

Collaborative Partners and the LJMU Academic Framework Regulations

Dr Henry Forsyth

Link to the Academic Framework Regulations is [Here](#)

Aims and Objectives

- A brief overview of the Academic Calendar and what happens when (for standard programmes)
- Programme design and the Academic Framework Regulations
- Progression rules and regulations

The overarching aim is to enable collaborative partners to understand the Academic Framework Regulations and apply this knowledge when running programmes in conjunction with LJMU

The Academic Calendar 2020/21

Link to the main calendar page is [Here](#)

The above link contains the 2021/22 and 2022/23 Academic Calendars.

The dates in the calendar don't necessarily apply to collaborative programmes. However, the principles behind the structure of the calendar do. So, for example, partners need to work in conjunction with their LJMU team to define mark finalisation dates and mark release dates for 1st semester modules.

Key points of the Academic Calendar

- Standard LJMU programmes typically have the following features
 - Teaching starts during the last week in September 2 X 12 week semesters
 - Semester 1 marks are moderated (internally and externally) and formally released to students during Semester 2
 - Note:- These are considered final marks and are NOT subsequently subject to change
 - Semester 2 marks are moderated (internally and externally) and are formally released to students following the Board of Examiners (typically late May / early June)
 - Note:- Credits for all modules is awarded at these boards
 - A reassessment period for students deferring / failing Semester 1 / 2 modules in late June / early July
 - A reassessment Board of Examiners typically in the 3rd week in July

Other calendar related considerations

- External Examiners approve all summative assessments (Coursework specifications / Exam papers etc) prior to the beginning of teaching on a module
- Collaborative partners will be asked to confirm
 - the involvement of the External Examiner in the approval of the form and nature of the assessment item
 - the External Examiner has been involved in the moderation of an appropriate sample of assessment submissions as defined in the moderation policy
- The above must be completed prior to the finalisation of marks in both semesters.
 - This is critical to the release of marks in Semester 1 and the operation of the Boards of Examiners in Semester 2 / Reassessment Period

The Return to Campus during 2021/22

For modules starting after 1st August 2021 we return to the “standard” academic framework regulations

So, for example,

- referral attempts will be “capped” at the pass mark for any module starting after 1st August
- Borderline consideration will return to the standard algorithm for UG students
- The concept of borderline consideration for PGT students is removed as per the standard PGT regulations
- Personal Circumstances claims will require evidence as part of the consideration of the claim
- Extensions – Module leaders may require evidence for such claims
- Moderation at Level 3 and Level 4 returns to “normal” in terms of the involvement of the External Examiner in moderating the relevant samples of work
- No discounting of modules as per the NDF

Key Components of the Academic Framework

- Marking and Moderation
- The Role of the External Examiner
- Personal Circumstance (Non Attempt, Special Mitigation and Extensions)
- Fit to Attempt / Fit to Sit
- Academic Misconduct
- Student Progression and Boards of Examiners
- Classifications and Borderline Consideration for UG students

Moderation

- External Examiners are required to approve the form and content of all summative assessments at all levels in order to ensure that all students will be assessed fairly.
- Coursework and written examinations must be anonymised prior to marking, in accordance with the University's policy
- First marking and second marking (of the moderation sample) must take place as per the moderation policy
- The external examiner will be provided with samples in a timely manner to allow them to engage with the process of moderation of assessed work.
 - IMPORTANT – The External Examiner must be provided from both first and referral / deferral attempts at the module
- The moderation sample size is 10 pieces of work (or 10% of the total submissions)
 - So, for example if we have 150 submissions then 10% would be 15 pieces of work in the moderation sample.

