

Annex G.1 Board of Examiners Policy & Procedures

Policy owner:	Northern School of Contemporary Dance – Quality Office
Lead contact:	Quality & Regulations Manager
Audience:	Students/Staff for Northern School of Contemporary Dance Courses of higher education
Approving body:	Northern School of Contemporary Dance: Senate
Date approved:	January 2026
Policy Implementation date:	This policy takes effect from January 2026
Supersedes:	Validating Body: University of Kent Academic Board of Examiners Policy
Previous approved version(s) dates:	N/A
Review cycle:	2 years
Next review due date:	July 2028
Related Statutes, Ordinances, General Regulations	Academic Regulations & Credit Framework Equality Act 2010
Related Policies, Procedures and Guidance:	Academic Regulations & Credit Framework, Mitigating Circumstances Policy & Procedures, Academic Misconduct Policy & Procedures, Academic Appeals Policy & Procedures
UK Quality Code reference:	Quality Code Expectations for Quality; Core Practices
OfS Conditions reference:	Conditions: B4, C2, C4
Equality and Diversity Considerations:	Policy should be available in accessible format for all students.
Date Equality and Diversity Assessment Completed:	
Further information:	

Contents

1. Principles.....	3
2. Sub-Committees	3
2.1. Module Assessment Boards	3
2.2. In Year Progression Boards	4
2.3. Academic Misconduct Panel	4
2.4. Mitigation Sub-Committee	4
3. Roles and Responsibilities	5
3.1. The Role of the Board of Examiners	5
3.2. The Role of the Chair	6
3.3. The Role of the External Examiner	6
3.4. The Role of the Head of Faculty (or equivalent from Partner Institution)	6
3.5. The Role of the Director of Studies (or equivalent from Partner Institution)	7
3.6. The Role of the Quality Office	7
4. The Board of Examiners Process	8
4.1. Stage 1 - Sub-Committees Meetings	8
4.2. Stage 2 – Preliminary Meeting.....	8
4.3. Stage 3 – The Board of Examiners Meeting	9
4.4. Stage 4 – Senate Approval	9
4.5. Stage 5 – Results	10
4.6. Stage 6 – Re-sit Ratification.....	10
4.7. Stage 7 – Appeals	10
4.8. Stage 8 – Congregations.....	10

1. Principles

- 1.1. This Annex establishes the framework and procedures to be followed in operating meetings of Boards of Examiners at NSCD.
- 1.2. Boards of Examiners will follow the requirements of *Annex A.1 Academic Regulations and Credit Framework* when making recommendations regarding progression, concessions, re-sits, award of credit and awards.
- 1.3. Validated partners are required to follow the principles and procedures outlined in this Annex in consultation with the NSCD Quality Office.
- 1.4. It is the responsibility of the Quality Office to ensure that these procedures are adhered to at NSCD and in validated partner institutions.
- 1.5. All discussion at meetings of Boards of Examiners and its sub-committees must be confidential.
- 1.6. No individual member of academic staff should take on a formal role of representing or advocating the interests of an individual student at Boards of Examiners or its sub-committees.
- 1.7. Any member of a Board of Examiners who has a particular interest in a student(s) to be considered must declare such interest at the start of the Board of Examiners or its sub-committees, so the Chair can decide whether it would be appropriate for such a member to withdraw for part or all of the meeting.

2. Sub-Committees

2.1. Module Assessment Boards

- 2.1.1. Module Assessment Boards are responsible for
 - 2.1.1.1. Verifying the marks of completed modules
 - 2.1.1.2. Confirming failed assessments/modules and issuing capped re-sits in year
 - 2.1.1.3. Issuing un-capped re-sits in year, approved by the Chair of the Mitigation Sub-Committee – the Module Assessment Board does **not** have authority to apply any other concessions or compensation.
 - 2.1.1.4. Confirming the status of outstanding marks due to extended deadlines
- 2.1.2. For full details of re-sit regulations refer to section 3 of *Annex A.1 Academic Regulations and Credit Framework*.
- 2.1.3. Module Assessment Boards should be convened at least once per term and consist of the Module Leaders for the modules being considered, a representative from the Quality Office, and the Head of Faculty as Chair.
- 2.1.4. A Report on the Module Assessment Boards should be provided to the Board of Examiners by the Head of Faculty, to confirm that the verification processes have taken place and re-sits issued as required.

