ASSESSMENT, PROGRESSION AND AWARDING: TAUGHT PROGRAMMES HANDBOOK

7. Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees (APAC)

7.1 Introduction

- 7.1.1 In accordance with Ordinance 5, every assessment for a Degree, Diploma or Certificate of the University, whether taken at one sitting or in parts, is directed by an Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee (APAC).
- 7.1.2 Where required, APACs may take place throughout the year to consider those programmes with non-standard start/ finish dates. Such APACs must adhere to the membership and quoracy guidelines stipulated in the guidance below and must be clearly minuted.
- 7.1.3 For each programme, an APAC should be held at least once per academic year. Additional APACs may be held when awarding or progression decisions need to be made. APACs held following referred/deferred assessments shall follow the same rules as for other APACs, except where specific regulations apply.
- 7.1.4 Where a nominee Chair is appointed, as set out in sections 7.4, 7.11 and 7.20, they **should** have academic/professional qualifications appropriate in the level and subject of the areas being reviewed by the APAC. Additionally, their standing, expertise and experience should be such as to enable the fulfilment of their responsibilities, normally, the University would expect such experience to be demonstrated only by those of Senior Lecturer level (or equivalent) status.
- 7.1.5 Where programmes are designed to allow new students to enrol at multiple points in the year, it may be appropriate to hold APACs to reflect these multiple entry points, to ensure that students are not waiting unduly for confirmation of results and degree awards. The rules for referral and deferral also require APACs to confirm marks on a regular basis.
- 7.1.6 For Nursing programmes offered by the Medical School, please see 'Special Provisions for Healthcare Programmes' for further guidance.
- 7.1.7 For Special Provisions for Degree Apprenticeship programmes, please see 'Special Provisions for Degree Apprenticeships' for further guidance.

7.2 Definitions

- 7.2.1 The University has a three-tier system for Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees. The three tiers defined in the following sections.
- 7.2.2 Tier One: Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees (P/DAPACs) whose primary responsibility is to safeguard academic standards for the particular programmes under consideration; this applies to all stages of a programme. An APAC may cover an individual programme, multiple programmes or groups of modules delivered by an academic department. All students, including those on Academic Partnership programmes and International Summer School programmes, must be included in an APAC. All module results should be received by an APAC. Where programmes are assessed and awarded as part of a Validation Partnership, APACs should be convened by the Partner Institution.
- 7.2.3 Tier Two: Faculty Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees (FAPACs) whose primary responsibility is to assure that academic regulations are applied consistently and equitably across Departments within the Faculty (or delegated School). Where programmes are assessed and awarded as part of a Validation Partnership, Partner Institution APACs should report into the cognate Faculty APAC of the University. Where this is not possible due to differences in the academic year, the Partner Institution may convene its own Faculty or equivalent level APAC.
- 7.2.4 Tier Three: University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee (UAPAC) whose primary responsibility is to identify areas where policy clarifications or enhancements are required, to consider patterns of degree outcomes and academic standards and make associated strategic recommendations. The UAPAC should also consider matters arising from the preceding P/DAPACs and FAPACs, including those held by Partner Institutions.

7.3 Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees – **Terms of Reference**

- P/DAPACs are primarily responsible for safeguarding academic standards for the 7.3.1 particular programmes under consideration and establishing and enacting principles of fairness and impartiality. This includes:
 - a. Taking an overview of the assessment processes that operate for the programmes and modules in the subject area, including:

- i. Setting examination papers, essay titles, and other assessments
- ii. Marking processes (including moderation, sampling, etc)
- iii. Application of regulations.
- b. Ensuring that appropriate and clear marking criteria have been set and applied consistently to identify threshold standards and that classification boundaries are clear.
- 7.3.2 To exercise this responsibility, P/DAPACs have the following terms of reference:
 - a. To be responsible for finalising and approving module marks for all students on modules overseen by the P/DAPAC:
 - i. To review module-level data on academic performance, to comment upon the performance of module cohorts and to recommend scaling in either direction to particular modules as required.
 - To receive confirmation that Mitigation Committee decisions have been applied.¹
 - To be responsible for confirming and approving progression decisions for all students on programmes overseen by the P/DAPAC, including the application of condonement in accordance with Chapter 8.
 - d. To make recommendations for awards, classification and consequences of failure for students on programmes overseen by the P/DAPAC.
 - To error check (including condonement, degree titles, classifications, core modules, level of credits).
 - To consider External Examiner(s) reports. f.
 - To consider assessment processes e.g. moderation and any assessment changes.
 - To identify student exceptions that require further scrutiny or advice from the FAPAC, including:
 - i. Individual student adjustments (in Exceptional Years as set out in the Exceptional Circumstances Handbook).
 - ii. Dean for Taught Students' exceptions to be requested e.g. Aegrotat awards.
 - iii. Irregular occurrences or instances where University regulations were difficult to adhere to in relation to consequences of failure.