Personal Circumstances and associated Forms

The link below provides access to a number of forms relevant to collaborative partners and their students

<https://www.ljmu.ac.uk/academic-registry/student/registry-services/forms-for-collaborative-partner-college-student-use-only>

A definition for Personal Circumstances

- “Personal Circumstances” describe serious and exceptional factors outside a student’s control, which adversely affected their performance during their study and not already taken into account by an Individual Student Learning Plan (ISLP).
- Collaborative students who have been impacted by the above have three avenues available to them
 - 1) Request an extension from the module leader
 - 2) Submit a “Non attempt at Assessment Personal Circumstances” claim
 - 3) Submit a “Special Mitigation Personal Circumstance” claim
- The forms are available at the link on previous slide

Encouraging Extensions rather than non-attempt at assessment claims

- Where illness or other verifiable cause will prevent a student from completing an assessment, s/he should contact the Module Leader as soon as possible. The Module Leader may, on receipt of appropriate evidence, agree one or both of the actions listed below.
 - (i) extend an assessment deadline;
 - (ii) set an alternative assessment, provided the alternative task meets the learning outcomes of the original assessment task. The decision to set an alternative assessment task must be agreed no later than one week in advance of the original assessment item deadline; recorded and reported by the Module Leader to the Board of Examiners.
- Any extension deadline / alternative assessment must allow all processes, such as moderation and mark verification, to be completed prior to the Board Reporting Deadline (BRD) / Board of Examiners Deadline.

What's the Board Reporting Deadline / Board of Examiners Deadline

- Using the standard academic calendar (2021/22) then we have the following deadlines
 - Semester 1 Modules BRD of 11th February 2022
 - Semester 2 Modules BoE Deadline of 1st June 2022
- Therefore a module leader for a Semester 1 module is allowed to give an extension up to such a date that they can mark and moderation the submission (and get the marks entered into SIS) by the BRD of 11th February
 - And the same holds true for Semester 2 modules and the BoE deadline
- Note: Non-standard programmes including collaborative offerings may have different BRD / BoE deadlines and therefore module leaders need to know these dates from the programme plan

Non-attempt at Assessment PC Claim

- If the student issue cannot be mitigated using extension and the student does not attempt the assessment then a student should be advised to submit a “non-attempt at assessment claim” Personal Circumstances requests may normally only be made no later than five working days after the affected assessment event.
 - All applications made after this deadline are deemed to be late. Late applications must be submitted with a justification for the inability of the student to submit within the established timeframe.
 - If the reason for late submission is accepted as valid, then the standard personal circumstances/special mitigation process will apply
 - In exceptional circumstances, where a student can demonstrate, with the support of independent documentary evidence, that they could not have reasonably been expected to have complied with the University’s regulations owing to the specific nature of the issues involved, an application submitted beyond this timeframe may be considered. Where appropriate, if the late application is upheld after the relevant Board of Examiners has met, the Chair of the Board will be notified and the student’s academic profile will be reconsidered.

Special Mitigation Claims

- A student declares themselves “fit to sit” if they submit a coursework or attend an examination
- In extreme circumstances, the University reserves the right to apply Special Mitigation following a student’s attempt at any assessment item.
- A student who has declared themselves ‘fit to attempt’ a summative assessment item may request that a Personal Circumstances Panel withdraws their declaration if there is clear evidence that the student was not in a fit state to decide whether they were fit to submit/sit the assessment concerned
- Again, Special Mitigation Claims are submitted and considered by the School / Faculty Personal Circumstances Panel
- So, Special Mitigation should only be used where a student has actually submitted / attempted an assessment and where there is evidence that that they were not in a fit state of mind to have made this decision. There should be independent verifiable evidence to support this assertion.

Boards, Progression and the Academic Framework

- All collaborative partners will complete the MVI (Module Verification Interface) in Webhub prior to any finalisation of marks for release to students via the MyLJMU student portal
 - This a vital stage in the process and should be treated seriously by all involved and shouldn't be seen as a “tick-box” exercise
 - Module Leaders sign off four questions and confirm
 - the involvement of the External Examiner in the approval of the form and nature of the assessment item
 - the External Examiner has been involved in the moderation of an appropriate sample of assessment submissions as defined in the moderation policy
 - the marks are confirmed as accurate for all module assessment items
 - the module assessments, including approved alternative assessments, have provided students with the opportunity to achieve all module learning outcomes. Assessments have only been waived as part of a wider modular assessment strategy.
 - This sign-off is fundamental to the release of marks to students and the consequences of signing modules off where marks are incorrect etc can be extremely serious (recalculation of student degrees post board etc)

