

**KIBOGORA INSTITUTE A.K.A.
"KIBOGORA POLYTECHNIC"**



EXAMINATION POLICY AND REGULATIONS

EXAMINATION POLICY AND REGULATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

These Regulations may be cited as the KIBOGORA POLYTECHNIC Examination Policy and Regulations, 2016.

Purpose and Rationale

The purpose of this Examination Policy and Regulations is to maintain coordinated, consistent assessment practices across the KP. It sets out the principles underpinning the use of exams and other assessments in the assessment of candidate learning. The Policy complies with the Higher Education Council's National Policy on Internal and External Moderation of Higher Education which is to be found in **Appendix 4** of these Regulations.

The Examination Regulations reflect the vision of the KP that the educational process should integrate legal knowledge and legal skills into the professional practice of lawyers. Hence the Examination components form a balanced mix between written exams, practical assignments, application in the field of practice and research.

Scope and Definitions

This Policy and these Regulations apply to all KP s. It is relevant to all staff and candidates involved in any aspect of the assessment process.

Definitions:

Appeal: an appeal means an appeal by a candidate against a decision of the Academic Senate. Appeals are governed by these Regulations, in particular, **Appendix 3**.

Examination: the combination of the components that are forming the overall candidate assessment and the final grade

Examination Board: established by the KP Academic Senate to consider candidate grades and determine whether candidates may proceed. The Examination Board makes recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Exam: a formal, time-limited, written or practical assessment with invigilation scheduled by the Academic Registrar.

Exam paper: the original document prepared by the member of academic staff.

Exam script: the KP booklet in which the candidate gives responses.

External examiner: a person appointed by the Academic Senate in accordance with the regulations of the Higher Education Council to supervise all aspects of the examination process. The policy and regulations governing external examiners will be found in **Appendix 2** of these regulations.

Re-take of module: Retake of module(s): means coming back to the KP, sitting with candidates in class during the modules in which the candidate failed, studying with them, doing all the assignments and then writing exams with them. The candidate is expected to pay the required tuition fees as set by the KP management.

Re-take of programme: means coming back to the KP, sitting with candidates in class for the whole programme, studying with them, doing all the assignments and then writing exams with them. The candidate is expected to pay the required tuition fees as set by the KP management.

B. POLICY

Time table

The Academic Registrar shall publish the dates of the exams for each course in the Student Guide. Each candidate is responsible for adhering to the exam timetable.

The Academic Registrar shall, before the commencement of each course, publish a full exam schedule for all staff. The exams schedule will include the following:

Pre Exam

- Deadlines for the submission of each draft exam to the Head of Modules
- Deadlines for the submission of each draft exam to the DVCA
- Deadlines for the submission of each draft exam to the Academic Registrar
- Deadlines for printing of exams.

Post Exam

- Deadlines for the completion of the exam and coursework marking and the submission of all Module marks by the head of Modules to the Academic Registrar

General

- The dates of the Examination Board meeting
- The dates of all re-sit examinations

The Academic Registrar shall, before the commencement of each course, publish a full procedure for the arrangements with the external examiner or examiners.

Module Assessment

The mode and content of assignments and exams of the modules reflect the learning outcomes as described in the syllabus of each module. The assessment includes both formative and summative methods and measures both legal knowledge and professional skills.

The lecturers develop the exam questions and other assessments of their own subject in the module and Head of Modules prepares the draft exam paper, and final exam is approved by the DVCA.

Invigilation

Invigilators have responsibility for the conduct of exams. Procedures for Invigilation are to be found in **Appendix 1**.

An invigilator has and may exercise such powers as are reasonably necessary to ensure the proper and efficient conduct of the exam. An invigilator should not enter into debate with a candidate for any direction given to the candidate. If guidance is given it should be given by a member of staff involved in the setting of the exam.

Publication of exam results and feedback

The Academic Registrar will normally publish the provisional results of an exam to the students within four weeks of the exam date.

The candidate has the right to ask the Head of Module for feedback on his/her exam results and the Head of Module is obliged to allow the candidate to see their examination script and to give feedback to the candidate.

Appeal

A candidate may appeal against a decision made by the Examination Board in accordance with these Regulations. A candidate may not appeal against an awarded mark which represents the academic judgment of the markers.

