Assessment and feedback

Document type	Policy
Scope (applies to)	Staff and students
Applicability date	26/08/2025
Expiry date	30/08/2028
Approved date	31/12/2024
Approver	Senate Policies
Document owner	Academic Policy Officer
School / unit	Education and Student Experience
Document status	Published
Information classification	Public
Equality impact assessment	None
Key terms	Academic policies/Assessment, examination and award
Purpose	This policy sets out the University's approach to assessment and feedback.

Version number	Purpose / changes	Document status	Author of changes, role and School or unit	Date
1.1	Minor changes: 1) in 13.3, MD modules are added for clarification, 2) in 15.7, definition of deferrals is clarified, and 3) in 5.3 and 5.3.1, references to ILO are clarified.	Published	Academic Policy Officer (Digital & Student Experience)	6/2/2026

- British Sign Language (BSL) users can contact us via the online BSL Video Relay Interpreting Service: https://contactscotland-bsl.org
- This document and forms associated with this document are available in an alternative format upon request.

Contents

1.   Statement

1.1   This policy sets out the University's approach to assessment and feedback.

1.2   The formulation of this policy has been guided by the academic infrastructure outlined by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and, in particular, the UK Quality Code. All assessment practices are aligned with the SCQF (Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework).

2.   Purpose

2.1   This policy sets out the University's approach to setting, delivering, and evaluating student assessments, providing feedback, applying penalties, reasonable adjustments, extensions, deferrals, and no-detriment rules.

2.2   This policy sets minimum requirements and standards for students and staff, ensuring a degree of consistency in assessment and feedback practice across Schools/Departments while maintaining scope for innovation and appropriate variation across disciplines.

2.3   This policy should be read in conjunction with the Good Academic Practice Policy for the University's policy and processes on ensuring academic integrity and handling academic misconduct in assessing students, the Quality Assurance for Assessment policy, and the Exam Rules.

3.   Scope

3.1   This policy applies to undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes at the University of St Andrews and any portions of postgraduate research degrees taught by the university. It also applies to any other SCQF credit-bearing educational offering (e.g. short courses, micro-credential modules) unless otherwise specified.

3.2   This policy does not apply to the University's educational offering which does not have associated credits.

3.3   All staff and students are expected to comply with the regulations set out in this policy for all assessments.

3.4   It is expected that for all award types, assessments and associated marking criteria will be transparent, reliable, inclusive, equitable, and fair. Assessments will be designed in consideration of the module's Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), programme specifications, competence standards (where applicable), the Employability Strategy, and Graduate Attributes.

4. Types of Assessment

Assessments can be **diagnostic** (determining prior knowledge at the start of a class), **formative** (providing feedback to support learning, used to determine how a student is progressing), or **summative** (evaluating achievement against learning outcomes, with marks contributing to final grades, while still offering feedback for improvement).

It is expected that all modules within degree-awarding programmes contain at least one summative assessment. Schools/Departments are encouraged to include a mix of formative and summative assessment in all degree programmes. Diagnostic assessment should be used, where pedagogically appropriate, within degree programmes.

The University uses various assessment methods across different award types. Schools should ensure assessments align with ILOs in module and programme design. Some assessments may not suit certain awards, like short courses and micro credentials, which may require different assessment types, and/or overall assessment-type balance accumulatively, in keeping with volume of assessment criteria (see Section 5) through module and programme approvals.

Advice on modes of assessment can be sought from the [Curriculum Approval Group (CAG)](#), which is responsible for approving new module proposals and amendments to existing modules.

4.1 Coursework

Coursework encompasses all assessments not defined as a type of Examination, including written work (e.g., essays, reports, reflective writing), class tests, presentations, portfolios, podcasts, videos or other assessment types. Oral assessments, dissertations and final projects, defined further below, are also considered as coursework.

Coursework is not scheduled by the Exams Office. Coursework is usually completed before the revision period for modules with centrally organised exams (see section 5.2 for further information about deadlines during revision and examination periods).

Schools/Departments should consider appropriate scheduling of coursework where possible, so that a student's attendance at other assessments is not significantly impacted. It is not always possible to avoid coinciding submission dates and students are expected to plan and manage their time.

Coursework set and published by Schools/Departments during an examination diet would normally be expected to take between 8 and 72 hours to complete.

Schools/Departments may choose to extend coursework deadlines, but they should not bring submission/completion deadlines forward after they have been published to students.

Further quality assurance considerations with respect to the types of coursework outlined below are provided in the [Quality Assurance for Assessment policy](.).

4.1.1 Dissertations and final projects

a. Dissertations and final projects are significant pieces of coursework undertaken by students under the direction of a supervisor. This type of highly weighted assessment can take various forms, ranging from a single lengthy piece of writing to a portfolio of outputs.

b. Schools/Departments offering dissertations and final projects to UG students will provide further information and guidance to students regarding format, expectations, and supervision arrangements.

c. Further instructions and guidance on PGT dissertations, or other similar final projects that constitute a postgraduate taught programme's final module, can be found in the [Final module in a PGT programme policy](.).

4.1.2 Group work assessments

a. Group work assessment is the evaluation of individual and collective contributions and skills in collaborative tasks. Group work can be assessed individually, collectively, or using a combination of collective and individual marks. Where practical, group work should be designed so that it is possible to assign marks to individual students.

b. In UG and PGT modules (excluding VIP modules), where assigning individual marks is not feasible, group assessments must not account for more than 30% of the module grade. In VIP modules, group work must not account for more than 50% of the module grade.

c. When reviewing module assessment proposals, Directors of Teaching should be mindful of the amount of group work that students may engage with across their programmes of study

4.1.3 Peer assessments

a. Peer assessment is a process where individuals evaluate the performance or contributions of their peers based on set established criteria.

b. Where peer assessment is used to assign a summative mark, it must be appropriately moderated by the module coordinator, and a record must be kept of the process.

c. Peer assessment should not constitute more than 25% of the overall module grade. Where a module has groupwork and peer assessment, the combined elements should not account for more than 30% of the total module grade.

d. Directors of Teaching should carefully consider the extent of peer assessment that is employed for summative assessment across modules in a programme. Procedures for its use should be explicitly discussed with and approved by the relevant External Examiner.