ESRs, FMAs and Progression

- Students are given a 1st and 2nd attempt (referral) at all modules
- UG Students can progress to the next level of their programme trailing a maximum of 20 credits
 - Therefore student can progress to L5 from L4 trailing a maximum of 20 credits
 - The student in the example above would attempt their “trailed module” during the next level of their study
 - In the example above the trailed module would be called an ESR (Exceptional Second Referral) with the following features
 - They don’t have to reattend the module itself
 - Previously successful component marks are brought forward
 - Students failing the ESR attempt at the module cannot be given a 4th attempt and therefore the implications of failing an ESR are serious
- There is a whole issue around the timing of ESR attempts as there are two schools of thought regarding the timing of these attempts....early or later on in the next level of study

ESRs, FMAs and Progression

- Whilst ESRs can be used for students trailing 20 credits once a student has failed more than 20 credits short at a level then a different process is used. This is called FMAs (Final Module Attempts)
- For example, Student A has failed 40 credits in Level 4
 - They can't progress to Level 5 so would effectively be "held-back" in Level 4 for the following academic year
 - In this situation students with more than 60 credits achieve would be "entitled" to be offered FMAs
 - They attend the module again
 - They do all assessments in the module (previously successful components are not brought forward)
- If a student has achieved less than 60 credits then it is a Board of Examiners decision whether to offer FMAs or fail and withdraw the student at that point

ESRs, FMAs and Progression

- Progression can be held up as a result of deferrals as a result of “non attempt at assessment claims” / “Special Mitigation” claim
- So, for example, Student A passes 80 credits but defers 2 X 20 credits modules due to illness
- In this example the student would not be allowed to progress to the next level of their programme and therefore this brings into sharp focus the need for module leaders to try and use extensions (if possible) as the implications for these students is obviously quite serious

Academic Misconduct

- There is a new Academic Misconduct policy which has been approved by Education Committee / Academic Board
- Key component will be the ability for a module leader to instigate a Viva where they think the coursework has been purchased / obtained from a 3rd party
- Bear in mind when considering potential misconduct cases that Academic misconduct is deemed to cover all **deliberate attempt(s) to gain an unfair advantage in assessments.**
- It is the **responsibility of the Programme Leader** to provide students with clear guidance and instruction early in the programme, on the appropriate preparation for and presentation of work, including writing and citation requirements. This guidance must clearly indicate that all types of academic misconduct are considered to be serious. The guidance must also indicate the consequence of, and penalties associated with, academic misconduct (see UG.C5.5.7).

UG Classifications Calculation

- For standard programmes classifications are calculated using 25% of their Level 5 mean mark plus 75% of their Level 6 mean mark
- So, for example
- Level 5 = 63% and Level 6 = 74%
$$= (63\% * 0.25) + (74\% * 0.75) = 15.75 + 55.5 = 71.25\%$$
 (and then rounded to the nearest whole integer = 71%)
 - 40 – 49% = third class
 - 50 – 59% = lower second class
 - 60 – 69% = upper second class
 - =>70% = first class

Board of Examiner Borderline Consideration

- The regulations revert to “standard” consideration of borderline students for 2021/22.
- PGT students don’t have any borderline consideration (e.g. 69% would be awarded a merit)
- For UG students
 - Borderline will only include students on 49%, 59% or 69%
 - To be awarded the higher classification the student would need to have the majority of their final year credits in the higher classification
- So Student A and B both receive an award mark of 69% (let’s assume all modules are 20 credits)
 - **Student A** receives the following marks at L6 – 69%, **71%**, **70%**, 68%, **72%** and 69%
 - **Student B** receives the following marks at L6 – **70%**, **70%**, **72%**, 64%, 62% and **70%**
 - In this example, Student A would NOT receive a 1st class degree as they only have 60 credits in the upper classification range and therefore **they don’t** satisfy the “majority criteria”
 - Student B would receive a 1st class degree as they have 80 credits in the upper classification boundary and therefore **they do** satisfy the “majority criteria”

A whistle-stop tour of the Academic Framework Regulations

- <https://www.ljmu.ac.uk/about-us/public-information/academic-quality-and-regulations/academic-framework>

The Academic Framework Regulations Review

- During 2021/22, a full review of the Academic Framework Regulations is due to take place with new updated regulations in place for the 2022/23 academic year.
- This review will include an analysis of sector practice as well as consulting staff and students with LJMU
- Collaborative partners were consulted via an online questionnaire related to a variety of topics
- The intention is that all students will transfer to the new regulations rather than the previous major review which saw students on different regulations (what became known as “2” code and “3” code regulations)

Who is your Assistant Academic Registrar?