Eligibility

The Academic meeting will determine who is eligible to sit an exam. Candidates not considered eligible will be excluded from the exam and this will result in the candidate being awarded a Fail grade (F) for the module.

Candidates living with disability

The Institute will make reasonable adjustments for candidates with a disability or other special needs to ensure fairness and equality of opportunity for all candidates. The extent of the adjustments needed will normally be agreed at the time of the admission of the student.

C. EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

Minimum Standards and Code of Conduct for handling all assessments

Preparation of exam papers

- 1) All staff involved in the preparation of exam papers must ensure that candidates are not able to see or gain access, either accidentally or deliberately, to exam questions or related material.
- 2) The lecturing team of the module decide together in advance if the module will be a closed book or an open book exam. The exact procedures for closed and open book exams will be determined and communicated to all students taking the exam. Students are not allowed to access Internet during an open book exam unless there is a specific authorisation by the lecturer to do so.
- 3) The Head of Module scrutinises the exam questions to ensure they correspond with the learning outcomes of the module and are in all respects comprehensible and appropriate.
- 4) The Head of Module prepares the exam paper for the module in both English and French.
- 5) The Head of Module delivers the exam paper to the Head of Department who is responsible for the final check. The HoD delivers the final exam to the Academic Registrar.
- 6) The Academic Registrar ensures that the exam paper is put into the required format and printed by at the latest the day before the exam is due.

Securing the exam papers

It is the duty of all those involved in setting the exam to keep all aspects of the exam confidential. It is also the duty of all those involved in the examination process to ensure the security of the exam paper. Failure to perform these duties may result in disciplinary proceedings. **Exam Organization**

7. All invigilation of exams shall be in accordance with **Appendix 1** on Invigilation of Exams.

Verification of Identity of a candidate

8. When attending exams, candidates must display their registration cards on their desk before the start of the session, which must be verified by an invigilator.

Behaviour in Exams

9. Candidates shall be seated as directed by the invigilators and in accordance with the seating arrangement provided by the Officer in charge of the Post Graduate Programme.
10. No food or drink is permitted in the examination room other than medicines on prescription and one small bottle of water per candidate.
11. If a candidate wishes to attract the invigilator's attention they should do so by raising a hand.
12. If an alarm sounds, candidates must leave their exam paper and exam script, collect their personal belongings, and evacuate the room quickly and quietly.
13. Except where specified before the exam and in the exam rubric, candidates may not bring into the examination room any books, papers or calculators with text facility. Mobile telephones, tablets and any other electronic devices are prohibited in the examination room.
14. If candidates report that they have inadvertently brought an unauthorised item to their desk, the invigilator should remove the item, make a report and report the full circumstances to the Academic Registrar. The candidates should be permitted to continue the exam.

15. In the event of a candidate becoming ill or similar emergency, the Chief Invigilator should send immediately for health personnel and submit a full report to the Academic Registrar.

Authorized absence/late submission of assignments, and mitigation of results

16. If a student has attended less than 80% of the teaching session of a particular module, the DVCA may take a decision to exclude the student from taking the exam.
17. Candidates may make a written request to the DVCA to be absent from teaching sessions or one or more exams, producing evidence of circumstances that make it impossible for them to attend.
18. An application may also be made after failure to attend an exam but within 3 days of it, and must additionally explain, with evidence, why it was not possible to make the application before the date of the exam. Applications later than this will be exceptional. Applications must be made to the DVCA who is empowered to make a decision.
19. Where a candidate fails to attend an examination because of authorised absence, he or she shall take a special exam which shall not count as a re-sit. The script shall be eligible for the full range of marks.
20. Failure to pass a module because the date for the special exam has not yet been reached shall not preclude candidates from progressing between phases.
21. Candidates may make a written request to the Academic Dean for authorization of late submission of coursework, producing evidence of circumstances that make it impossible for them to hand it in on time. Such applications must normally be made before the due date for the work.
22. Extensions may be for no longer than a month, or up to one week before the module exam, whichever is shorter. Where a candidate is likely to need an extension longer than this, the application must go to the DVCA.

