
4.2.	Rounding & Display of Marks	29
4.3.	Exit Awards.....	29
4.4.	Classification of Awards	30
4.5.	Withholding Awards.....	31
4.6.	Aegrotat Awards	31
4.7.	Posthumous Awards.....	32
Section 5: Quality Assurance		32
5.1.	Introduction	32
5.2.	Marking & Moderation	32
5.3.	External Examiners	32
5.4.	Boards of Examiners	32
5.5.	Academic Misconduct	33
5.6.	Academic Appeals.....	33
5.7.	Delegation of Powers & Dispensation from Regulations	34

Section 1: Credit Framework

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. NSCD operates a credit-based Academic Framework applicable to all taught NSCD programmes that lead to a validated award. The Senate approves all programmes of study and modules, including any subsequent amendments.
- 1.1.2. Courses that are delivered by or on behalf of NSCD are subject to the terms and requirements of these regulations and also to *NSCD's Quality Code*.
- 1.1.3. NSCD may make changes to a programme of study or module where such changes are deemed to be beneficial to students or are minor in nature and unlikely to impact negatively upon students or become necessary due to circumstances beyond the control of NSCD. Such events are rare, but where this does happen NSCD operates a policy of consultation, advice and support to all enrolled students affected by a proposed change to their programme or module. Where changes are proposed which will affect existing students, programme teams must ensure that those students will not be disadvantaged by the change. Examples of essential change include changes enabling new research to be brought into the curriculum, or changes that are subsequently agreed in response to concerns expressed by students, external examiners or in line with changes in the industry in which we are training students to enter. Oversight and approval of changes through review and minor change processes provide an additional safeguard to the student experience of continuing students.
- 1.1.4. All programmes leading to NSCD awards are expected to operate within the Academic Regulations and Credit Framework.
- 1.1.5. Applications for variance must be submitted before validation and resubmitted prior to subsequent validations (*see appendix A.1a*).
- 1.1.6. All programmes must be designed, taught and assessed in English.

1.2. Admissions

- 1.2.1. The recommended minimum age to study a Certificate of Higher Education is 16 years old.
- 1.2.2. The minimum age to study a Diploma of Higher Education or Degree Programme at the School is usually at least 17 years at enrolment. There is no upper age limit.
- 1.2.3. The usual age to study a Masters degree is 20 years old. There is no upper age limit.
- 1.2.4. Applicants for admission to postgraduate programmes of study should normally be expected to have an Honours degree in an appropriate subject awarded by a UK University or equivalent. Holders of other qualifications should be considered individually.

1.3. Programmes of Study

- 1.3.1. Each award is constructed as a programme of study (also referred to as a programme) based on a credit framework.
- 1.3.2. Each programme consists of a predefined set of modules, which must add up to the credit value of the awarded qualification.
- 1.3.3. Each module is an individually contained unit of learning with a defined educational aim and scope. Each module is individually assessed with an ascribed credit value.
- 1.3.4. The programme title must be clear, unambiguous and accurately represent the nature and field(s) of study undertaken. Every validated NSCD award must have a programme specification. A programme specification is a concise description of the intended learning outcomes of a programme and how these outcomes can be achieved and demonstrated. Programme and module rules must align with the Academic Regulations and Credit Framework, except and unless Programme Approval Sub Committee (PASC), has agreed to a variance (*see appendix A.1a*)
- 1.3.5. In order to be eligible for an award from NSCD, a student must take an approved programme 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 programme of study. Each programme of study comprises a number of modules, usually at different levels and stages (*see 1.4 and 1.7*) 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 3*).

1.4. Levels of Study

- 1.4.1. NSCD has adopted, as the definitions of levels 4 to 8, the qualification level descriptors as set out in the *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications for England, Wales and Northern Ireland* (FHEQ), published by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA). The University definition of level 3 is the descriptor as proposed by the Southern England Consortium for Credit Accumulation and Transfer in Credit Level Descriptors for Further and Higher Education, January 2003.
- 1.4.2. Each module and programme within the School's Credit Framework must be at one and only one of levels 3 through to 7.
- 1.4.3. 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."

- 1.4.4. Years of study on programmes are designed to fit around the framework levels of the Framework Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) ¹with each programme corresponding to the framework level descriptor.

Level	Qualifications
Level 3	Further Education (Access inc. Level 0)
Level 4	Certificate of Higher Education (Cert HE)
Level 5	Diploma of Higher Education (Dip HE)
Level 6	BA (Hons), BA
Level 7	PgCert, PgDip, MA

1.5. Level Descriptors

- 1.5.1. The following level descriptors have been drawn from the QAA Framework for higher education published February 2024: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/the-frameworks-for-higher-education-qualifications-of-uk-degree-awarding-bodies-2024.pdf?sfvrsn=3562b281_11

	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:
Level 3	<p>i) a limited factual and conceptual knowledge base, with some appreciation of the breadth of the field of study and the relevant terminology;</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>a) apply knowledge and skills within a defined context and evaluate own strengths and weaknesses within criteria largely set by others;</p> <p>b) within a defined context, manage information and collect data from a range of straightforward sources;</p> <p>c) apply given tools/methods to a well-defined problem and show emerging recognition of the complexity of associated issues.</p> <p>And will have:</p> <p>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.</p>

¹ <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/qualifications-frameworks>

Level 4	<p>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;</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>a) evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work;</p> <p>b) communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments;</p> <p>c) undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment.</p> <p>And will have:</p> <p>d) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.</p>
Level 5	<p>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>iv) an understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge.</p>	<p>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>c) undertake further training, develop existing skills, and acquire new competences that will enable them to assume significant responsibility within organisations.</p> <p>And will have:</p> <p>d) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision-making.</p>
Level 6	<p>i) a systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study,</p>	<p>a) apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review,</p>

	<p>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;</p> <p>ii) an ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline;</p> <p>iii) conceptual understanding that enables the student 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;</p> <p>iv) an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge;</p> <p>v) 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).</p>	<p>consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>c) communicate information, ideas, problems, and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>And will have:</p> <p>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.</p>
Level 7	<p>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;</p> <p>ii) a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship;</p> <p>iii) 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;</p>	<p>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;</p> <p>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;</p> <p>c) continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.</p> <p>And will have:</p>

	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.	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.
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1.6. Academic Delivery

- 1.6.1. A standard academic year's duration for a student on a full time programme is three terms (Autumn, Spring & Summer) for all undergraduate programmes and for a Postgraduate Diploma. A term is up to 13 weeks in duration.
- 1.6.2. For students studying for a full Masters programme of study the academic year comprises of Autumn, Spring and an extended Summer term of up to 18 weeks.
- 1.6.3. The distribution of credit within a level should be balanced between terms wherever possible.
- 1.6.4. Any other year-long delivery is permitted as an approved variance request during the validation or programme review process (*see appendix A.1a*)
- 1.6.5. Opportunities for study abroad may be provided in some full-time programmes delivered at NSCD, either one or two terms, usually at Level 5 (*see Annex A.6 Study Abroad Framework*).