4.1.4 Oral assessments

a. Oral assessments are evaluations where students orally demonstrate their knowledge and skills, through spoken responses, dialogue, or presentations.

b. Appropriate record keeping of oral assessments, which includes presentations and oral examinations, is essential.

c. It is recommended that oral presentations are marked by at least two members of staff. However, in the case where oral presentations are single-marked it is expected that they will be sound and/or video recorded. This will ensure that:
i) adequate feedback can be provided,
ii) when oral assessment forms part of the moderated coursework adequate moderation can take place,
iii) external examiners can review the assessment, and
iv) should the assessment be subject to appeal on the grounds of procedure, recordings can be used to ascertain that procedure was followed.

d. Written feedback is highly recommended; however, Schools/Departments may give oral feedback.

e. In cases where oral assessments are blind double marked, agreed marks and written feedback should be shared with the student, this may be combined marker or individual marker feedback.

f. The use of sound and/or video recording of blind double marked presentations for the reasons outlined above is encouraged, but not compulsory.

g. Recordings of oral assessments should not be made on personal devices.

h. The above requirements apply to all oral assessments, including oral reassessments for failed examinations.

i. It is recommended that Schools/Departments establish agreement with External Examiners, outlining how such assessments will be reviewed as part of the external examination process.

4.1.5 **Class tests**

a. Class tests are usually closed proctored assessments (i.e. assessments to be completed without the availability of written notes, books, or other materials) completed outside formal examination diets. Schools/Departments can determine if they wish class tests to be open book.

b. Closed class tests must be administered in accordance with the same rules and regulations as proctored and online examinations, but with all administration undertaken by the School/Department.

c. In all class tests Schools/Departments must take care to ensure that students with a disability support plan receive adequate adjustments.

d. Schools/Departments should establish their own common invigilation arrangements for class tests. In venues with more than one student, Schools/Departments are encouraged to have more than one invigilator to ensure that should a student need to leave a venue for a short period of time that they can be accompanied before returning to the venue.

4.2 **Examinations**

The University operates three formal, centrally organised, exam diets, whose dates are published online in advance of the start of the academic year as part of the Semester dates information:

- Semester 1 diet (Martinmas)

- Semester 2 (Candlemas) & Extended May diet

- August Reassessment diet

General examination requirements

The University employs various forms of examinations as part of a range of assessments. For all types of examination, and all examination diets, the following requirements as well as the Exam Rules apply:

4.2.1   Students can only attend exams for modules that they have been advised into.

4.2.2   Students must be available for the full duration of the published examination assessment periods, including the extended examination period. Students must not take holidays, or travel during exam periods in case of timetable changes or additional reassessment opportunities within the designated examination period.

4.2.3   Disabled students and/or students with a medical condition requiring alternative examination arrangements must ensure that they have registered with the Student Services Disability Team as soon as possible. Requests made after the date specified here may result in alternative arrangements not being provided for in the upcoming diet.

4.2.4   Students must write their answers in English, unless:

a. it is clear from the examination paper instructions that a response in another language is required, or

b. special arrangements have been made in advance with the School. In these cases, students must seek prior approval for arrangements from the exams officer in the relevant academic School and provide a copy of this to invigilators.

4.2.5   If a student is absent from an examination due to illness or for any other reason:

a. The student must submit a Self-Certificate of Absence in MySaint as soon as they are able to do so. The self-certificate should be submitted preferably before the examination is due to take place, and no later than 3 calendar days after the examination; **and**

b. The student must contact the School responsible for the module at the earliest opportunity to discuss the absence and ascertain if extenuating circumstances are valid and warrant a deferral. Any alternative arrangements due to non-attendance are determined by the School.

4.2.6   Students who have been given permission to sit a deferred or reassessment examination must register online and, in the case of reassessment examinations, pay the required fees. Students will receive registration information from the Exams Officer after timetable publication for the relevant exam diet.

4.3   **Proctored Examinations**

Proctored Examinations are in-person assessments completed within a closed environment and with no supporting materials other than those approved by the School/Department.

4.3.1   Proctored Examinations must be completed in a restricted period of no more than 3-hours, excluding agreed academic adjustments.

4.3.2   All centrally proctored examinations must be scheduled by the Examinations Office and occur during the formal in-semester examination diets. Centrally proctored exams are not delivered in the August reassessment diet.

4.3.3   Schools/Departments must ensure that students with a disability support plan receive adequate adjustments when administering in-School proctored exams.

4.3.4   Schools/Departments should establish their own invigilation arrangements for in-School proctored exams. In venues with more than one student, Schools/Departments should have more than one invigilator to ensure that should a student need to leave a proctored venue for a short period of time that they can be accompanied before returning to the venue.

4.3.5   Students must ensure their exam answers are legible. Poor handwriting is not a valid reason to be permitted to use a computer.

a. If two markers find a script illegible, the School may arrange transcription, requiring the student's availability. The transcription must be a faithful copy, with no additions or omissions, or it will be considered academic misconduct.

b. If the student has left St Andrews, remote transcription may be used. The student must sign off on the transcription confirming its faithfulness, and the original script must be compared for accuracy.

c. Each School is responsible for transcription arrangements, typically using postgraduate tutors, administrative staff, or Student Services-recommended transcribers.

d. Markers suspecting a disability should refer the student to Student Services. These arrangements do not apply to students with pre-arranged scribes or transcriptions managed by Student Services.

4.4   Practical Examinations

Practical Examinations are assessments in which students are asked to display their performance of a practical skill and/or set of professional standards (e.g., patient interviews, experimental performance, OSCE), which is assessed by staff members. They can occur at any time during a semester.

4.4.1   Practical Examinations must be administered in accordance with the same rules and regulations as examinations but with all administration undertaken by the School/Department.

4.4.2   Schools/Departments may set specific rules about the materials a student may bring to such exams.

4.4.3   Schools/Departments must ensure that students with an academic adjustment are given appropriate agreed time, space or alternative adjustments in line with their agreed adjustments for examinations.

4.5   Online examinations

Online examinations are assessments completed online by individual students without any consultation with another individual (student, teacher, family etc.).

4.5.1   Online assessments are usually not proctored, and it is expected that students will have access to notes and other supporting material, as outlined by the Schools/Department setting the exam.

4.5.2   Online examinations must be completed in a restricted period of no more than 3 hours, excluding agreed academic adjustments.

4.5.3   All online examinations for the Faculties of Arts, Divinity and Science must be scheduled by the Examinations Office and occur during formal examination diets. See the Exam Rules.

4.6   Extended-time online exam

Extended-time online exams are assessments completed within a scheduled examination diet that must be completed in a restricted period of no more than 8-hours and no less than three hours, not including agreed academic adjustments, and which do not require the student to work for the entire permitted period.

4.6.1   Extended-time online exams must be scheduled by the Examinations Office, but all other administration and delivery of the assessment is undertaken by the School/Department.