- 2.1.5. Partner institutions should hold their own internal Module Assessment Boards with relevant staff and guidance from the NSCD Quality Office, and provide a report to the Board of Examiners.

2.2. In Year Progression Boards

- 2.2.1. Progression Boards are responsible for:
 - 2.2.1.1. The confirmation of student progression from stage 1 to stage 2 of a one year programme of study (for example, an MA)
 - 2.2.1.2. Confirming failed assessments and issuing capped re-sits for stage 1.
 - 2.2.1.3. Issuing un-capped re-sits for stage 1 as approved by the Chair of the Mitigation Sub-Committee.
 - 2.2.1.4. Provisionally confirming concessions for stage 1 as approved by the Chair of the Mitigation Sub-Committee.
- 2.2.2. Progression Boards should be convened upon completion of stage 1 of an MA programme, and consist of the Programme/Module Leads, a representative from the Quality Office, and the Head of Faculty as Chair.
- 2.2.3. A Report on Progression Boards should be provided to the Board of Examiners by the Head of Faculty.
- 2.2.4. Partner institutions should hold their own internal Progression Boards with relevant staff and a representative from the NSCD Quality Office in attendance and provide a report to the Board of Examiners.

2.3. Academic Misconduct Panel

- 2.3.1. An Academic Misconduct Panel should be convened when an allegation of Academic Misconduct has been made against a student, to review the case and apply an appropriate penalty, as per the procedures set out in *Annex A.3. Academic Misconduct Policy & Procedures*.
- 2.3.2. A report on the Academic Misconduct Panel should be provided to the Board of Examiners by the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel, and applied penalties noted on results sheets.
- 2.3.3. No Academic Misconduct case should be re-opened during Boards of Examiners proceedings.
- 2.3.4. Partner institutions should manage their own academic misconduct panels with guidance from the NSCD Quality Office.

2.4. Mitigation Sub-Committee

- 2.4.1. A Mitigation Sub-Committee should be convened prior to each Board of Examiners to consider all applications for concessionary measures and to sign off all in-year adjustments made due to mitigating circumstances, as per the procedures set out in *Annex A.2 Mitigation Policy & Procedures*.

- 2.4.2. A report on the Mitigation Sub-Committee should be provided to the Board of Examiners by the Chair of the Mitigation Sub-Committee, and all recommended concessions should be noted on results sheets.
- 2.4.3. No Mitigation application should be re-opened during Boards of Examiners proceedings.
- 2.4.4. Partner Institutions should manage their own Mitigation committee with guidance from the NSCD Quality Office.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

3.1. The Role of the Board of Examiners

- 3.1.1. To apply measures as defined in the Academic Regulations in relation to assessment and achievement.
- 3.1.2. To confirm the marks to be awarded for all modules, via Module Assessment Boards.
- 3.1.3. To apply the recommendations of the Mitigation Sub-Committee on the application of concessionary measures.
- 3.1.4. To determine any re-sit requirements for students with failed assessments.
- 3.1.5. To implement the decisions from Academic Misconduct Panels.
- 3.1.6. To make recommendations regarding student progression.
- 3.1.7. To make recommendations regarding withdrawal and intermission of students.
- 3.1.8. To agree alternative exit awards where students are eligible.
- 3.1.9. To reconsider an earlier decision if required by an Academic Appeal Panel.
- 3.1.10. To make recommendations for the award of Certificates, Diplomas and Degrees to students who have successfully completed courses of study.
- 3.1.11. To analyse module and results data, against previous years where possible.
- 3.1.12. Via the External Examiner report, to ensure that students have been assessed fairly, moderation regulations have been adhered to, that assessments and criteria are effective, and receive any recommendations for improvement.
- 3.1.13. Full details of the Board's role and responsibilities can be found in *Annex G.1 Appendix A - Board of Examiners Terms of Reference*.