1.7. Stages

- 1.7.1. Most programmes of study are divided into a number of stages and students must achieve specified requirements in each stage before being permitted to progress to the next stage.
- 1.7.2. For undergraduate honours degree programmes, a stage should normally consist of modules amounting to 120 credits. Undergraduate programmes of study comprising 120 credits or less should normally consist of a single stage.
- 1.7.3. In Masters programmes, stage 1 represents 120 credits of study before progressing to complete the final 60 credits research project / dissertation.

1.8. Modules

- 1.8.1. A module is a self-contained component of a programme or programmes of study with defined learning outcomes, curriculum content overview, delivery modes and assessment requirements.

- 1.8.2. A module must correspond to a multiple of 15 credits.
- 1.8.3. The module specification is the validated source of information about the module. It includes the level, credit rating, aims, learning outcomes, the assessment components and weightings, learning activities and outline syllabus.
- 1.8.4. Programmes of study consist of either Core (compulsory) modules which are prescribed to a level of study or Option (optional choice) modules which students can choose to a maximum credit value up to a total value for the level of study. It is not uncommon that some levels of programmes have only core modules.
- 1.8.5. At Levels 4, 5 and 6 the maximum number of modules permitted per level per individual student is seven and per individual student per programme is 21.
- 1.8.6. At Level 7 of a postgraduate programme the maximum number of modules permitted per individual student is seven.

1.9. Credits & ECTS

- 1.9.1. Modules must comprise of multiple of 15 credits (15, 30, 45, 60, 75, 90 credits) except for a research project/dissertation module at Level 6 and Level 7 which must comprise of 30, 45 or 60 credits.
- 1.9.2. One credit equates to 10 hours of learning. A standard academic year for a full-time student studying an undergraduate programme and a postgraduate diploma equates to 120 credits and 1200 notional hours of learning. A standard academic year for a full-time student studying a full Postgraduate Masters programme equates to 180 credits and 1800 notional hours of learning.
- 1.9.3. The European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (ECTS) is based on the principle that 60 ECTS credits are equivalent to the learning outcomes and associated workload of a typical full-time academic year of formal learning. Therefore two NSCD credits are equivalent to one ECTS credit.

1.10. Duration of Study & Time Limits

- 1.10.1. A student must complete the programme within the maximum period shown below, to include any periods in which the student has suspended study. The maximum period of study should exclude interruptions that derive from periods during which students have been unable to engage with their studies due to reasons linked to protected characteristics.

Award	Minimum period of study (academic years)	Maximum period for the completion of a programme of study
Access, Level 3 or Level 0	1 year	2 years
Certificate of Higher education	1 year	4 years

Diploma of Higher Education	2 years	5 years
Bachelor's degree with honours	3 years	6 years
Postgraduate Certificate / Diploma or Masters	1 year	6 years

1.11. Programmes of Study that include a Pathway

- 1.11.1. A programme of study may include one or more pathways. Where a programme is designed to include a pathway, the pathway must 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 must 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 term in parentheses, indicating the distinctive nature of the pathway's content and learning. Note: the distinctive programme-level learning outcomes of the pathway may be provided by compulsory modules that are also optional in other pathways or an associated generalist programme specification.
- 1.11.2. 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').

1.12. Proposals for New Programmes of Study

- 1.12.1. New NSCD programmes should be proposed by each Faculty Team and approved by the Programme Approval Sub-Committee (PAsC) before being considered by relevant Learning, Teaching & Quality Assurance Committee and Senate.
- 1.12.2. For new partnerships due diligence checks should be signed off by the Audit Committee prior to PAsC.
- 1.12.3. New proposals must be considered in the context of NSCD's strategic plan, the number of students to be recruited, the range of NSCD's existing programmes, their relationship to each other and to the awards of other bodies. It is only possible to award a qualification as an alternative exit award when the award has been validated as part of the programme's list of exit awards (*see Annex C.2*)

Section 2: Assessment Regulations

2.1. Introduction

- 2.1.1. These Assessment Regulations provide a comprehensive overview of assessment practices at NSCD, drawing together regulations and guidance documents to support students and staff in their practical application. These regulations have been informed by Chapter B6 of the QAA, UK Quality Code for Higher Education, are adhered to, and NSCD processes are mapped against QAA Guiding Principles 1-10 <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/quality-code/advice-and-guidance/assessment#>
- 2.1.2. These regulations should be read in conjunction with *Annex A.2 Mitigating Circumstances Policy & Procedures* and *Annex A.3 Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures*.
- 2.1.3. With the exception of formative feedback, these regulations apply only to assessments that contribute to the final module grade conducted for the purposes of awarding credit, the right to progress, or determining a final award.
- 2.1.4. Any variations to the procedures and principles outlined here relative to specific subject specialisms and/or exceptional circumstances should be referred to Academic Regulations Sub-Committee for approval in a timely manner within the annual review cycle.
- 2.1.5. Exceptional circumstances are defined as sudden or unforeseen circumstances or events that have significant impact on teaching, learning and assessment, including, but not limited to, natural disaster, war, outbreak of disease, industrial action, significant IT failure and unforeseen building closure that prevents access to necessary resources.
- 2.1.6. The procedures and principles outlined here also apply to Academic Partners, who must provide detail of their own organisation-specific assessment procedures.

2.2. Principles of Assessment

- 2.2.1. Assessment activity and tasks must be clearly defined, with the number, timing and modes of assessment reflecting the learning within the module and the relevant level descriptors (see section 1.5).
- 2.2.2. Each assessment task must enable students to demonstrate the learning outcomes indicated on the module specification, and over the course of a module, assessment tasks must ensure that every module learning outcome is assessed.
- 2.2.3. Assessments must support student learning as well as measure achievement.
- 2.2.4. Any alterations to assessment activity or assessment processes, including agreed extensions and alternative assessments, must not unfairly disadvantage the student.
- 2.2.5. Consideration must be given to measures which will support the elimination of academic misconduct.