4.6.2   Schools/Departments offering extended-time online exams must ensure that any students with an academic adjustment are given appropriate agreed adjustments. In some cases, it should be noted that providing further additional time may not be appropriate; instead, it may be more appropriate for a School/Department to ascertain with the Disability Team if an alternative type of assessment should be considered.

5.   Volume and timing of assessment

5.1   The volume of assessment should be appropriate to the credit weighting of the modules, in line with the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Details of assessment are required in the proposal for every new module, and for major amendments to an existing module or its assessment patterns. Further guidance on module proposals and amendments is available on the Module and programme approval page.

5.2   The nature, description, and timing of assessed work must also be clearly communicated at the start of the module so that this information is available to students. Module coordinators should facilitate opportunities to help students fully understand the role of assessment in their learning, discussing what the expected standards of performance look like, and how assessment tools work, as required.

5.2.1   It should be noted that where assessment is a centrally organised exam, exact timings will not be known until later in the semester.

5.3   **Minimum proportion of assessment**

Schools/Departments are required to establish and communicate the minimum percentage of assessments that a student must complete in order to demonstrate that the module ILOs have been met and in order to be eligible to earn credit for a module. This must be published in relevant School/Department handbooks. The minimum percentage of assessment that must be completed can be as high as 100% but must not fall below 75%.

5.3.1   Where the minimum assessment requirement is set below 100%, a grade may be awarded based on the completed assessments, provided that:

a. the minimum requirement is satisfied,

b. the ILOs for the module have been demonstrated, and

c. the relevant School/Department is satisfied that there are valid reasons for any incomplete assessments

5.3.2   This statement on the minimum required percentage of assessment must also specify any mandatory assessments required by the School/Department that students must complete, even if no grade is awarded for this assessment.

5.3.3   Where the evidence supplied indicates a valid reason for incomplete assessment and the minimum requirement (as defined by the School/Department, but no less than 75%) has been achieved, the School/Department can elect to award the grade calculated using the assessment completed. 'Valid reason' of extenuating circumstances may be established by a Head of School, Director of Teaching or delegate(s), who may review documentary evidence if necessary.

5.3.4   Where the minimum requirement is not met and the evidence supplied indicates valid reason, the School/Department should advise a deferred assessment (0D) to the Module Board and Registry. Where a 0D has been awarded, the School/Department should provide for submission of continuous assessment at a later date and/or provide for deferred examinations.

5.3.5   If a student fails to submit Self-Certificates of Absence for missed assessments and does not provide a valid justification for non-submission, they may still be eligible to receive credit for the module, provided they have met the minimum percentage requirement. However, their grade must be calculated with a mark of zero for the missing assessment components.

5.3.6   Where the minimum requirement (as defined by the School/Department, but no less than 75%) has not been achieved and no valid reason and/or evidence for noncompletion of assessment has been given, the School/Department may award the candidate a fail mark allowing for reassessment, overwriting a running score that would otherwise pass, or they may elect to award a 0X grade. The School/Department **must not** allow a passing grade for candidates in this category.

5.4   **Deadlines during Independent Learning Week (ILW), revision periods, and examination diets**

In accordance with the University's policy on Independent Learning Week, assessment deadlines may be set during the ILWs, provided that

Schools/Departments can ensure students are appropriately supported in the period leading up to the submission date.

5.4.1   To ensure that no student is disadvantaged by preparation for the exam diet, deadlines for assessed coursework should not be set during the revision period.

a. Only exceptionally will permission be granted on a module-by-module basis for assessment to take place during the revision weeks, either when the module is initially approved or subsequently by the Dean of Learning and Teaching or Provost, or their delegate.

5.4.2   For modules with no examination, final coursework deadlines may be set during the examination diets.

6.   Marks, grades, and classification

6.1   Marks and grades

6.1.1   A **mark** is attached to an individual piece of assessment work.

6.1.2   A **grade** is used to report the final module outcome, and may be calculated using one or more assessment marks.

6.1.3   To allow for flexibility of marking strategies and alternative marking schemes across Schools, while also ensuring comparability across all credit bearing modules within degree awards, module grades are calculated based on one or more marks in accordance with the framework for the module, which itself is approved through the relevant curriculum approval process (see also the Module and Programme Approval policy).

6.1.4   Marks are provisional until they are approved by the Module Board, the Dean/Provost or their delegate, and the final grade is published.

6.1.5   Grades are reported using a numerical value between 0 and 20. Module grades are reported to one decimal place (e.g., 15.6).

6.1.6   Schools/Departments should clearly detail mark and grade descriptors in module handbooks.

6.2   The 20-point Common Reporting Scale

The University of St Andrews uses a 20-point common reporting scale for taught module outcomes and degree classifications. The common reporting scale allows for comparisons to be made across the University and

represents the same standing of achievement at the same level of study in any subject on a modular and programme level.

The 20-point Common Reporting Scale can be viewed as either an ordinal or an interval scale, depending on its usage:

6.2.1 **Ordinal Scale:** Used for ranking without implying equal intervals. The 20-point scale is treated as a ranking system. The numbers (0-20) do not carry inherent numerical meaning beyond indicating an order from smallest to largest. When marking is done using a different scale (e.g., percentages), it is possible to convert those marks by mapping certain ranges of scores to specific grade categories on the 20-point scale. If applied this way, only whole numbers (0 to 20) are used as distinct categories.

6.2.2 **Interval Scale:** Assumes equal intervals between points, allowing for decimal places and statistical analysis. Decimal places can be used meaningfully, suggesting that scores like 15.5 reflect consistent intervals. After converting marks to this scale, grades between 0 and 20 (including decimal values) are assigned, allowing for statistical analysis such as calculating means and medians.

6.2.3 Schools/Departments must not use more than one decimal place when reporting grades on MMS.

6.3 Alternative marking scales and grade conversion

Work may be marked using another scale, which is then converted to the 20-point Common Reporting Scale. If a marking scale other than 0-20 is used, the scale and the conversion procedures (mapping) used to convert the mark to the 20-point scale or to calculate the final module grade must be.

a. reliable and transparent,

b. (ii) approved by External Examiners, and

c. (iii) normally published in advance

The Faculty of Medicine employ a standard-setting approach to marking and further details of the methodology used are available from the School.

This Section does not relate to conversion of grades for study abroad. For study abroad conversions, see Credits and grade conversions for study abroad.

6.4 Use of the 20-point Scale for Grade Reporting and Classification

Classification is the final result of a student's degree programme as calculated using the published algorithm. Further information on degree classifications can be found in the [Classification policy](#).

Only module grades on the 20-point Common Reporting Scale are used for degree classification.