23. Failure to pass modules because of an extension of course work has been given shall not preclude from progressing between phases.
24. Where repeated applications for late submission or absence from exam are based on a chronic or on-going medical condition, they shall not normally be allowed. Instead, the DVCA shall consult with the candidate and the Institution's medical officer or other disability officer to see what help the Institution can offer that will help to overcome the effect of the condition insofar as ability to study and deliver coursework is concerned.

Dealing with Emergency Interruptions to Exams

25. Where at the designated time of starting an exam, the building in which it was due to be held is closed as a result of an emergency building evacuation, the exam will normally start fifteen minutes after the building has been re-opened or in an alternative room.
26. It is the responsibility of the invigilators to remain in the vicinity of the building so that they may be the first people to (re)enter the building after the all-clear is given.
27. It is the responsibility of the candidates to ensure that they are present at the time when the building is re-opened. No exam candidates should (re)enter the examination room until authorised to do so by the Chief Invigilator.
28. Where an exam has been in process and it is disrupted because of an emergency then such an exam may be rescheduled. When the disruption occurs before 75% of the time allocated has passed, the exam will be rescheduled.
29. Where the interruption occurs after 75% or more of the time allocated has passed, the DVCA, in consultation with appropriate colleagues and taking into account the nature of the paper, will decide either:
 - a) to assess the candidates on the basis of the work available, if it is sufficient to allow an informed judgment to be made on the achievement of the learning outcomes; or
 - b) to require that the exam be rescheduled.

- 30.** The Head of Module, in consultation with the Academic Registrar, is responsible for communicating the decision to candidates within 48 hours of the interrupted exam, by means of a notice affixed to the candidates' notice boards, that the exam will not take place as scheduled.
- 31.** The Academic Registrar will fix a new date, time and place and display the information on the candidates' notice board and forward the same to the Faculty concerned. It is the responsibility of the candidates to ascertain the revised schedule and to be present at the designated time and place for the exam.

D. EXAMINATION OFFENCES

Cheating and Plagiarism

- 32.** Cheating may be punished by permanent exclusion from exams and the candidate may be expelled from the Institute if the cheating consists of:
- a) written communication, through telephone, paper or any other means, between two candidates in a room or between a candidate and someone else outside the room;
 - b) exchanging of exam papers between candidates during the exam;
 - c) any oral communication between candidates during the exam;
 - d) obtaining copies of unseen exams or tests beforehand;
 - e) influencing the contents of exams or tests beforehand by threat or inducement;
 - f) influencing the marks by threat or inducement;
 - g) impersonating a candidate in an exam;
 - h) any attempt to harass or corrupt a lecturer or other member of staff in order to gain advantage.
- 33.** A candidate who is suspected of cheating and who attempts any threat against exam supervisors shall be expelled from the Institute.
- 34.** Plagiarism is the practice whereby a candidate submits work which has originated in sum or in part from someone else, with or without their consent but without acknowledgement. When plagiarism is proven for any assessment, the candidate shall normally fail that assessment.

35. Cheating of any other variety may render the candidate liable to failing an examination for that module, failing a programme phase or temporary or permanent exclusion from the Institute, according to the gravity of the offence as will be decided by the Examination Board.
36. Where a member of staff detects or suspects cheating or plagiarism on the part of a candidate, the Academic Registrar must be notified in writing as quickly as possible and in all cases within 24 hours being detected and evidence must be provided to support the charge.
37. If the Academic Registrar is satisfied that there is a case to answer, he or she shall send copies of the evidence to the, Vice Rector Academic within three working days of its receipt.
38. Within three days the candidate will be informed of the pending accusation including an explanation of the procedures to be followed.
39. The candidate shall then have three working days to submit a defence or justification in writing from the date of receiving the accusation.
40. The Examination Board shall consider the evidence and the candidate's reply, decide whether it appears that cheating has occurred and recommend a penalty.
41. If the candidate wishes to appeal against the penalty of the Examination Board, he or she shall have a right to appeal in accordance with the Appeal Regulations.
42. If the candidate makes such an appeal and then fails without any proper reason to attend the hearing, it shall be held in his or her absence, the evidence reviewed and the penalty reconfirmed or varied.
43. A record of any proven charges of cheating, attempted cheating, and the penalty awarded, shall be held on the candidate's file and the record shall be produced to the Examination Board in any future cases involving the same candidate.
44. Any member of staff proved to be complicit in a candidate's cheating shall be liable to disciplinary proceedings and in certain circumstances, may be liable to criminal proceedings.