- 2.2.6. All assessment must be conducted against assessment criteria and grade descriptors (see *appendices A.1b and A.1c*). The number of assessment criteria should reflect the size of the assessment item and be designed to aid student understanding of the assessment task.
- 2.2.7. At enrolment all students must sign an agreement to declare that the authorship of assessed work will always be correctly attributed. Any work of others must be accurately referenced in line with task guidance and academic conventions (see *Annex A.3 Academic Misconduct Policy & Procedures*).
- 2.2.8. All assessment must be undertaken in line with all assessment guidelines from the Office for Students, including required considerations of spelling and grammar.
- 2.2.9. In order to avoid over assessment, the following maximum number of assessment tasks should be adhered to within each module:

Credit Value	Maximum assessment tasks
15	2
30	3
45	3
60 and above	4

2.3. Marking Scale

- 2.3.1. For numerically graded modules, marking tutors must apply the following numerical marking scale to all graded assessments against the relevant award of the programme of study.

Numerical Scale	Classification		
	Undergraduate		Postgraduate
100 98 96 94 92 90 88 86 84 82 80 78 76 74 72 70	First Class	Distinction	Distinction
68 66 64 62 60	Upper Second Class	Merit	Merit
58 56 54 52 50	Lower Second Class	Pass Fail	Pass
48 46 44 42 40	Third Class		Fail
38 36 34 32 30 28 26 24 22 20 10 0	Fail		

- 2.3.2. For pass/fail module, marking tutors must record a mark of pass or fail.

2.4. Information Available to Students

- 2.4.1. Assessment tasks, submission dates, submission procedures, assessment criteria, grade descriptors and information about summative feedback should be easily available to students at the start of the module. Assessment tasks should include durations/word counts, marking criteria and reference to a style guide where appropriate to the assessment task.
- 2.4.2. Where assessment information is not known at the start of the module (for example if the assessment is tied to a professional project that has not yet be scheduled), guidance around the assessment item must be given, with the exact information relayed in a timely manner.
- 2.4.3. Any amendments to assessment must be clearly and accessibly communicated to students as soon as reasonably possible.
- 2.4.4. Information about academic conventions, learner resources, learner support, re-sits, methods for requesting extensions and the procedure for making a complaint around assessment must be clear and available to all staff and students.
- 2.4.5. Consequences for late or non-submission must be made clear to students.
- 2.4.6. Should a student experience difficulty submitting work they should be advised to submit their work through another means, for example to email a copy of their work to the module tutor and/or the Quality Office along with an explanation of why they have been unable to upload their work to the electronic portal. This may be accepted as successful submission of work.

2.5. Assessment Modes

- 2.5.1. Assessment can be either summative or continuous, and can take a number of forms, including, but not limited to, technical classes, essays, reports, portfolios, presentations, lecture demonstrations, performative work, creative work, teaching practice and placement observation.
- 2.5.2. Consideration must be given to ensure that the assessment mode reflects best practice within the field of study.
- 2.5.3. Within continuous assessment students must be clearly informed around which elements of their learning are being evaluated in their assessment. This may include: attendance, punctuality, and other professional attributes demonstrated over the specified time period; preparation for sessions, as evidenced by an appropriate state of physical, creative, intellectual, and readiness to learn; commitment, engagement, and response to teaching and learning within sessions; completion of directed study tasks & engagement with self-directed learning.
- 2.5.4. Consideration must be given to the balance of group assessment within the programme of study in relation to accurately reflecting individual attainment within the final mark profile.

- 2.5.5. Information must be given over the nature of the group assessment and the process by which the final mark is arrived at, including whether there is any individualisation of marks.
- 2.5.6. Clear guidance must be offered around how any individual roles are assigned within the group, how the group are expected to work together, and how this impacts on the marking process. This may be supported by guidelines for conflict resolution.
- 2.5.7. Within any module which contributes to degree classification learning activity is based solely around group working, assessment should include at least one element that enables students to be assessed individually and allow individualisation of marks, for example through a contextualising or reflective piece of work.
- 2.5.8. The size of each assessment task must reflect the size of credit value of the module and the weighting of the individual assessment within the module. The following guidelines may be used in setting different modes of assessment.
- 2.5.9. Length of assessment is guided towards the lower end of the scale for lower level first time assessment (i.e. Level 4) and towards the upper end for higher level assessment (i.e. Level 6 or 7).

Assessment Type:	Module credit value	Suggested Item Assessment weighting	Suggested typical length
Written coursework	60 credits	100%	8,000 – 12,000 words
		75%	6,000 – 9,000 words
		50%	4,000 – 6,000 words
		25%	2,000 – 3,000 words
	30 credits	100%	4,000 – 6,000 words
		75%	3,000 – 4,500 words
		50%	2,000 – 3,000 words
		25%	1,000 – 1,500 words
	15 Credits	100%	2,000 – 3,000 words
		75%	1,500 – 2,250 words
		50%	1,000 – 1,500 words
		25%	500 – 750 words

Assessment Type:	Module credit value	Suggested Item Assessment weighting	Suggested typical length
Presentations and group performance (context dependant)	60 credits	100%	48 – 72 minutes
		75%	36 – 54 minutes
		50%	24 – 36 minutes
		25%	12 – 18 minutes
	30 credits	100%	27 – 36 minutes
		75%	18 – 27 minutes
		50%	9 – 18 minutes

		25%	6 – 9 minutes
	15 Credits	100%	12 – 18 minutes
		75%	9 – 14 minutes
		50%	6 – 9 minutes
		25%	3 – 5 minutes

Assessment Type:	Module credit value	Suggested Item Assessment weighting	Suggested typical length
Creative work and solo performance (context dependant)	60 credits	100%	16 – 32 minutes
		75%	12 – 24 minutes
		50%	8 – 16 minutes
		25%	4 – 8 minutes
	30 credits	100%	8 – 16 minutes
		75%	6 – 12 minutes
		50%	4 – 8 minutes
		25%	2 – 4 minutes
	15 Credits	100%	4 – 8 minutes
		75%	3 – 6 minutes
		50%	2 – 4 minutes
		25%	1 – 2 minutes

2.6. Inclusive Assessment

- 2.6.1. All assessments must be made as accessible as possible to students identifying as having a disability, conforming to The Equality Act 2010 and NSCDs Equality, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Policy.
- 2.6.2. Within a programme of study variety should be offered, so that students have the opportunity to submit work in a range of different modes.
- 2.6.3. All assessment items should include a range of complementary assessment choices, for example a choice between an essay, verbal presentation, lecture demonstration or annotated presentation.
- 2.6.4. Students should be enabled to evidence their learning through less conventional assessment methods and approaches as appropriate to the field of study.
- 2.6.5. Any adjustments and adaptations made to assessment should be made in consultation with the student to ensure they best meet the needs of the individual.