6.4.1   For degree classification, credit weighted grade point averages (GPAs) and credit weighted medians are calculated, and one decimal place is used.

6.4.2   One decimal place is used in calculations for overall degree classification and one decimal place is displayed on the student record, including transcripts.

7.   Pass/fail modules

7.1   Assessment

Pass/Fail modules are assessed without the use of numerical grades. When reporting a grade as Pass/Fail, a Failing grade is reported as 0F and a Passing grade as 0P.

7.2   Reassessment

A grade of 0F at the first attempt permits the student one reassessment attempt (unless reassessment is prohibited within the module catalogue). A second grade of 0F means that the student fails the module with no right to reassessment and the Fail will be recorded on the transcript.

7.3   Classification

Where the modules are part of a degree programme that leads to an award with classifications, pass/fail modules do not contribute to a student's overall degree classification but are included in the total credit required for classification.

8.   Standard setting and mark descriptors

8.1   Schools/Departments set standard descriptors, outlining the expectations of students' work at a particular level within the module handbook. This is usually accompanied by a set of marking criteria which link assessments with Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs). To ensure fair and accurate evaluation, standard setting is tailored to the specific goals and context of each discipline.

8.2   Examples of standard setting may include:

8.2.1   Tests involving complex calculations or factual knowledge are often scored objectively, allowing students to accumulate marks based on correct responses. Here, the key requirement is that the questions vary in difficulty, providing enough challenge to differentiate between students of varying abilities.

8.2.2   For tasks like essays, dissertations, and reports, standard setting follows a criterion-referenced approach. Each student's work is evaluated based on predefined criteria, assessing whether the student meets the required knowledge or skill level for a specific purpose (e.g., passing a module) or achieving a particular degree classification. The assessor sets the performance level needed, aligning the marking process with the intended learning outcomes of the course.

8.2.3   The School of Medicine applies standard setting to individual components of every assessment. Here, standard setting is a procedure which estimates the degree of difficulty of an assessment. It ensures consistency of results between different forms of assessment and between different modules and requires that specific levels of competency be shown to pass a test.

8.3   Mark descriptors explicitly identify what qualities are being assessed in a piece of work and should be linked to ILOs. Mark descriptors should be sufficiently relevant to the assessment for which they are used to provide meaningful feedback to students about their performance.

8.4   Schools/Departments are expected to produce and publish mark descriptors for each level of study and assessment (where appropriate), which conform to the SCQF guidelines for that level (e.g. 1000-level modules map onto SCQF level 7, 2000-level modules onto SCQF level 8, etc.).

8.5   Schools/Departments should ensure that the relevant marking criteria are released to students in advance of the assessment.

8.6   For the avoidance of doubt, it should be noted that the University of St Andrews does not use norm-referenced methodology, which relies on comparing how a student performs against other students.

8.7   Standard setting is monitored through programme and module curriculum approval and module grade approval (See the Quality Assurance for Assessment policy). In addition, External Examiners and the Dean of Learning & Teaching, along with the Associate Decanal team, have a critical role in Standard Setting. Both External Examiners and the Dean of Learning & Teaching with the Associate Decanal team have a role in approving programmes of study and modules; examination and coursework formats;

exam questions; and in reviewing the performance of students in assessment.

9. Marking assessments

9.1 The identification of markers and moderators is the responsibility of the Head of School (or appropriate delegate, normally the Director of Teaching or Director of Postgraduate Taught Studies). A marker or moderator may be appointed from outside the School or University, if necessary, for example when an appropriate specialist is not available in the University. In such cases, external markers should be supplied with the necessary resources to enable them to assess using the 20-point scale.

9.2 Marking of assessed work must be carried out in an appropriately private environment, and Schools/Departments must comply with institutional requirements for the security of assessment processes.

9.2.1 Assessment results must be logged centrally by the School/Department in a timely manner (not solely at the end of the semester).

9.2.2 Heads of School, along with their School or Department Manager/Administrator(s), must ensure that appropriate measures are in place for the secure storage of assessment papers and results. Heads of School or their delegate should ensure that staff are briefed on the safe storage and transportation of assessment.

9.2.3 Heads of School must be granted timely access to assessment materials held by staff during the marking process, upon request.

9.3 When marking any piece of assessment, the marker should always strive to use the full range of marks available to them, e.g. 0-20 on the common reporting scale. A student should be given a 20 when they produce the highest quality of work that can reasonably be expected of a student at their level. Equally, students producing work that meets none of the specified criteria should be given a 0.

9.4 To gain a pass in a module a student must demonstrate that they have performed at, or above, the standard required to earn a grade of 7. A student who gains a pass in a module shall be awarded the designated credits for that module. Once a pass grade has been achieved in a module, a student cannot re-register for the module. This rule will only be waived in exceptional circumstances, and at the discretion of the Vice-Principal Education (Proctor) or their delegate.

9.5 **Anonymisation:** The University requires anonymisation by matriculation number at all levels for assessed coursework and examinations where

practicable. Once the marking (and moderating or second-marking, where applicable) has been anonymously completed, it is permissible to record marks against the student's name and provide feedback to the student on an individual basis.

9.6 **Team marking:** Where pieces of coursework and examinations are to be marked by more than one marker, a process should always be in place so that standards and marking conventions are internally set, clearly understood and applied by all markers.

9.6.1 Marking should also be checked for consistency across and between markers, before feedback is released and marks are reported. This process may be set up, for example, by issuing detailed marking instructions, or by a preparatory meeting or marking workshop for the whole team.

9.6.2 The scheme should be checked when marking is complete, for example by second or blind double marking, by the exchange of scripts between markers, or by sampling by the module coordinator or another senior member of the marking team.

10. Moderation, Second-marking and Blind Double-Marking

10.1 Moderation and second-marking are integral components of the marking process. They are designed to ensure consistent marking, that sufficient and appropriate feedback has been given, and that correct procedures have been followed.

10.2 Schools/Departments are empowered to decide to use moderation, second-marking, or a combination of both per module. This decision should be made based on requirements set out in sections 10.3-10.5, and should consider the type of assessment, and good practice in the discipline.

10.3 **Moderation** is a process used to maintain fairness and consistency when applying marking criteria, typically by having a second staff member review a sample of assessed work.

10.3.1 Moderation should be carried out by a suitably qualified member of staff who inspects a sample of assessed work (see Section 5.5 of the Quality Assurance for Assessment policy) from a given module after first-marking is complete. The moderator should see samples of work spanning the entire range of marks, including samples from all markers on a particular assessment. The moderator should comment on the marks awarded for the individual pieces of work, the marking scheme (where appropriate) and standards in general, as well as the quality of proposed feedback where applicable.