7.4 Membership of Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding **Committees**

- 7.4.1 P/DAPACs **must** have the following core membership:
 - a. The Chair must be the Head of Department / Director of Education and Student Experience (DESE) or equivalent for the Medical School, Business School and Partner Institution where the programme is assessed and awarded as part of a Validation Partnership). With the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education's (APVCE) approval, the Chair may also be a nominated representative.
 - b. At least one member of the academic staff of the University with responsibility for the oversight of assessment and examinations, or equivalent Partner Institution representative where the programme is assessed and awarded as part of a Validation Partnership. Where this member is also the DESE, an alternative academic should be present as agreed by the Chair. INTO/University of Exeter International Study Centre P/DAPACs must include a University of Exeter DESE or appropriate representative from the cognate Departments and other programmes is assessed and awarded as part of a Validation Partnership must include the Link Tutor from the cognate Department.
 - c. An Education Support Team, or equivalent, member to act as secretary.
 - d. An additional Education Support Team, or equivalent, member to oversee procedural elements.
 - External Examiner(s).

In addition, the following membership is optional, at the discretion of the Chair:

- All relevant module conveners for the Programme/Department.
- Other relevant professional services and academic staff.
- 7.4.2 The membership of preparatory meetings is to be agreed by the Chair of the P/DAPACs, but should include the following:
 - Academic with responsibility for oversight of assessment and examinations a. (Assessment Officer / Assessment Lead / Programme Director).
 - Education Support Team, or equivalent, member to act as secretary. b.

7.5 External Examiner Attendance at Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees

- 7.5.1 External Examiner(s) are expected to attend any meeting of the Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee at which module marks are finalised and recommendations are made for the award of degrees, diplomas or certificates.
- 7.5.2 Attendance for all participants, including External Examiners, can be online/virtually or in-person/physically, as appropriate to the meeting, including for Referral / Deferral APACs.
- 7.5.3 As per the External Examining Handbook, External Examiners can provide written comments instead of being in attendance in an P/DAPAC, including Referral/Deferral P/DAPACs, provided that, on at least one occasion in the academic year, they attend online/virtually or in-person/physically. This must be agreed in advance by the Chair. This written report must include a record of the External Examiner's remarks and recommendations on classifications and failures, and approve any proposals to scale module marks, and/or changes an individual student's module marks, progression status or award (except when made for the purposes of error correction).
- 7.5.4 When, exceptionally and for good reason, the above attendance on one occasion is not possible, the External Examiner's absence, where it is known in advance, must be approved in advance by the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education. Under such circumstances, the Chair should ensure that the External Examiner has been fully involved in agreeing marks and that there is, at the meeting, a written record of the External Examiner's remarks and recommendations on classifications and failures in advance of P/DAPAPCs. Further information about what an External Examiner should do in the event of absence is not known and approved in advance, including for Referral/Deferral P/DAPACs, is found in the External Examining Handbook, sections 5.2–5.7.
- 7.5.5 The following actions of a P/DAPAC can only be made in consultation with an appropriate External Examiner (whether in person or in writing):
 - a. Scaling of module marks.
 - b. Changes to an individual student's module marks, progression status or award, except when made for the purposes of error correction.
 - All decisions **must** be clearly recorded in the minutes and **must** include details of the

- rationale for any changes to marks, any noted objections (and any responses to these objections) and the impact on marks.
- 7.5.6 More information on the role and responsibilities of External Examiners can be found in the External Examining Handbook.