2.7. Alternative Assessment

- 2.7.1. Within an effective inclusive assessment strategy, the vast majority of student needs should be met. However, within assessment design there are still times when further

adjustments are necessary in order to not discriminate against individual students. In these cases, alternative assessment practices must be adopted.

- 2.7.2. Alternative assessments must be provided where required, for example in relation to specific disabilities, and must align with The Equality Act 2010.
- 2.7.3. Alternative assessment arrangements may be made for students who are managing mitigating circumstances including; physical injuries, health issues or personal circumstances (*see Annex A.2 Mitigating Circumstance Policy & Procedures*) or other specific scenarios which may require adjustment, such as professional development opportunities.
- 2.7.4. Alternative assessment should enable students to engage with the programme and must enable them to demonstrate the relevant learning outcomes.
- 2.7.5. Alternative assessments must allow all processes, such as moderation and mark verification, to be completed prior to the Board of Examiners.

2.8. Re-sit Tasks

- 2.8.1. This section refers to the content of re-sit tasks, for regulations regarding the issuing of re-sits refer to sections 3.10-3.12.
- 2.8.2. Where possible students should be permitted to be reassessed on the original task. Circumstances in which it is not possible to be reassessed on the original task include: the original assessment was a group project which is not possible to repeat, there is no access to specialist resources used initially; there was input from visiting staff who are no longer available; the assessment took place on a placement.
- 2.8.3. Where it is not possible to re-sit the original task the rationale for the alternative assessment should be made clear to students as soon as reasonably possible.
- 2.8.4. Students should be permitted to reuse material from the failed assessment submission, unless that material contravenes other regulations, for example health and safety guidance.
- 2.8.5. Students must be provided with a resit brief covering the task, assessment criteria, and all other information relevant to the resit.

2.9. Marking

- 2.9.1. All student work submitted for assessment must be marked and all marking must be free from prejudice and discrimination.
- 2.9.2. All assessment items must be subject to moderation (*see sections 2.10 & 2.11*).
- 2.9.3. Staff who have a personal interest in, or relationship with, a student being assessed, must declare an interest to the Head of Faculty. This member of staff must not be involved in the

marking or moderation process.

- 2.9.4. In the case of late or non-submission of work without reasonable cause, a mark of zero will be recorded and a re-sit opportunity issued following the Board of Examiners or Module Assessment Board.
- 2.9.5. In the case of late or non-submission of work due to mitigating circumstances, such as illness or personal circumstances, the Mitigation Policy will be applied (*see Annex A.2 Mitigating Circumstances Policy & Procedures*).
- 2.9.6. All marking must *either* be undertaken by internal staff *or*, in the case of new assessors, be overseen by experienced staff.
- 2.9.7. Marking may be undertaken by external partners who have received relevant training. Where this occurs, this must be overseen by an internal member of staff, and the internal moderation report must detail the safeguards in place to ensure accuracy and transparency of marking.
- 2.9.8. The use of anonymity within student submissions may be utilised where appropriate to the assessment task and cohort size.
- 2.9.9. All marking must be undertaken in relation to the relevant assessment criteria, level and grade descriptors.
- 2.9.10. Marks must be considered provisional until confirmed by the relevant board of examiners.

2.10. Principles of Moderation

- 2.10.1. Moderation is the process used to ensure assessment outcomes are fair and reliable, and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently. It is not necessary that each individual piece of student work is moderated.
- 2.10.2. Whichever form of moderation is used for assessment it must ensure the fair, reliable and transparent application of assessment processes to student work.
- 2.10.3. Moderation must include both internal moderation, overseen by the institution, and external moderation, overseen by an external examiner (*see Annex I.1 External Advisors Policy & Procedures*).
- 2.10.4. Each module must be subject to internal moderation, with an internal moderator assigned.
- 2.10.5. Internal moderation must be undertaken by experienced staff, and be sufficient to assure the External Examiner that academic standards have been maintained, and that all marking is fair, reliable and valid.
- 2.10.6. The internal moderator should: review assessment tasks; review all student work in which the learning outcomes have not been met; review all arrangements for resits where this

deviates from the original assessment item; complete an internal moderation report outlining the moderation process and noting any observations related to the learning and assessment on the module.

- 2.10.7. Internal moderation should follow the modes of moderation outlined in section 2.11. Two modes of moderation may be used in conjunction, however in such cases a clear rationale must be given in the internal moderator report.
- 2.10.8. If any member of the marking team or the internal moderator has concerns over the accuracy of marking that cannot be resolved through the moderation process, they must refer this to the head of faculty for review.
- 2.10.9. Upon review, if marking is deemed to be inaccurate, all affected work should be remarked, and, where this is not possible, students should be given the opportunity to resubmit the assessment as for the first time.
- 2.10.10. Moderation should scrutinise work from a range of different student profiles, including consideration of the protected characteristics of The Equality Act 2010.

2.11. Modes of Moderation

- 2.11.1. Moderation can take the form of double marking (including panel assessment), sampling and moderation through mutual review.
- 2.11.2. Double marking involves two or more markers looking at every piece of work within an assessment. This method is particularly useful for modules with a high credit rating, or where there is a wide range of assessment choices. Within double marking the following procedure must be followed:
 - 2.11.2.1. All marks must be discussed within a moderation meeting.
 - 2.11.2.2. In order to ensure parity across the assessed work *either* one marker must see all work *or* marking must be shared out so that there is crossover between all members of the marking team.
 - 2.11.2.3. Marks must be determined through agreement with the different markers. Should agreement not be reached the assessment item must be referred to the Head of Faculty, who may ask to see a wider selection of assessment material.
 - 2.11.2.4. Markers may *either* mark individually prior to the panel discussion, *or* the mark can be arrived at through the panel discussion, however the process for marking must be made clear in advance to the marking panel.
 - 2.11.2.5. Within double marking one of the markers takes the role of internal moderator. This is typically the module leader.
- 2.11.3. Sampling covers a process by which work is marked individually by one or more assessors, and then a sample from the assessment is reviewed by an internal moderator. Sampling is particularly useful for low credit value modules, pass/fail modules, and assessments where it is more difficult to be viewed by a panel (for example continuous assessment and placements). Within sampling the following procedure must be followed:
 - 2.11.3.1. The internal moderator must not be involved as a marker.