10.3.2 Moderation should **not** lead to changes in individual marks (unless an individual marking error has been revealed) but may lead to changes to the distribution or range of marks. This does not include instances in which academic colleagues may discuss an individual piece of student work for guidance and support purposes.

10.3.3 Following moderation, a discussion should take place between marker and moderator. If the moderator agrees with the first marker, no further marking need take place. There are two options available if the moderator disagrees with the first marker:

   a. If the moderator can discern a regular pattern to any discrepancy with the first marker (e.g. of over- or under-marking), marks for all submissions may be adjusted accordingly in consultation with the first marker, and no further marking need take place.
   b. If the moderator cannot discern a regular pattern to any discrepancy with the first marker all submissions must be second-marked in accordance with the standard second-marking process outlined in 10.4.

10.4 **Second-marking** is a process where the second-marker produces their own mark and comments having seen the annotations, comments and mark of the first marker. When used, second-marking is usually applied to all work in a given submission, not just a sample. **Blind double-marking** is a process where the first and second markers mark independently without seeing the other marker's comments or mark before assigning their own.

10.4.1 In either case, both markers' comments may be as full as each other's or be relatively brief. Following the independent marking process by both markers, it is expected that the two markers will agree to a mark for each student and a brief rationale for each decision recorded.

10.4.2 Where there is significant disagreement as to the mark that should be awarded (for a single student or the whole cohort), the work should be further reviewed in accordance with published School/Department processes (typically discussion and/or the involvement of a third marker).

10.5 Rules on Moderation, Second-marking and Blind double-marking

Within degree-awarding programmes, a student's final module grade must not normally be awarded on the basis of a single individual's marking of all assessment elements without moderation or second-marking having been carried out. Schools/Departments should ensure that appropriate moderation, second-marking or blind double-marking processes are in place to prevent that from happening. In so doing, Schools/Departments are expected to abide by the following institutional requirements:

10.5.1 Assessment accounting for at least 40% of the overall module grade must be subject to moderation, second-marking or blind double-marking. In modules with several assessed elements, moderation of a single significant element may suffice, provided that the 40% module-level threshold is met by that single piece of assessment.

10.5.2 Where work is marked using a pre-formed rubric, the correct application of the rubric must be checked, and a sample (in line with the requirements of the Quality Assurance for Assessment policy) of answers moderated.

10.5.3 Systematic blind double-marking of all assessed work is only required for:
   a. Honours and Masters Dissertations and substantial Projects
   b. Marking done by individuals who are not academic members of the University (e.g. external placement supervisors).

10.5.4 Inexperienced markers, or any individual marking student assessments who is unfamiliar with the marking scale or subject area should always be supported through second-marking or moderation (blind double-marking may be used but is not usually required) by more experienced colleagues until they are completely familiar with the relevant practices.

10.6 In exceptional cases where any of the above cannot be met, the Director of Teaching should discuss this with the Head of School and the relevant Associate Dean/Provost Education as needed.

11. Mark and grade adjustment

11.1 Mark adjustments and overall grade adjustments are systematic adjustments of the distribution of marks within a module, and/or the final grade of a module. These interventions should only be used in rare cases, after scrutiny, if there is a need to address anomalies in the distribution of marks for a specific question, or overall grades of a module.

11.1.1 For example, if three out of four elements on a module produce identical distributions of marks but the fourth has a skewed distribution that depresses the overall grade, it might be appropriate to question that element and consider mark adjustment. It may be the case that a fourth element was more challenging than other elements for sound pedagogical reasons. In that case, no adjustment would be warranted.

11.1.2 Mark or grade adjustments **must not** be used to manipulate marks or grades awarded to specific individual students, or to generate an arbitrary inflation or deflation of outcomes.

11.2   In situations where mark or grade adjustments were used, a clear case for adjustment and an appropriate methodology must be presented to External Examiners prior to the reporting of grades to the Assistant Vice-Principal (Dean of Learning and Teaching) and Provost. Schools/Departments should also reflect on their approach to assessment to prevent such irregularities in future. Whenever possible, students should be made aware of the procedures used to adjust marks or grades.

11.3   For further information on when a mark or grade adjustment might be appropriate and the options for adjusting, please see Section 11.3 of the [Quality Assurance for Assessment policy](#).

12.   Feedback

12.1   Students must receive feedback on any work they submit for assessment. Schools/Departments are free to choose the precise approach to providing feedback, which could include individual feedback to the student and may also include collective feedback to the class. Any feedback must be:

- provided to students in a format appropriate to the type of assessment.
- of a quantity and detail appropriate for the work submitted.
- aligned to assessment criteria, the intended learning outcomes and may be aligned to programme competence standards.
- understandable, sufficiently detailed, and constructive.
- provided in time to be beneficial in future assessments.

12.2   Turnaround times may vary based on the size of the module or the nature of the assessment. Schools/Departments must clearly indicate to students and staff the turnaround time for the return of coursework with feedback. Coursework feedback should, whenever possible, be delivered in time for students to benefit from it in their next assignment.

12.2.1 No coursework feedback in the Faculties of Arts, Divinity and Science should take longer than 21 consecutive days (15-working days), excluding University holidays and public holidays, to be returned to students. Schools/Departments are advised to organise assessment in such a way as to enable this expectation to be met and avoid over-reliance on single assessors where possible.

12.2.2 All feedback (whether on coursework or examinations) should be efficient and effective – it should not over burden staff, and it should constructively aid students' learning.

12.2.3 In exceptional circumstances where feedback is delayed (for example, due to staff illness), this must be clearly communicated to students.

12.3   Feedback provided on restricted documents such as examination scripts must be delivered in controlled conditions under supervision by an appropriate member of staff. Staff should provide a mechanism for students to meet with them for a feedback review.

12.3.1   Non-restricted documents, as defined by the School/Department, such as written feedback sheets, may be returned to students.

12.4   As exam scripts constitute the School's record, the student is not permitted to have their physical script of their proctored exam returned to them. If a student makes a formal written request to the School/Department for a photocopy of their exam script, it should be on the following terms:

12.4.1   It must be on receipt of a fee set at the University level of £10 (per examination script).

12.4.2   The request must be made no later than the end of week 3 of the semester following the exam diet.

12.5   Alternatively, Schools/Departments may choose to allow students to take a photo of their own script to avoid placing students under an obligation to pay a fee to obtain a photocopy of their exam script.

13.   Reassessment

13.1   **Reassessment for undergraduate students**
A student who fails a module with the right to reassessment will be reassessed through methods determined by the School/Department, which will normally align with the mode of reassessment approved by CAG in the module proposal and publicly displayed in the Module Catalogue.