3.2. The Role of the Chair

- 3.2.1. To confirm that all assessment processes adhere to academic regulations.
- 3.2.2. To ensure that appropriate involvement of the External Examiner has taken place.
- 3.2.3. To ensure that appropriate Quality Assurance checks have taken place to confirm the accuracy of results presented to the Board of Examiners.
- 3.2.4. To review the papers for the Board of Examiners and to highlight any errors or anomalies to the Quality Office in advance of the meeting.
- 3.2.5. To receive reports from the Board of Examiners Sub-Committees and consider any recommendations made.
- 3.2.6. To consider the report on results analysis and propose any recommended areas for monitoring or improvement.
- 3.2.7. To Chair Board of Examiners for validated partner institutions and attend partner MA Progression Boards.

3.3. The Role of the External Examiner

- 3.3.1. External Examiners are expected to attend Boards of Examiners meetings for the programmes that they have reviewed and should be involved in the consideration of all decisions of the Board of Examiners.
- 3.3.2. The External Examiner is expected to present a report to the Board of Examiners on the findings of their review, including areas of good practice and any recommendations for improvement.
- 3.3.3. The full role requirements of External Examiners can be found in *Annex H.2 - External Examiners Policy & Procedures*.

3.4. The Role of the Head of Faculty (or equivalent from Partner Institution)

- 3.4.1. To confirm that procedures are followed regarding the marking of all assessments.
- 3.4.2. To confirm the completion of the moderation process.
- 3.4.3. To ensure that marks achieved by students for each assessment task are finalised by given deadlines.
- 3.4.4. To ensure liaison with the External Examiners and relevant teaching staff regarding arrangements for in-person moderation visits.
- 3.4.5. To Chair Module Assessment Boards and Progression Boards, ensure re-sit arrangements are made for re-sits issued by these sub-committees, and provide a report to the Board of Examiners regarding the mark verification and re-sit processes.

- 3.4.6. To review the papers for the Board of Examiners and to highlight any errors or anomalies to the Quality Office in advance of the meeting.

3.5. The Role of the Director of Studies (or equivalent from Partner Institution)

- 3.5.1. To Chair Academic Misconduct Panels and provide a report to the Board of Examiners regarding penalties applied.
- 3.5.2. To Chair Mitigation Sub-Committees and provide a report to the Board of Examiners regarding concessionary measures applied.
- 3.5.3. To act as Deputy Chair at the Board of Examiners and confirm each student's progression or award.
- 3.5.4. To review the papers for the Board of Examiners and to highlight any errors or anomalies to the Quality Office in advance of the meeting.

3.6. The Role of the Quality Office

- 3.6.1. To provide advice and guidance in the application of regulations and conventions and their interpretation to NSCD academic staff, validated partners, and the Board of Examiners.
- 3.6.2. To provide appropriate deadlines to teaching staff for the submission of assessment marks.
- 3.6.3. To organise Module Assessment Boards in good time to ensure the mark verification process is completed prior to the Board of Examiners and to confirm any re-sit arrangements issued by the Module Assessment Boards. In addition, to provide guidance to partner institutions on the management of Module Assessment Boards and attend these as required.
- 3.6.4. To organise Academic Misconduct Panels as needed and to record decisions on results sheets, ensuring these decisions adhere to regulations. In addition, to provide guidance to partner institutions on the management of Academic Misconduct Panels and attend these as required.
- 3.6.5. To organise Mitigation Sub-Committees in good time to ensure decisions on concessions recommendations have taken place prior to the Board of Examiners, adhering to academic regulations, and to record these decisions on the results sheet. In addition, to provide guidance to partner institutions on the management of Mitigating Sub-Committees and attend these as required.
- 3.6.6. To ensure that External Examiners have access to marks, feedback and recorded assessment footage for review.
- 3.6.7. To ensure that the Board of Examiners is arranged in good time for a date that allows the attendance of the External Examiner(s) and the completion of all marking and moderation processes.