7.6 Quorum of Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding **Committees**

7.6.1 The quorum for the attendance of members at a meeting of a P/DAPAC must be a minimum of five individuals, including the core members as set out in section 7.4.1.

7.7 Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Meeting

- 7.7.1 Meetings of Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees should have the following items on the agenda as a minimum. Where items are to be covered by a preparatory meeting or delegated to a subsequent meeting, this should be made clear on the agenda of the main meeting. Any reports from preparatory meetings should form part of the meeting papers.
 - a. Introductory meeting requirements:
 - Confirmation of attendance, apologies for absence and quoracy
 - Terms of reference ii.
 - Declarations of interest iii.
 - Minutes of the previous meetings (Tier One, Tier Two and Referral/Deferral) iv. and matters arising.
 - b. Receipt of confirmation that Mitigation Committee decisions have been applied.
 - c. Receipt of programme rules (as specified in Chapter 8 of this Handbook and in programme specifications), including:
 - Condonement and referral rules for all programmes under consideration
 - Specific programme rules affecting degree titles (where applicable) ii.
 - iii. Specific programme rules related to PSRB requirements.
 - d. Consideration of module marks and recommendations for module scaling.
 - Consideration of individual student records of attainment:
 - Ensuring accuracy with regards to condonement, degree titles, classifications, core modules and levels of credits

- Determining recommendations to Senate around awards, progression, classification, condonement (as set out in Chapter 8) and consequences of failure, in line with University regulations
- Identifying exceptions requiring further scrutiny or advice from Faculty iii. Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees including cases of:
 - 1. Individual student adjustments
 - 2. Dean for Taught Students' exceptions to be requested such as repeat study and Aegrotat awards
 - 3. Irregular occurrences or instances where university regulations were difficult to adhere to in relation to consequences of failure.
- f. Confirmation from the External Examiner(s) that he/she is in agreement with the decisions taken.
- g. Oral review from the External Examiner(s).
- h. Any other business.
- 7.7.2 These agendas are not exclusive and further items may be added for a particular meeting as Committee business requires (e.g. Prizes and Dean for Taught Students' Commendations). Where exceptional circumstances prevent the P/DAPAC from following the proposed agenda or format, or where quoracy has not been achieved, the APAC meeting may continue, however, this must be reported in writing as a matter of urgency to Education Policy, Quality and Standards. If it is known in advance that quoracy cannot be achieved (for example, if the External Examiner cannot attend), approval must be sought in advance for the meeting to proceed.
- 7.7.3 The External Examiner(s) is expected to confirm the decisions taken by the P/DAPAC with an appropriate minute made. More information on the role and responsibilities of External Examiners can be found in the External Examining Handbook.
- 7.7.4 The following actions **must** be approved by the External Examiner:
- a. Any scaling of module marks.
- b. Any changes to an individual's module marks, progression or award (except when done as error correction).
- 7.7.5 The full Committee may delegate some responsibilities to a group smaller than the Committee ('Subsequent meeting'). Similarly, at the discretion of the Chair, a

- preparatory meeting ('Preparatory meeting') may be convened in advance of the main Programme/Department APAC.
- 7.7.6 The membership of subsequent meetings or Preparatory meetings should be agreed by the Programme/Department Chair and must include:
- 7.7.6.1 An academic staff member with responsibility for oversight of assessment and examinations (normally Assessment Officer, Assessment Lead or Programme Director).
- 7.7.6.2 An Education Support Team member (to act as secretary).
- 7.7.7 The main Programme/Department APAC meeting is expected to accept the recommendations/actions of the Preparatory meeting or Subsequent meeting, as long recommendations/actions have those been approved Programme/Department APAC Chair. Any actions requiring the approval of the External Examiner (see 7.7.4) must have their explicit approval.
- 7.7.8 All Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees, including Preparatory or Subsequent meetings must keep formal minutes of their proceedings, recording results (as an attachment if more appropriate) and the reasons for recommendations relating to cases of condonement and consequences of failure. The minutes of Preparatory or Subsequent meetings must be reported to the full Programme/Department APAC, either at the main meeting, or by circulation afterwards. Minutes of the meetings will be approved by the Chair prior to submission to Faculty.
- 7.7.9 Mitigating evidence considered by a Mitigation Committee or equivalent should only be presented to the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee, if relevant and with the explicit permission of the relevant student.