13.1.1   Students should have access to clearly published information for each module in advance of advising, detailing the opportunities and requirements for reassessment.

13.1.2   Where re-assessment is permitted, detail of the re-assessment format should be provided to all students in the School/module handbook, which students can access upon being advised into a module.

13.1.3   Students who fail a module at first assessment with a grade of 4.0 or higher are eligible for re-assessment in the module if the module description includes a re-assessment opportunity. Students who fail a module with a grade of 3.9 or less are not eligible for re-assessment, except:

a. UG students in the Faculty of Medicine, who will be eligible for a re-assessment regardless of grade obtained at first attempt, and

b. As permitted under the policy on S-Coding.

13.1.4 Reassessment arrangements for Pass/Fail modules are dealt with differently (see Section 7.2 above).

13.2 **Reassessment for postgraduate taught students**
Students on Postgraduate taught programmes who have failed a module at first attempt may take reassessment on modules, where this is permitted. However, it should be noted that they are not permitted to *retake modules* they have previously failed or take additional modules to substitute for failed modules. This does not include Integrated Masters programmes.

13.2.1 Reassessment is not permitted for postgraduate taught programme dissertations/final projects (see Classification policy for further details).

13.3 Capping of reassessment results
Modules which are passed at reassessment will be capped at grade 7.0 and passing re-assessment modules taken at 3000-level or above will be entered into the degree calculation as a grade of 7.0. This cap does not apply to English for Academic Purposes modules offered by the IELLI and MD 2101 & MD 3101 (part of ScotGEM MBChB, which is governed by an independent set of academic regulations, but they are recorded here for the avoidance of doubt).

13.4 Failed assessments
Students who fail re-assessment in a module are not eligible for a further re-assessment (other than as permitted under the Policy on S-Coding). Please see the Classification Policy for an explanation of how failed reassessment grades are dealt with at classification.

14. Penalties

14.1 **Word count penalties**
An assessment may have a specified length in terms of word count, either as an indicative guideline, or as a requirement enforced by penalty. Failure to adhere to a required word length is penalised using one of the approved penalty schemes.

14.1.1 Schools/Departments must specify which penalty scheme will be used in advance.

14.1.2 The penalty scheme is chosen according to the nature of the module and the assignment and may vary between assignments or may be

consistent for an entire module or for all assignments in the School/Department.

      14.1.3   Annex 2 presents example effects of word count penalties imposed.

14.2   Where work is marked directly on the 20-point scale, the following penalty schemes are available:

A. 1 mark for work that is 10% over-length, then a further 1 mark per additional 10% over

B. 1 mark for work that is 5% over-length, then a further 1 mark per additional 10% over

C. 1 mark for work that is over-length to any extent, then a further 1 mark per additional 5% over

14.3   Where work is marked to some other scale, the following variants apply:

A. 5% of the maximum available mark for work that is 10% over-length, then a further 5% of the maximum available mark per additional 10% over

B. 5% of the maximum available mark for work that is 5% over-length, then a further 5% of the maximum available mark per additional 10% over

C. 5% of the maximum available mark for work that is over-length to any extent, then a further 5% of the maximum available mark per additional 5% over

14.4   Schools/Departments may also choose to penalise work that is shorter than the specified length, in which case the equivalent schemes are used with the word "under" substituted for the word "over".

14.5   The following may be decided at School/Department level, and should be clearly communicated to students:

- The method for counting words.
- The details of which parts of a written assignment are included in the word count.
- The process for dealing with disputes as to actual word length.

14.6   Coursework Lateness penalties
All Schools/Departments must publish deadlines (date and time) for the submission of assessed work as well as the penalties to be applied for work that is submitted late.

      14.6.1   Schools/Departments must specify which penalty scheme will be used in advance.

14.6.2 The penalty scheme is chosen according to the nature of the module and the assignment and may vary between assignments or may be consistent for an entire module or for all assignments in the School/Department.

14.6.3 Every day of the week counts towards a late penalty. This rule applies to all holidays (public and University) and includes weekends, with Saturday and Sunday each counting as one day.

14.6.4 Annex 2 presents example effects of lateness penalties imposed.

14.7 Where work is marked directly on the 20-point scale, the following lateness penalty schemes are available:

A.   1 mark per day, or part thereof
B.   1 mark per 8-hour period, or part thereof
C.   Initial penalty of 3 marks, then a further 1 mark per additional 8-hour period, or part thereof

14.8 Where work is marked to some other scale, the following variants apply:

A.   5% of the maximum available mark per day, or part thereof
B.   5% of the maximum available mark per 8-hour period, or part thereof
C.   Initial penalty of 15% of the maximum available mark, then a further 5% per 8-hour period, or part thereof

14.9 In conjunction with one of the available penalty schemes, a cut-off period may also be specified, after which a mark of zero will be awarded. At the School's/Department's discretion, such work may still be assessed for credit.

14.10 Schools/Departments may operate stricter penalty schemes, including 100% penalty for any unjustified lateness, for assessments that by their nature need to take place at a particular time. Examples include oral presentations and interviews.

14.11 In cases where, due to a particular School's/Department's teaching arrangements, the application of this policy would disadvantage some students relative to others, the Dean of Learning & Teaching may authorise the use of minor variations of these schemes.

14.12 Students experiencing extenuating circumstances or the exacerbation of a disability that may impact their ability to submit work on time must request an extension prior to the submission deadline. This allows Schools/Departments to make an informed decision regarding the application of late penalties. For further information, please refer to the guidance on extensions and flexible deadlines.

15. Reasonable adjustments

15.1   The University is committed to promoting inclusive education by providing fair and equitable assessment opportunities for all students, particularly those with disabilities or specific learning needs. Reasonable adjustments will be provided where necessary to ensure that no student is disadvantaged due to disability, mental health issues, or other extenuating circumstances. This will be done in line with the University's obligations under the **Equality Act 2010.**

15.2   The University employs several tools to address circumstances affecting an individual student's assessment. These include extensions of time, assistive technologies, exam adaptations, deferred assessments, alternative assessments and waived assessments. These will be offered and applied in line with the Extenuating Circumstances policy, the Religious Observance (Students) Policy, and/or the guidance on Academic Adjustments for Disabled Students.

15.3   Further methods for addressing circumstances affecting all or part of a module are described in the policies and guidance highlighted in this section and in the S-coding policy. The following adjustments relate to circumstances impacting more than one piece of assessment within degree-awarding programmes. These are outlined in further detail in the following guidance document Academic adjustments for disabled students.