- 3.6.8. To ensure that accurate results sheets are produced prior to the Board of Examiners. Partner institutions should submit results sheets 7 days prior to the Board of Examiners for Quality Office checks to be conducted.
- 3.6.9. To circulate in advance of the Board of Examiners meeting an agenda (*see appendix H.1b*), anonymised results sheets and links to any relevant regulations to all members.
- 3.6.10. To attend and act as Secretary to NSCD and Partner Institution Board of Examiners. To take formal minutes of the Board of Examiners meeting, keeping a record of the decisions made by the Board and ensuring that these decisions are acted upon.
- 3.6.11. To provide a results analysis report to the Board of Examiners, detailing average module marks, breakdown of classifications, number of concessions, penalties and re-sits, comparing against previous years and highlighting trends. Partner institutions should submit results analysis to the Quality Office 7 days prior to the Board of Examiners.
- 3.6.12. To confirm with the Chair and the External Examiner the accuracy of the official record of the decisions of the Board.
- 3.6.13. To submit a report from the Board of Examiners to Senate, seeking approval for the decisions made.
- 3.6.14. To communicate results with students, including confirmation of any concessionary measures, misconduct penalties and re-sit arrangements and provide guidance to partner institutions.

4. The Board of Examiners Process

4.1. Stage 1 - Sub-Committees Meetings

- 4.1.1. Sub-Committee meetings should take place in the academic year, as and when required (*see section 2*)

4.2. Stage 2 – Preliminary Meeting

- 4.2.1. The Chair may convene a pre-meeting with the Quality Office following the circulation of the papers and prior to the Board, to determine any inaccuracies or anomalies that have been identified, identify any student cases that should be drawn to the attention of the Board and any issues requiring discussion.
- 4.2.2. The Chair may check the quality assurance procedures that have taken place prior to the Board of Examiners to ensure the accuracy of results.
- 4.2.3. Any preliminary meeting should be conducted anonymously, with student names only available to the Quality Office members.

4.3. Stage 3 – The Board of Examiners Meeting

- 4.3.1. A Board of Examiners should be convened at the end of a programme of study and should follow the standard agenda (*see Appendix B*)
- 4.3.2. The Board of Examiners should consist of the Vice Principal (Chair), External Examiner/s, Director of Studies (Deputy Chair), Head of Faculty, Head of Academic Registry, and the Quality Manager (Secretary). Full membership requirements, including quorum, can be found in *Appendix A*.
- 4.3.3. Partner Boards of Examiners should consist of equivalent staff members from the partner institution and be chaired by the Vice Principal of NSCD, with an NSCD Quality Office Representative as Secretary.
- 4.3.4. The Board of Examiners must be recorded formally using the approved minutes template (*see Appendix B*) and minutes must be available to members within one week of the meeting.
- 4.3.5. Any conflicts of interest should be declared at the start of the meeting.
- 4.3.6. Identities of candidates should not be made known during Boards of Examiners, with students referred to by an ID number and names only available to the Secretary.
- 4.3.7. The Board of Examiners should receive reports from its sub-committees, External Examiners and a results analysis report.
- 4.3.8. The Chair or Deputy Chair should verbally confirm each student's progression or award status, noting any outstanding credits, re-sits, recommended penalties and concessions and any other items noted on the results sheet for consideration.
- 4.3.9. Where a student has been recommended for withdrawal as a consequence of disciplinary procedures, a Student Engagement Panel or Academic Misconduct Panel, the Board of Examiners will receive and consider a recommendation as to whether an award should be withheld. In exceptional circumstances and subject to verifiable evidence, a Board may consider recommending that an award of NSCD is not conferred upon student where the student's behaviour represents a serious breach of NSCD's Student Charter and/or Codes of Practice.
- 4.3.10. On completion of the Board meeting, the results sheets will be formally signed off by the External Examiner and the Chair.
- 4.3.11. All decisions and recommendations of the Boards of Examiners on individual students within its terms of reference are final, except in the case of an upheld appeal.

4.4. Stage 4 – Senate Approval

- 4.4.1. All recommended awards are subject to the conferral of the Senate.
- 4.4.2. A report should be submitted to Senate by the Quality Office seeking approval of the awards to be conferred and to note any matters arising.