7.8 Exceptional Years

Certain powers of P/DAPACs, FAPACs and UAPACs are only able to be exercised in declared Exceptional Years. These are set out in Chapter 3 of the Exceptional Circumstances Handbook

7.9 Exception Reporting at Programme/Department APACs

7.9.1 Although the P/DAPAC is responsible for ensuring there has been a review of all modules results and the performance of all students on the programme, this does not necessarily need to be achieved by having all the relevant data reports scrutinised in the main APAC

- meeting. It is acceptable for the main APAC meeting to consider exceptional cases provided that a preparatory meeting has taken place to scrutinise all reports.
- 7.9.2 Decisions must be minuted on whether or not to scale any module outliers. Minutes would be received by the P/DAPAC.
- 7.9.3 Exceptional cases are those including where:
 - a. A student is unable to progress or will receive an award other than the one they were expecting.
 - b. The case is likely to be referred to the FAPAC.
 - c. A module is proposed to be scaled (module reports).
 - d. Some noteworthy occurrence means that the membership of the P/DAPAC would reasonably expect that it be brought to their attention.
- 7.9.4 Where a preparatory meeting has scrutinised the appropriate paperwork and made recommendations it is expected that these decisions will be accepted by the P/DAPAC, provided that they have been approved by the Chair of the P/DAPAC and the External Examiner (when involving actions requiring External Examiner approval). When a preparatory meeting has recommended scaling of a module, the module convener should be consulted.

7.10 Faculty Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees – Terms of Reference

- 7.10.1The primary responsibility of FAPACs is to ensure that academic regulations are applied consistently and equitably across departments. To exercise this responsibility FAPACs have the following terms of reference:
 - a. To receive reports on module scaling exceptions with rationale.
 - To consider student exceptions that require further scrutiny or advice (as identified in the Programme/Department APAC) to include:
 - Individual student adjustments
 - Dean for Taught Students' exceptions to be requested such as Aegrotat ii. awards
 - Irregular occurrences or instances where University regulations were difficult iii. to adhere to in relation to consequences of failure.
 - c. To ensure the consistent application of the requirements of the Assessment, <u>Progression and Awarding Handbook</u> across Programmes/Departments.
 - d. To identify areas where policy clarifications or enhancements are required.

e. To identify and share good practice from P/DAPACs.

7.11 Membership of Faculty Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees

- 7.11.1 The FAPAC **must** have the following core membership:
 - a. The Chair should normally be the APVCE or their nominee. Normally the Chair should not have attended the previous P/DAPAC meetings. Where a FAPAC is being held at a Partner Institution and is considering programmes assessed and awarded under a Validation Partnership, an equivalent senior representative from that institution may chair the meeting.
 - b. Each P/DAPAC must be represented at the FAPAC by at least one academic representative (normally the P/DAPAC Chair, DESE or Assessment Lead). The representative must have attended the meeting they are the representative of.
 - c. An Education Support Manager, or equivalent, member to act as secretary.
 - d. Faculty Senior Education Partner, or nominee, or cognate Department Link Tutor(s) for a Partnership Institution In addition, the following membership is optional:
 - e. Other relevant professional services and academic staff as agreed by the Chair.

7.12 Quorum of Faculty Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees

7.12.1 The quorum for the attendance of members at a meeting of a FAPAC should be a minimum of three individuals plus one representative per Department i.e. the core members as set out above in section 17.11.1.