- 2.11.3.2. Sampling must be undertaken on a sample size of 10% of student work, with a minimum of 6 works being sampled, and should include a range of marks across all awarded grade boundaries and review all fails.
- 2.11.3.3. Where assessment takes place over a period of time (for example in continuous assessment) the internal moderator may observe the assessment at a number of points.
- 2.11.4. Moderation through mutual review occurs when 2 or more staff mark individually and then review each other's marking to ensure parity. This is particularly useful when there is a large marking team or where there is already crossover between staff within the assessment process. Within moderation through mutual review the following procedure must be followed:
 - 2.11.4.1. All assessors must have their marking reviewed by another member of the marking team.
 - 2.11.4.2. In total 10% of student work, with a minimum of 6 works, must be reviewed, and should include a range of marks across all awarded grade boundaries and all fails.
 - 2.11.4.3. Where moderation through mutual review takes place one of the markers must take on the role of internal moderator. This is typically the module leader.

2.12. Feedback

- 2.12.1. Feedback is a vital part of the student experience, as it promotes and supports learning, which in turn assures academic standards and quality. Assessment and feedback principles should be inclusive of all students regardless of their backgrounds or experiences and should be responsive to the diverse needs of the student population.
- 2.12.2. All interactions with students, formal and informal, may offer an opportunity for feedback that supports learning and enhances the student experience, with effective feedback processes actively promoting learning and supporting the academic development of students. All feedback should be delivered in an impartial manner.
- 2.12.3. Effective feedback through assessment is a key aspect of the learning process and must be considered as a part of overall learning.
- 2.12.4. All students should receive equitable feedback experiences. Feedback must take into account any needs based on a student's Individual Support Plan.
- 2.12.5. Students should receive a variety of different feedback modes, including written and verbal, based on an inclusive feedback model. Feedback may be individual or given collectively.
- 2.12.6. Students should have the opportunity to provide feedback on their experience of assessment and feedback within a module.
- 2.12.7. Feedback typically takes the form of either formative or summative feedback.
- 2.12.8. Formative feedback relates to the students ongoing learning and often takes place within the teaching environment, including guidance on assessment tasks in the run up to assessment.

- 2.12.8.1. Tutors across a module should be clear about the amount and nature of feedback students can expect. This should be overseen by module leaders.
 - 2.12.8.2. Students should receive timely general and individualised feedback spread across the duration of the module.
 - 2.12.8.3. Information should be explicit and accessible to all students regarding when they can expect to submit drafts, attend tutorials or participate in work-in-progress sharings. This should include how and when they can expect to receive feedback.
 - 2.12.8.4. Students should have opportunity for formative feedback on their work in progress ahead of assessment. This may be given in a collective context where appropriate.
- 2.12.9. Summative feedback relates to specific feedback in relation to assessment items after assessment. This gives students key information about their achievement to date, as well as guidance for continued development.
- 2.12.9.1. Students should receive summative feedback on each assessed item. It may be appropriate to feedback on multiple assessment items at the same time. Feedback must be individual unless that item is based on group work and group feedback is more effective.
 - 2.12.9.2. All summative feedback should be accessible, explicit, rigorous, detailed, clearly related to assessment criteria.
 - 2.12.9.3. All marks and feedback should be easily accessible to the student.
 - 2.12.9.4. All assessment feedback should usually be delivered within three term time weeks. Where it is not possible to give feedback within this time frame (for example in the case of staff illness), this must be communicated to the students with a rationale given.

Section 3: Award of Credit & Progression

3.1. Introduction

- 3.1.1. Students are required to attempt all items of assessment at the appointed time as a condition of the award of credit. Failure to do so will be deemed by the Board of Examiners as a fail, unless there are accepted mitigating circumstances, following the procedures outlined in *Annex A.2 Mitigating Circumstances Policy & Procedures*.
- 3.1.2. Stage completion is achieved when a student has gained the number of credits required at that stage. Students cannot retake successfully attained modules. The progress of each student will be considered by a Board of Examiners at least once per academic year.
- 3.1.3. For full-time students on a three-year Undergraduate programme stage completion and progression are synonymous. In order to progress from one stage to the next, a full-time undergraduate student must have 120 credits at the level under consideration; or no more than 30 credits outstanding due to outstanding re-sits, trailing or concessionary measures.
- 3.1.4. Undergraduate students who have not achieved at least 60 credits (50% of the stage) may not be allowed to progress to the next stage. In these cases, it is advisable for the Board of Examiners to recommend that the student be given the option to repeat the year during the following academic year rather than undertake further assessment during the re-sit period. Depending on circumstance, the school may ask the student to consider withdrawal from the programme as an option, especially if this would lead to a student taking on additional hardship should they feel that they are likely to not engage fully with the re-sit. This recommendation would be based on academic judgement and there is, therefore, no grounds for appealing against the recommendation.
- 3.1.5. For students who enrol onto a Masters programme, in order to progress, they must complete a minimum required stage 1 credits (120 credits) before progressing onto stage 2.
- 3.1.6. The Board of Examiners is responsible for approving student progression and actions for outstanding credits. It is the responsibility of the Quality Office to provide written notification confidentially to students in accordance with the published results release date (*see Annex H.1 Board of Examiners Policy & Procedures*).

3.2. Successful Completion of a Module

- 3.2.1. A student who successfully demonstrates 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.
- 3.2.2. Where a module learning outcome is tested only in one component of assessment, the assessment in question must become pass-compulsory for the module.
- 3.2.3. In certain programmes, module assessment may be on a Fail/Pass or a Fail/Pass/Merit/Distinction basis and numerical marks will not be awarded.