15.4   Possible adjustments include the following:

- Support with alternative formatting of information
- Lecture slides issued in advance
- Adapted Exam Arrangements including alternative format papers, additional time, rest breaks, rooming arrangements
- Assistive technologies
- Non-medical personal support (NMPH) e.g. reader or scribe in examinations
- Flexible Deadlines
- Alternative assessment

15.5   The following types of adjustments relate to extenuating circumstances impacting assessment within degree-awarding programmes. Some assessment adjustments may not suit certain awards or credit recognition, like short courses and micro-credentials, which may require different assessment adjustments to be considered.

15.6   **Extension**
        An extension is an academic adjustment which gives a student additional time to complete their coursework. It may be an option when extenuating

circumstances have significantly affected a student's ability to prepare for, or submit, an assignment. Guidance on extensions as an academic adjustment can be found in the [Extension guidance](#)

15.7 **Deferral of assessment within taught degree-awarding programmes**

A deferred assessment typically delays the publication of the module result beyond the original reporting deadline. However, in some cases - particularly for deferred exam - the assessment may be rescheduled shortly after the original exam date, usually within the same exam diet. When this occurs, the later exam sitting should still be treated as a deferral. Deferral may be an option when extenuating circumstances have significantly affected the ability of the student to prepare for or sit a scheduled assessment.

15.7.1 Deferrals should be in the same format as the original assessment unless permission is given by the AVP (or their delegate). Deferred exams will always comprise different questions from those used in the original.

15.7.2 Deferral of any component of a module (exam and/or coursework) will result in a grade of 0D for the module being reported on the student's record until all the assessment is completed and a final grade reported.

15.7.3 When approving a deferral, Schools/Departments should plan for how re-assessment would be delivered if needed. A planned timeframe for when a deferral will be taken should be recorded for Registry on MMS. Extensions to agreed deferred deadlines/ submission dates are not permitted, unless a student has paused their studies due to leave of absence. Students should be informed that the agreed deferral date is final.

15.7.4 No student in the Faculties of Arts, Divinity and Science shall be permitted to defer more than 60-credits of assessment in a given academic year, unless in exceptional circumstances and only following approval by Dean/Provost or their delegate, the relevant Associate Dean/Provost (Students). Students who have reached this deferral limit will be flagged by Registry in January and May and a list of such students will be sent to the relevant Associate Deans, School exams officers, and DoTs.

15.7.5 Undergraduate students are not permitted to defer more than 45 credits into the following academic year, except under exceptional circumstances with approval from the AVP (or their delegate, the relevant Associate Dean for Students). This limit will be reduced if there are modules failed without the right to reassessment. This will be reviewed after the August assessment period.

a. For instance, if a student defers 30 credits and fails a 20-credit module with a grade below 4, they will not be allowed deferrals into the next academic year. Students exceeding this 45-credit limit will typically be required to take a Leave of Absence and must re-engage before the relevant exam period to complete outstanding assessments.

15.7.6 For postgraduate taught students, the deferral arrangements will apply as follows:

a. Students who are studying in person are expected to complete their programme within a single year of study (or part-time equivalent). Any requests for deferral beyond the end date of the programme must be discussed with the Associate Provost (Students).
b. For programmes with in-built flexibility (e.g. online part-time PGT programmes), formal deferral arrangements may not be required; students may instead choose to exercise the flexibility provided within the programme, provided that they meet minimum credit and maximum duration of studies requirements as prescribed by the PGT Senate Regulations and/or their respective programme requirements. These arrangements will be made on a case-by-case basis on a School-level; in cases where the deferral would take a student beyond their programme end date, this must be discussed with the Associate Provost (Students).

15.7.7 Guidance on deferred assessment can be found in the deferral planning guidance document: Deferral Guidance.

15.7.8 All requests for deferrals that would take any student beyond their programme end date must be discussed with the relevant Associate Dean/Provost (Students).

15.7.9 Deferral of assessment arrangements may not be available for other types of awards or credit recognition, like short courses and micro-credentials.

15.8 **Alternative assessment**
An alternative assessment refers to a different type or format of evaluation within degree-awarding programmes, designed to measure the same intended learning outcomes as the original assessment. Some assessment alternatives may not suit certain awards or credit recognition, like short courses and micro-credentials, or certain competence standard based subjects such as Medicine, which may require different alternative assessment to be considered.

15.8.1 Alternative assessments may be considered a reasonable adjustment for students with disabilities or may be provided in

exceptional cases where extenuating circumstances have significantly impacted the student's ability to prepare for and complete the scheduled assessments in their original form.

15.8.2 When an alternative assessment is required, it must meet two key criteria:

   a. it should mitigate the disadvantage posed by the student's disability (if applicable) and ensure the assessment accurately reflects the student's ability, and

   b. it must enable the student to demonstrate the same level of skill and knowledge as would be assessed in the standard format.

15.8.3 The design and implementation of alternative assessments are determined in consultation with the relevant academic School/Department, Student Services and the Dean/Provost or their delegate.

15.8.4 Despite the difference in format, an alternative assessment must maintain the same level of rigour as the original assessment and be aligned with the same intended learning outcomes. Any adjustments made to accommodate a student must not compromise the integrity of academic standards or the competence standard (where applicable) being assessed. Consequently, alternative assessments may not always be feasible for certain competence standard assessments, please see guidance on reasonable adjustments.

15.8.5 Student Services must be consulted when alternative assessment is being considered and devised.

16. No detriment rule

16.1 If an error in the grade is identified following the publishing of module results, students will normally be awarded the grade that is in their best interest (i.e. the higher of the original or correct grade).

16.2 If a School/Department believes that there is a good reason to disapply the no detriment rule in a particular instance, they should consult the appropriate Associate Dean Education or Associate Provost Education prior to communicating with the student(s) about the decision.

17.   Approaches to mitigating widespread disruption

Sometimes circumstances outside the University's control may affect a group or entire cohort of students. The University may use one or more of the following approaches to mitigate the impact on students.

17.1   Incomplete assessments
When there is an incomplete set of assessment results for cohorts of students because of a significant disruption of the assessment process, outstanding module assessments must be completed and marked before final module grades can be assigned. Module grades reported based on an incomplete set of assessment results are provisional and must be finalised on the basis of a full set of assessment results as soon as is feasible. This is required to preserve the integrity and quality of the grades that the University awards.

17.2   Module reporting and degree classification
All module grades must be duly reported before a final qualification or degree classification can be assigned. The University will not award qualifications or assign degree classifications based on partial or incomplete results, but may, with the approval of the University Court, indicate provisional outcomes.