7.13 Faculty Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Meeting

- 7.13.1 Meetings of FAPACs **should** have the following agenda:
 - a. Introductory meeting requirements:
 - Confirmation of attendance, apologies for absence and quoracy
 - Terms of reference ii.
 - **Declarations of interest** iii.
 - iv. Minutes of the previous meetings (FAPACs from the previous year) and matters arising.
 - b. Receive oral reports from P/DAPACs to include, where relevant:

- Confirmation that the P/DAPAC was conducted in accordance with the Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook Chapter 7.
- ii. Incidences where scaling exceptions were applied and the rationale for these.
- Major concerns expressed or recommendations made by the External iii. Examiner(s).
- Exceptions requiring further scrutiny or advice from the Faculty Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees including cases of:
 - 1. Individual student adjustments
 - 2. Dean for Taught Students' exceptions to be requested such as Aegrotat awards
 - 3. Irregular occurrences or instances where University regulations were difficult to adhere to in relation to consequences of failure.
- Discussion of common themes and good practice emerging from Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committees.
- d. Identification of requirements for policy clarifications or enhancements.
- Any other business.
- 7.13.2 It is not intended that the FAPAC will amend decisions made by the P/DAPAC, except in cases of actual errors in the application of procedure or policy. Should queries arise, clarification on decisions made **should** be sought from the Chair of the P/DAPAC.
- 7.13.3 As decisions relating to standards of awards (i.e. confirmation of marks and appropriate application of threshold and classification standards) are the responsibility of P/DAPACs, External Examiners are not expected to attend FAPACs.
- 7.13.4 This agenda is not exclusive and further items **may** be added for a particular meeting as Committee business requires. Where exceptional circumstances prevent the FAPAC from following the proposed agenda or format, or where quoracy has not been achieved, the FAPAC meeting may continue, however, this must be reported as a matter of urgency to Education Policy, Quality and Standards.
- 7.13.5 The FAPAC **must** be provided with all relevant information to enable appropriate decisions to be made. Evidence of mitigation considered by a Mitigation Committee or equivalent should only be presented to the Committee with the explicit permission of the relevant student.

- 7.13.6 This default agenda is not exclusive and further items may be added for a particular meeting as Committee business requires.
- 7.13.7 All FAPACs **must** keep formal minutes of their proceedings, recording outcomes (as an attachment if more appropriate) and the reasons for recommendations relating to cases requiring discussion, including reference to any documentary or other evidence as appropriate. The Chair of the FAPAC must sign the minutes. A copy of all minutes and supporting documentation must be submitted to Education Policy, Quality and Standards for monitoring, review and onward reporting to the UAPAC no more than three weeks following the date of the meeting.

7.14 Terms of References of the University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee

- 7.14.1 The primary responsibility of the University APAC is to oversee assessment, progression and awarding policy and practice from an institution-wide perspective. In doing so, it provides assurance that academic standards are being upheld, and that the integrity and credibility of awards is maintained over time. To exercise this responsibility, the University APAC has the following Terms of Reference:
 - a. To contribute to the provision of institutional-level academic assurance, with a focus on compliance with Condition B4 (assessment and awarding) and Condition B5 (sector recognised standards) of the University's registration with the Office for Students (OfS).
 - b. To ensure the consistent application of the policies and procedures set out in the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Handbook of the Teaching Quality Assurance (TQA) Manual across all Departments and Faculties.
 - c. To make recommendations to the <u>Education Board</u> on the updating or clarification of, addition to, or further development of the policies and procedures set out in the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Handbook of the TQA Manual.
 - To receive reports on the outcomes of the annual internal review of degree classification and outcomes data (see <u>Chapter 13</u> of the Assessment, progression and Awarding Handbook) to inform its decision making and to request additional analyses as required.

- e. To receive reports on requests for, and approvals of, Dean for Taught Students' Exceptions in relation to assessment, progression or awarding policies and processes and any lessons learned from these.
- f. To receive reports on key themes, both best practice and recommendations, arising from the reports of External Examiners and any actions that need to be taken in response.
- g. To identify and share good practice arising from the undertaking and management of Programme/Department APACs (P/DAPACs) and Faculty APACs (FAPACs) and to issue guidance and recommend training and development as required.

7.15 Membership of the University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee

7.15.1 The University APAC must have the following core membership:

- The Dean for Taught Students, acting as Chair.
- The Associate Dean for Taught Students. b.
- The Director of Teaching Excellence and Student Experience. c.
- d. The Head of Education Policy, Quality and Standards
- e. The Principal External Examiner
- e. A Senior Quality and Standards Advisor, acting as Secretary.

7.15.2The University APAC **may** have the following additional membership:

- a. Senior Academic representatives from each of the three Faculties.
- b. Senior Professional Services representatives from the Directorate of Education and Academic Support.
- c. Student Representatives, usually the appropriate Sabbatical Officers of the Exeter Students' Guild and Falmouth and Exeter Students' Union.