- 3.2.4. Except where denoted as non-compensatable or non-condonable in the relevant course specification, modules for which a pass-compulsory component of assessment has not been demonstrated may be compensated or condoned where it can be demonstrated that the programme learning outcomes for the stage have been met.
- 3.2.5. Where modules and therefore the stage are marked on a Pass/Fail basis, this will not result in a classified award.

3.3. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL)

- 3.3.1. The arrangements for the recognition of Prior Experiential Learning and the recognition of prior Certified Learning are set out in *Annex A.5 Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) Framework*.
- 3.3.2. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is a generic term for the process by which Higher Education Providers recognise and, where appropriate, award credit for learning that has taken place before entry onto a programme of study.
- 3.3.3. The Credit Framework limits the amount of credit that can be used for RPL as detailed below:

Level of Study	Maximum credit transfer
Level 5	120
Level 6	240
Level 7	120

3.4. Compensation

- 3.4.1. Where a student fails one or more modules but has an overall module mark that falls within 5% points of the pass mark, the Board of Examiners may award the student the credits for the module(s), up to a limit of 25% of each stage of a programme of study.
- 3.4.2. For compensation to be applied, there must be evidence to show that programme learning outcomes have been achieved, and programme specifications will state which modules cannot be compensated.
- 3.4.3. Where a module is compensated, the pass mark must be used for stage and award calculations, however the original mark must stand on the student transcript and be noted that credits have been awarded via compensation.

3.5. Mitigating Circumstances & Concessionary Measures

- 3.5.1. Applications from students for mitigating circumstances must be considered by the Mitigation Sub-Committee on behalf of the Board of Examiners where they are submitted in line with the procedures set out in *Annex A.2 Mitigating Circumstances Policy & Procedures*.
- 3.5.2. If a request for mitigation is accepted, the Mitigation Sub-Committee may recommend

concessionary measures from the options of condonement, disregarding, trailing or uncapped re-sits following the regulations set out below.

- 3.5.3. The Mitigation Sub-Committee should review the full mark profile of students with submitted circumstances, to ensure any anomalies are considered.

3.6. Condonement (Concession)

- 3.6.1. Where a student fails a module or modules but it is accepted that this was due to illness or other mitigating circumstances, the Board of Examiners may condone such failure and award credits for the module(s), up to a limit of 25% of each stage of a programme of study and with the possible application of additional measures, 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, where required.
- 3.6.2. 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 Condonement.
- 3.6.3. In order to ensure that the application of Condonement does not disadvantage a student when an award is classified, 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. Programme specifications specify modules in which failure cannot be condoned.

3.7. Disregarding (Concession)

- 3.7.1. Where a student fails a component of a module or modules but it is accepted that this was due to mitigating circumstances, the Board of Examiners may disregard the failed component provided that the learning outcomes for the module(s) have been achieved and the adjusted marks accurately represent the student's achievement on the module.
- 3.7.2. Where a module component is passed with a mark significantly out of line with the student's grade profile, but it is accepted that this was due to mitigating circumstances, the Board of Examiners may disregard the affected component.
- 3.7.3. Where the module in question has been failed, disregarding must only be used for up to a maximum of 25% of the credits available for the stage. Where the module(s) in question have been passed, the disregard measures may be used without restriction.

3.8. Trailing & Retrieving Credit (Concession)

- 3.8.1. 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.

- 3.8.2. The trailing provision may be applied as a concessionary measure for students with mitigating circumstances to either defer a first attempt or undertake an un-capped re-sit in the following academic year. Trailing may also be used as a planned adjustment to a student's programme of study where appropriate (for example, if a student misses the original assessment due to an approved professional development or placement opportunity).
- 3.8.3. 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 outstanding modules. This is known as trailing credit. Where credit is trailed, the Board of Examiners may permit the student to repeat the failed/deferred 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 allow reassessment to be undertaken according to the method specified by the module specification.
- 3.8.4. Where a student trails credit in this way and again fails to obtain the credits, the credit may not be trailed to the next stage of the programme e.g. a student will not be permitted to progress to Stage 3 of a programme unless they have obtained all Stage 1 credits and met the minimum progression requirements in Stage 2. Therefore, any referral opportunity following a trailed assessment must take place in the same stage as the referral.
- 3.8.5. Students may be permitted to take a Stage 2 module before completing Stage 1 or a Stage 3 module before completing Stage 2 provided:
 - 3.8.5.1. that the Vice Principal or Chair of Board of Examiners (or nominee) has approved the arrangement in advance;
 - 3.8.5.2. 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;
 - 3.8.5.3. that any relevant prerequisite module for the current stage has been successfully completed by the student concerned.

3.9. Concurrent Application of Compensation & Concessionary Measures

- 3.9.1. The application of condonement, compensation or trailing provisions is limited to a maximum cumulative total of 25% of the credit available for any stage.
- 3.9.2. The disregarding measures for failed modules may be applied to an additional 25% of the stage.
- 3.9.3. Thus, where as much as 50% of the credit for the stage has been failed, Boards may award the credits for failed modules by applying the measures above concurrently.
- 3.9.4. Where a student has failed more than 50% of the credits it is recommended that they re-take the stage in full. However, in exceptional circumstances the above measures may be applied

up to 50% of the stage in conjunction with re-sit of the remaining credits with approval from the Board of Examiners.

3.10. Resits

- 3.10.1. Where a student has failed a module without mitigation or has reached the maximum application of concessionary measures in other modules, they will be required to take a re-sit.
- 3.10.2. At least once per term a Module Assessment Board should be held to sign off completed module marks and issue first capped re-sits, and un-capped re-sits where deemed appropriate by the Chair of the Mitigation Sub-Committee, which shall be taken in the following term. Failed assessments within the summer term should be reviewed by the Board of Examiners with a re-sit opportunity over the summer break.
- 3.10.3. Where re-sit assessment is significant, it can be advised that a manageable timeline be agreed with the student and put in writing. All students must be advised of submission deadlines for re-sits and this then set as a contract with the student.
- 3.10.4. Exceptionally, the Board of Examiners may require students to undertake certain modules again, with attendance, as part of a re-sit opportunity.
- 3.10.5. All students have the right to two capped re-sit opportunities in any failed module(s). In cases of mitigating circumstances, students may be offered an additional un-capped re-sit opportunity prior to the usual two capped re-sit opportunities.
- 3.10.6. Students retrieve their failure by resubmitting the required element of the assessment. The content and form of the re-sit are determined by the Module Leader. The form of assessment for re-sit may be different from the original assessment task (see section 2.8 for regulations relating to re-sit tasks).
- 3.10.7. Wherever possible, NSCD should provide re-sit opportunities in modules which are no longer current. The Head of Faculty must make such special arrangements, in consultation with the External Examiner.
- 3.10.8. Any student who has exhausted the re-sit opportunities offered by the regulations will be withdrawn from that programme of study.
- 3.10.9. The method of reassessment for any module may take one of two forms:
 - 3.10.9.1. 'Like-for-Like' Reassessment: in this method the student must undertake a form of reassessment that allows for a mark to be recorded against each element of assessment that has been failed.
 - 3.10.9.2. Single Instrument of Reassessment: where this method is used, the reassessment takes the form of a single piece of work, the mark for which will replace the marks for all elements of assessment obtained at a previous attempt and will stand as the mark achieved for the module as a whole.
- 3.10.10. The method of re-sit for the item(s) of assessment will be specified in advance and set out