The Registrars are

Faculty of Arts, Professional and Social Studies – [Drew Li](#)

Faculty of Business and Law – [Liz Whitfield](#)

Faculty of Health – [Henry Forsyth](#)

Faculty of Engineering and Technology / Faculty of Science – [Graham Sherwood](#)

Questions & Answers

Ask me anything!



Scenario 1

- A level 4 student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) after both their first and referral attempts
 - Module 1 45% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 55% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 61% (attempted all components)
 - Module 4 39% (attempted all components)
 - Module 5 40% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 65% (attempted all components)

Student has achieved 100 credits with a mean mark of 44.17%

What would be the decision regarding progression for this student?

The student would be allowed to proceed to the next level of the programme trailing 20 credits from Module 4

Scenario 2

- A level 4 student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) after both their first and referral attempts)
 - Module 1 45% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 55% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 61% (attempted all components)
 - Module 4 40% (scored 80% in the coursework but did not attempt exam)
 - Module 5 40% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 65% (attempted all components)

What would be the decision regarding progression for this student?

The student would fail Module 4 (as they hadn't attempted all components but would be allowed to trail Module 4 into next level

Scenario 3

- A level 5 student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) after both their first and referral attempts)
 - Module 1 55% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 70% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 35% (attempted all components)
 - Module 4 37% (attempted all components)
 - Module 5 44% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 49% (attempted all components)

Student has achieved 80 credits with a mean mark of 48.33%

What would be the decision regarding progression for this student?

The student would stay in Level 5 but would be entitled to FMA in Modules 3 and 4

Scenario 4

- A level 6 student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) after both their first and referral attempts)
 - Module 1 38% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 23% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 16% (attempted all components)
 - Module 4 31% (attempted all components)
 - Module 5 42% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 40% (attempted all components)

Student has achieved 40 credits with a mean mark of 31.66%

What would be the decision regarding progression for this student?

The Board of Examiners would decide whether the student be allowed to have FMAs in Modules 1,2,3 and 4

Scenario 5

- A level 5 student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) after both their first and referral attempts)
 - Module 1 82% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 77% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 DEF (student deferred module attempt due to illness)
 - Module 4 DEF (student deferred module attempt due to illness)
 - Module 5 88% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 71% (attempted all components)

Student has achieved 80 credits with two deferred modules

What would be the decision regarding progression for this student?

The student could not proceed to the next level of the programme and would attempt the two deferrals in the following academic year

Scenario 6

- An MSc student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) after both their first and referral attempts) from the taught element (120 credits of their programme)
 - Module 1 55% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 70% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 35% (**this is the research methods module**)
 - Module 4 56% (attempted all components)
 - Module 5 67% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 68% (attempted all components)

Student has achieved 100 credits with a mean mark of 58.5%

What would be the outcome for this student?

The student could not submit the dissertation module (as research methods is fail). The student could be given an ESR in Module 3

Scenario 7

- An MSc student has the following profile (assuming all 20 credit modules) from the taught element (120 credits of their programme)
 - Module 1 55% (attempted all components)
 - Module 2 70% (attempted all components)
 - Module 3 65% (attempted all components)
 - Module 4 56% (attempted all components)
 - Module 5 67% (attempted all components)
 - Module 6 68% (attempted all components)
- However, they have failed the dissertation element (worth 60 credits) twice with marks of 42% and 48%

What would be the outcome at the Board of Examiners for this student?

The Board of Examiners would decide if the student would be given a Final Module Attempt in the dissertation