7.16 Quorum of the University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee

7.16.1 The quorum for the attendance of members at a meeting of the University APAC should be a minimum of three individuals from the core members set out in section 17.15.1.

7.17 University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee Meetings

- 7.17.1 The University APAC should usually meet three times per year, corresponding with the Summer (primarily undergraduate), Referral/Deferral and Autumn (primarily postgraduate taught) series of APACs, to undertake its standard, post-APAC business.
- 7.17.2The standard, post-APAC meetings of the University APAC should usually take place after the release of student marks, enabling the collation of data and information to inform its considerations and decision-making.
- 7.17.3 The standard, post-APAC meetings of the University APAC should usually have the following agenda, although this may be adjusted as and when required:
 - a. Confirmation of attendance, apologies for absence and quoracy.
 - b. Terms of reference.
 - Declarations of interest. c.
 - d. Minutes of the previous meetings(s), action log and matters arising.
 - e. Minutes of the previous Faculty APAC meetings.
 - f. Discussion of common themes and good practice emerging from the Programme/Department APACs and Faculty APACs.
 - g. Discussion of Dean for Taught Students exceptions requests and approvals arising during the academic year and/or from Programme/Department APACs and Faculty APACs.
 - h. Discussion of updates, clarifications, additions to or further development of the policies and procedures set out in the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Handbook, including any recommendations to be made to the Education Board.
 - Any other business. i.

The University APAC must keep formal minutes of its proceedings, actions and recommendations. A copy of the minutes and any supporting documentation should be submitted to the subsequent meeting of the Education Board.

7.18 Role of the University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee in the **Review of Degree Outcomes Data**

7.18.1 In addition to its standard, post-APAC meetings, the University APAC will hold a further meeting, usually in Term 2, to undertake an in-depth review of taught degree classifications and outcomes data from the proceeding academic year(s). The review will focus on ensuring that the University's qualifications and awards are credible and hold their value over time and that associated programmes of study meet sectorrecognised academic standards. The policy and procedures supporting this aspect of the University APAC's role are set out in Chapter 13 of the Assessment, progression and **Awarding Handbook**

7.19 Roles of the University Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee during **Declared Exceptional Years and Circumstances**

7.19.1 Should an Exceptional Year or other Exceptional Circumstances be declared in accordance with Chapter 1 of the Exceptional Circumstances Handbook, the University APAC performs an enhanced role, which may include using additional powers and holding additional meetings. Standard, post-APAC meetings must also be convened in advance of the release of student marks. The policy and procedures supporting the work of the University APAC in such circumstances are set out in Chapter 3 of the Exceptional Circumstances Handbook.

7.20 Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee for Flexible Combined Honours (FCH)

- 7.20.1 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee is nominated by the FCH Board of Studies, reporting to the Humanities Education Strategy Group and the FCH Strategy Board.
- 7.20.2 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee must be chaired by the Director of FCH or, their nominee.
- 7.20.3 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee consists of academic staff representatives from each subject area teaching FCH students. Other members of staff who are members of the Board of Studies may attend as observers without voting rights. The Chair of the FCH Board of Studies is an ex officio member.
- 7.20.4 FCH will have an External Examiner appointed by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. The function of the External Examiner will be:
 - a. To be a member of the FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee
 - b. To advise on the conduct of the FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee and on the operation of the conventions
 - c. To advise on the regulations and processes of the degree.

- 7.20.5 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee processes confirmed final marks for modules. Hence Faculties (or delegated Schools) must ensure that the marks recorded when the FCH Board meets is final and agreed by the relevant Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. The mark will not be subject to revision at the FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee. All such cases **should** be fully documented and minuted.
- 7.20.6 FCH will not hold a Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee: Tier One.
- 7.20.7 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee will follow the agenda and regulations of the Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee: Part 2 as detailed in section 7.7.1 – 7.7.6.
- 7.20.8 The FCH Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee will feed into the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee.

¹Reports for Mitigation Committees are likely to take the form of spreadsheets, made available to the APAC but not discussed.