in the module specification. This specified method should apply to all students. The Board of Examiners may permit a student to take an alternative task where appropriate i.e. to support an Personal Support Plan.

- 3.10.11. An alternative assessment may also be given for elements of assessment that are unrepeatable e.g group work or performance and should be substituted by other assignments testing the same learning outcomes.
- 3.10.12. Where the student has met the requirements for progression to the next stage of the programme, they may be permitted to trail the re-sit assessment, i.e. to proceed to the next stage and simultaneously undertake the re-sit (see 3.8).
- 3.10.13. A student may be required to or 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 and must do so before progressing to the next stage of the programme. If a student repeats a module this is treated as a re-sit attempt and not a first attempt.

3.11. Capped Resits

- 3.11.1. Where a student has failed a component or full module with no mitigating circumstances, or following failure of an un-capped re-sit, a capped re-sit opportunity will be offered.
- 3.11.2. The re-sit mark for the failed component is capped at the pass mark for the programme of study (40% for undergraduate and 50% for postgraduate).

3.12. Un-Capped Resits (Concession)

- 3.12.1. An un-capped re-sit refers to a resubmission opportunity in a failed assessment, where the student has accepted mitigating circumstances and therefore the re-sit is treated as a first attempt and the full marking scale is considered.
- 3.12.2. Any un-capped re-sit attempt would not further reduce the number of capped re-sit opportunities.

3.13. Interruption of Studies

- 3.13.1. The Quality Office may, in cases of illness or other reasonable cause, permit a student to take an interruption of studies for any minimum period but usually for one year at a time and up to two years as a maximum period.
- 3.13.2. The Vice Principal working with the Quality Office is empowered to authorise an interruption of study. This power can only be delegated to the CEO & Principal in their absence.
- 3.13.3. The full Interruption of Studies Policy should be referred to for further information, see *Annex D.10 Interruption of Studies Policy*.

3.14. Withdrawal of Studies

- 3.1.1. A student may, at any point in their studies, choose to withdraw from their programme of study by notifying the Quality Office.
- 3.1.2. Where there is clear evidence of non-engagement with their studies by a student, such as extensive failure to attend timetabled teaching sessions, no attempt to submit assessed work for any module and a failure to engage with interventions made by NSCD to correct this situation, a Student Engagement Panel may recommend to the Board of Examiners that the student be withdrawn from the Programme of Study, following the procedure as specified in *Annex D.1 Student Engagement Policy & Procedures*.

Section 4: Award Regulations

4.1. Introduction

- 4.1.1. All awards offered by NSCD must be consistent and comparable in standards with awards granted and conferred throughout Higher Education in the UK. NSCD's awards adhere to the criteria and qualification descriptors of *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies* (2014).
- 4.1.2. The Framework for Higher Education qualifications is designed to meet the expectations of the Bologna Declaration and thus aligns with *The Framework for Qualifications of the European Higher Education Area* (FQ-EHEA).
- 4.1.3. Proposals for new awards, within the Credit Framework, e.g. MRes (Masters in Dance Research) are considered by the Programme Approval Sub-Committee (PAsC) on behalf of the Senate.

4.2. Rounding & Display of Marks

- 4.2.1. Each item of assessment for a module will make a weighted contribution to the calculation of the aggregated overall mark for the module.
- 4.2.2. The aggregated overall mark for the module will be rounded to two decimal places.
- 4.2.3. Where a student has failed a module the actual fail mark will be recorded.
- 4.2.4. Where a student has an overall mark for a module which is above the pass mark but has failed a pass-compulsory component of the assessment, this module will be classed as failed and the overall mark for the module will be recorded as one mark below the pass mark e.g. if the pass mark is 40, an overall mark of 39 will be recorded.
- 4.2.5. The final mark for the module will contribute to the calculation of the stage average in line with the module credit weighting.
- 4.2.6. The stage average mark should be displayed to two decimal places, and will contribute to the final classification mark in line with the weighting of the stage.
- 4.2.7. The final mark for classification should be calculated and displayed to two decimal places.

4.3. Exit Awards

- 4.3.1. 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 Board of Examiners and where specified in the relevant approved programme specification.
- 4.3.2. Where a student does not achieve a named award, they will be issued with a transcript

certificate of achievement in recognition of credits achieved. This may then be used at a future date (usually within 5 years) for RPL purposes.

- 4.3.3. The tables below set out the alternative exit awards available to students registered on specific programmes of study.

4.3.3.1. Undergraduate Exit Awards

Credit	Award
Less than 120 credits	Certificate of Achievement
120 credits	Certificate of Higher Education
240 credits	Diploma of Higher Education
300 credits	BA

4.3.3.2. Postgraduate Exit Awards

Credit	Award
Less than 60 credits	Certificate of Achievement
60 credits	Postgraduate Certificate
120 credits	Postgraduate Diploma

4.4. Classification of Awards

- 4.4.1. A student may only be recommended for the award by NSCD of a Certificate, Diploma or Degree in a specified subject provided that:

- 4.4.1.1. They meet the minimum requirements in terms of the number and levels of credits for the award in question, except where the student has been granted limited exemption from these requirements through credit transfer, recognition of prior learning or recognition of prior experiential learning, and
- 4.4.1.2. 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 the processes for Credit Transfer or the Recognition of Prior Learning.

- 4.4.2. Only modules carrying a numerical mark (i.e. not a pass/fail grade) may contribute towards the classification.