- 4.4.3. This report should be confidential but is not required to be anonymous. Decisions on candidates, however, must not be revisited after their identities have been made known.

4.5. Stage 5 – Results

- 4.5.1. The Quality Office should issue an official results letter (*see appendix H.1e*) to students as soon as possible and within 5 working days of the final conferral of the Senate.
- 4.5.2. The Quality Office must ensure that all students who have been issued a re-sit opportunity are informed of the arrangements and deadline for submission within 5 working days of the final conferral of the Senate.
- 4.5.3. Partner Institutions should issue results and re-sit letters to their own students using the templates and guidance provided by the Quality Office.

4.6. Stage 6 – Re-sit Ratification

- 4.6.1. The approval of re-sit results and awards or progression resulting from successful re-sit completion can be sought via Board of Examiners Chair's Action, with approval from the External Examiner.
- 4.6.2. A report on Chair's Action should be submitted to the Senate for conferral.
- 4.6.3. Once conferred by Senate, results should be communicated with the student by the Quality Office, in line with section 5.

4.7. Stage 7 – Appeals

- 4.7.1. Students wishing to appeal against a decision of the Board of Examiners may do so on the grounds set out in *Annex A.4 Academic Appeals Policy & Procedure*.

4.8. Stage 8 – Congregations

- 4.8.1 Degree Congregations formally confer academic awards on students who have satisfied the requirements of approved programmes and whose awards have been ratified through the Board of Examiners and approved by Senate.
- 4.8.2 NSCD confers undergraduate and postgraduate awards up to level 7.
- 4.8.3 The roles and responsibilities of the NSCD Congregations are detailed in the table below:

Northern School of Contemporary Dance: Congregations			
Area	Responsibility	Key Actions / Requirements	Accountable Role
Purpose of Congregation	Formal conferment of awards	To formally confer awards on students whose outcomes have been approved through academic governance and who have satisfied all programme requirements.	Senate
Frequency	Annual ceremony	One Degree Congregation is held each academic year (usually October). Awards may be conferred <i>in absentia</i> where students do not attend.	Quality Office
Authority	Legal authority to confer awards	Authority derives from Senate under the provider's degree-awarding powers.	Senate
Award Approval	Academic decision-making	All awards must be approved by Boards of Examiners and ratified by Senate prior to the ceremony.	Boards of Examiners & Senate
Eligibility Confirmation	Verification of student status	Confirmation that all assessment requirements are met, no outstanding conditions remain, and student records are complete.	Quality Office
Ceremony invitation	Invitation to students/graduates	Invitation, ticket process managed using email and online form	Marketing
Ceremony planning	Facility & Resources considerations	NSCD manage internal resources such as studio bookings, facility requirements. Offsite venue / catering managed by contracted staff.	NSCD Facilities staff External Event Planners
Preparation for Ceremony	Award and ceremony preparation	Final award lists prepared; ceremony script approved; authority to confer confirmed; contingency for <i>in absentia</i> awards agreed.	Quality Office
Chair of Congregation	Conduct of ceremony	Presides over the Congregation, formally declares the Congregation open, and confers awards on behalf of Senate.	CEO & Principal (or nominee)
Method of Conferment	How awards are conferred	Awards will be conferred individually, corticate and transcript given to student on the day (or posted if not in attendance)	Chair of Congregation
Student Responsibilities	Attendance and conduct	Students confirm attendance (where applicable), verify personal details, and comply with ceremony conduct requirements.	Student / Graduate
Post-Ceremony Actions	Academic record finalisation	Awards recorded as conferred; certificates and transcripts not collected issued via post. Tracker completed.	Quality Office
Corrections and Amendments	Accuracy of records	Any post-ceremony corrections (resits/appeals) follow academic records and appeals procedures.	Quality Office

Northern School of Contemporary Dance: Congregations			
Area	Responsibility	Key Actions / Requirements	Accountable Role
Record-Keeping	Institutional assurance	A permanent record of all awards conferred is maintained and retained in line with data retention policies.	Quality Office
Quality Assurance	Governance oversight	The Degree Congregation process is reviewed periodically as part of academic governance and quality assurance arrangements in line with the Quality Code.	Senate