17.2.1   If necessary, where a full set of results is not available for a student due to no fault of the student, a lesser qualification or a lower classification of the same qualification may be awarded on a temporary or permanent basis on condition that the full requirements of the lesser qualification have been satisfied.

17.2.2   In cases where there are incomplete sets of assessment results for a cohort of students because of a significant disruption to the assessment process, the University may waive standard programme progression requirements. Such decisions require the approval of the Vice-Principal for Education (Proctor) or delegate.

17.2.3   If a student's module grades are incomplete or delayed through no fault of the student, the Head of School must ensure that timely supporting references and documentation regarding completed work are provided upon request.

18.   Retention schedule

Assessed work with be retained in line with the University's Principles of Records Management.

19.   Annex 1: The 20-point common reporting scale

The following table, for illustration purposes only, shows how each grade range on the reporting scale could align with a classification equivalent. Degree classification itself is dependent on the algorithm taking account of all eligible grades, in accordance with the Classification Policy.

Reporting Scale	Range	Honours Classification Indicator	PGT Classification Indicator
20	16.5-20	First class	Distinction at 5000 Level
19			
18			
17			
16	13.5-16.4	Upper second class	Merit at 5000 Level
15			
14			
13	10.5-13.4	Lower second class	Pass at 5000 Level
12			
11			
10	7-10.4	Third class	
9			
8			
7			
6	4-6.9	Fail (with right to reassessment*)	Fail (with right to reassessment*)
5			
4			
3	0-3.9	Fail (with no right to reassessment^)	Fail (with no right to reassessment)
2			
1			
0			

* Reassessment is not available in some modules.

^ This rule does not apply to UG modules in Medicine

20. Annex 2: Example effects of coursework penalties

TABLE A

For illustrative purpose only, the following table shows examples of the word count penalties imposed by the various schemes for various lengths of work. In each case it is assumed that the specified length is 3,000 words, and that the original mark awarded is 15 on the 20-point scale.

	Scheme A OVER length penalised (under-length not penalised) 1 mark for work that is 10% over-length, then a further 1 mark per additional 10% over	Scheme A OVER/UNDER length penalised 1 mark for work that is 10% over/under-length, then a further 1 mark per additional 10% over/under	Scheme B OVER length penalised (under-length not penalised) 1 mark for work that is 5% over-length, then a further 1 mark per additional 10% over	Scheme B OVER/UNDER length penalised 1 mark for work that is 5% over/under-length, then a further 1 mark per additional 10% over/under	Scheme C OVER length penalised (under-length not penalised) 1 mark for work that is over-length to any extent, then a further 1 mark per additional 5% over	Scheme C OVER/UNDER length penalised 1 mark for work that is over/under-length to any extent, then a further 1 mark per additional 5% over/under
2,400	0	2	0	2	0	5
2,550	0	1	0	2	0	4
2,700	0	1	0	1	0	3
2,850	0	0	0	1	0	2
2,990	0	0	0	0	0	1
3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
3,010	0	0	0	0	1	1
3,150	0	0	1	1	2	2
3,300	1	1	1	1	3	3
3,450	1	1	2	2	4	4
3,600	2	2	2	2	5	5

TABLE B

For illustrative purpose only, the following table shows examples of the lateness penalties imposed for various degrees of lateness. In each case it is assumed that the original mark awarded is 15 on the 20-point scale.

	Scheme A 1 mark per day, or part thereof	Scheme B 1 mark per 8-hour period, or part thereof	Scheme C Initial penalty of 3 marks, then a further 1 mark per additional 8-hour period, or part thereof
1 minute	1	1	3
1 hour	1	1	3
12 hours	1	2	4
1 day	1	3	5
25 hours	2	4	6
36 hours	2	5	7
3 days	3	9	11
10 days	10	15	15
16 days	15	15	15

21.   Annex 3: Module Results reporting codes

Module results at the University of St Andrews are reported using the following **Module Results Reporting** Codes, followed by the numeric grades in accordance with the Common Reporting Scale, as per Annex 1 of this document.

Grade	Description	Module Grade
P	Pass	7.0 to 20.0
P	Pass for pass/fail modules	0.0
F	Fail with right to re-assessment	4.0 to 6.9
F	Fail with no right to re-assessment	0.0 to 3.9

F	Fail for pass/fail modules	0.0
X	Fail due to non-completion – but with right to resit	6.9 (lowered from pass mark)
X	Failed to meet module requirements Applies where a student has failed to complete the work of a module without good reason or where a student does not register for, or does not attend, any exam without good reason. The student is not entitled to a re-assessment opportunity for this module. Where a student obtains a pre-defined adjustment prior to the deadline of the re-assessment their resit record will be closed.	0.0
D	Deferred Applies if there is a good medical or personal reason (see Extenuating Circumstances Policy) for a student's inability to complete any part of the assessment requirements. Arrangements must be made locally to complete the assessment and report the deferred result. Please enter an expected date of submission for the deferred assessment.	0.0
Z	No result reported, although expected Applies when a student's module result is unresolved due to mitigating circumstances or some other valid reason. Please enter a brief comment	0.0

	via MMS. Please note that Registry may request further information from the School/Department. This code should only be left temporarily on a student record, a further result should be reported as soon as possible.	
S	Special circumstances Applies if a student's module was affected by special circumstances (See S-coding policy). The grade should not be altered but reported with the annotation 'S' (for example, '6.0 S').	0.0 to 20.0
V	Void Applies for mitigating circumstances where the module is not included in classification.	0.0
A	Audited Applies to modules not taken for a grade or credit.	0.0
PC	Grade capped Applies to modules capped due to academic misconduct.	7.0
XA	Fail – academic misconduct Resit the module assessment at the next available opportunity	0.0
XC	Fail – academic misconduct	0.0

	Zero for the module with the right to retake the module for credit only.	
XN	Fail – academic misconduct Zero for the module and no right to take an additional module.	0.0
XR	Fail – academic misconduct Zero for the module with the right to take an additional module for credit only.	0.0

22. Contacts

22.1   Questions about this policy should be directed to the relevant Associate Dean/Provost Education, or to the Education Policy & Quality team (education@st-andrews.ac.uk).

23. Version control

Version number	Purpose or changes	Document status	Author of changes, role and School or unit	Date
1.0	New policy	Published	Academic Policy Officer (Digital & Student Experience)	27/08/2025
1.1	Minor changes: 1) in 13.3, MD modules are added for clarification, 2) in 15.7, definition of deferrals is clarified, and 3) in 5.3 and 5.3.1, references to ILO are	Published	Academic Policy Officer (Digital & Student Experience)	6/2/2026

	clarified.			
		35		