- 4.4.3. Stage Weightings & Classification Bands:

Award	Stage Weightings	Classification Bands
Cert HE	100% Level 4	<40 = Fail 40-49 = Pass
Dip HE	25% Level 4	

	75% Level 5 (if Level 4 is pass/fail, DipHE become 100% level 5)	50-69 = Merit >70 = Distinction
BA	No weighting	Un-graded (300 credits to pass)
BA (Hons)	40% Level 5 60% Level 6	<40 = Fail 40-49 = 3 rd Class 50-59 = Lower Second Class (2:2) 60-69 = Upper Second Class (2:1) >70 = First Class
Postgraduate Certificate / Diploma / MA	100% Level 7	<49 = Fail 50-59 = Pass 60-69 = Merit >70 = Distinction

- 4.4.4. A student must be awarded the higher classification of an undergraduate or postgraduate degree where their classification mark falls within 0.5% of the higher classification band, therefore marks of 39.50-39.99 (for Undergraduate), 49.50-49.99, 59.50-59.99 and 69.50-69.99 should be awarded the higher classification, however the raw mark should remain on results sheets and transcripts.

4.5. Withholding Awards

- 4.5.1. The award of a qualification may be withheld where a student owes money to the registered institution in fees.
- 4.5.2. Such students should not normally be considered by the Board of Examiners concerning them and any award of qualification will be withheld until all debt is paid and then the award will be considered at the next available Board of Examiners.
- 4.5.3. No award will be made beyond the maximum study period outlined in section 1.10.

4.6. Aegrotat Awards

- 4.6.1. An Aegrotat award may be recommended where there is insufficient evidence to determine the recommendation of an award but the Board of Examiners is nevertheless satisfied that the student would have qualified for the award had it not been for permanent incapacity, illness or other valid cause.
- 4.6.2. Aegrotat awards do not carry any classification, distinction or merit and is as such an unclassified degree.
- 4.6.3. The award of an aegrotat removes the right of any further assessment opportunity for the registered final award. Other than in cases of permanent incapacity, the student must have signified that they are willing to accept the award under this condition.

4.7. Posthumous Awards

- 4.7.1. Where a student has died before completion of their programme of study, the Board of Examiners may recommend a posthumous award. Should any regulations or credit conventions require dispensation in order to confirm the recommendation, the Chair may consider the appropriateness of doing so as relevant to the case in question.
- 4.7.2. Where the Chair exercises this power, this must also be reported to the Senate, normally at its next meeting.
- 4.7.3. Where the standard conditions of any award of NSCD have been satisfied, that award may be accepted posthumously on the student's behalf by a parent, partner or other appropriate individual.

Section 5: Quality Assurance

5.1. Introduction

- 5.1.1. The processes defined in this section indicate the measures of Quality Assurance for all HE programmes managed by NSCD.
- 5.1.2. The Quality Office is responsible for ensuring that the regulations are applied consistently and transparently as defined in this Annex.

5.2. Marking & Moderation

- 5.2.1. There must be marking and moderation procedures at all levels, consistent with NSCD's moderation regulations (refer to section 2). All members of the teaching staff are examiners of NSCD. The Heads of Faculty have responsibility for ensuring that the processes of marking and moderation operate in accordance with NSCD regulations.

5.3. External Examiners

- 5.3.1. An External Examiner appointment is required for all or part of each programme of study which leads to an award. The Learning, Teaching & Quality Assurance Committee (LTQAC) will nominate and recommend External Examiner(s) for appointment by the Senate.
- 5.3.2. For the full policies and procedures for External Examiners refer to *Annex I.1 External Advisors Policy & Procedures*.

5.4. Boards of Examiners

- 5.4.1. The Board of Examiners is responsible for:

- 5.4.1.1. Applying measures as defined in the Academic Regulations in relation to assessment and achievement.
 - 5.4.1.2. Confirming the marks to be awarded for all modules, via Module Assessment Boards.
 - 5.4.1.3. Confirming the recommendations of the Mitigation Sub-Committee on the application of concessionary measures.
 - 5.4.1.4. Determining any re-sit requirements for students with failed assessments.
 - 5.4.1.5. Implementing the decisions from Academic Misconduct Panels.
 - 5.4.1.6. Making recommendations with regard to student progression.
 - 5.4.1.7. Making recommendations with regard to withdrawal and intermission of students.
 - 5.4.1.8. Agreeing alternative exit awards where students are eligible.
 - 5.4.1.9. Reconsidering an earlier decision if required by an Academic Appeal Panel.
 - 5.4.1.10. Making recommendations for the award of Certificates, Diplomas and Degrees to students who have successfully completed courses of study.
 - 5.4.1.11. Analysing module and results data, against previous years where possible.
 - 5.4.1.12. Ensuring that students have been assessed fairly, moderation regulations have been adhered to, that assessments and criteria are effective, and receive any recommendations for improvement.
- 5.4.2. The full policy for the operation of Boards of Examiners are set out in *Annex H.1 Board of Examiners Policy and Procedures*.

5.5. Academic Misconduct

- 5.5.1. Academic Misconduct is deemed to cover all attempt(s) to gain an unfair advantage in assessments. This includes cheating, plagiarism, unauthorised collusion, unauthorised use of artificial intelligence, or any other attempt to gain an unfair advantage in assessed work. Assessment includes all forms of written work, presentations, practical work, demonstrations, viva voices, recognition of prior learning portfolios and all forms of examination.
- 5.5.2. For the full policy relating to Academic Misconduct refer to *Annex A.3 Academic Misconduct Policy & Procedures*.

5.6. Academic Appeals

- 5.6.1. Students may appeal the decision of a Board of Examiners, Academic Misconduct Panel or Student Engagement Panel where it can be demonstrated that one of the following has occurred:
- 5.6.1.1. that there has been a material administrative error
 - 5.6.1.2. that the decision was not made in accordance with these regulations
 - 5.6.1.3. that mitigating circumstances have not been considered.
- 5.6.2. The full Policy relating to Academic Appeals can be found in *Annex A.4 Academic Appeals Policy & Procedures*.

5.7. Delegation of Powers & Dispensation from Regulations

- 5.6.1. The Senate may delegate any of the powers conferred on it by these regulations to the Learning, Teaching & Quality Assurance Committee.
- 5.6.2. The Senate has delegated authority to approve exceptions to the requirements of the Credit Framework & Academic Regulations.