45. Where plagiarism or other cheating is discovered in any form of assessment after the award of a degree, a hearing analogous to an appeal hearing shall be held to consider it in the same way as if it had been discovered before the award. Every reasonable effort must be made to contact the candidate, but if these efforts are unsuccessful during a six-month period, the hearing shall be held in his or her absence. If the charge is proven, the candidate will be withdrawn. In this case the candidate has a right of appeal to a hearing chaired by the Rector.

E. PROGRESSION

46. The provisional results of the exams will be published within four weeks of the date the exam took place.
47. The Heads of Modules are responsible for delivering the list of grades of the exam of their respective modules to the Academic Registrar, and the program coordinator for the delivery of the list of grades of the internship and research.
48. The Academic Registrar is responsible for presenting the grades for all components of the examination in a programme to the Examination Board, in a period to be specified by the institution.
49. Marks awarded will be provisional until confirmed by the Academic Senate.
50. Candidates who are not allowed to progress to the next phase will normally be allowed to register as a part-time candidate and repeat the modules they have failed, but no module may be retaken or repeated more than once.

F. QUALITY ASSURANCE OF THE MARKING PROCESS

51. If the Examination Board so decides they can request an external examiner to remark an exam of a specific module.
52. The Examination Board considers the reports of the external examiner and submits the report together with any mark changes to the Academic Senate.
53. The External Examiner Policy forms part of this Examinations Policy and Regulations.

G. ORGANIZATION OF EXAMINATION; REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES

Examination Board

54. The KIBOGORA POLYTECHNIC has established an Examination Board to consider candidate grades and make recommendations to the Academic Senate whether candidates may proceed.
55. The Board consists of the Vice Rector for Academic Affairs and Research (DVCA) , who shall be the chairperson, the External Examiner, the Academic Registrar, the Academic Quality Assurance Director and at least 2 academic members of staff to be nominated by the DVCA.
56. The Board makes proposals on progression of candidates to the Academic Senate to approve.
57. The Board considers candidate progression, after each exam period and at the end of each phase and shall take note of the progress.
58. In cases of a dispute, decisions shall be taken by an absolute majority of those present, and in the case of a tied vote the outcome most favourable to the candidate shall be taken.
59. The details of the Board's deliberations are confidential and shall not be conveyed to any candidate or other person outside the Board, except in the Board's confidential minutes.
60. The Board shall consider the report and any recommendations of the external examiner.
61. The Examination Board produces a report on marks to the Academic Senate for deliberations and approval.

H. IN LEGAL PRACTICE

General Exam Rules

62. Every candidate assessment shall be marked out of 100.

- 63.** The overall assessment of the candidate is based upon the results of the components of the Examination: and shall generate a single mark between 0 and 100 %.

- 64.** The candidate is required to complete all components of the Examination and must pass with at least 50 % for each of the components.

65. A candidate who fails to attend a required exam or fails to complete other assessed work by the stated deadline shall be deemed to have failed and shall be awarded a mark of zero for that exam or assessment.
66. The DVCA, may allow mitigation in the light of the candidate's circumstances, based on the documentation filed by the Academic Registrar.

Examination Rules for the in Legal Practice Fulltime and Part time

67. For the individual components of the final mark, these rules mean the following:

68. *Module Assessment*

All nine modules are assessed by a written exam, course work and research exercises. The total mark for all nine modules constitutes an examination component.

Scores

- a. Candidates pass when they have an average score of at least 60 % in the module assessment for all 9 modules together and have no module score below 50 %.
- b. Candidates are allowed to re-sit modules with scores below 60 % up to a maximum of 3 modules. On re –sit the candidate can achieve a maximum mark of 60% in that re-sit exam and the re-sit mark replaces the original mark. Candidates may select 3 particular modules they wish to re-sit among the failed ones.
- c. If a candidate fails with 30% and below in only one module but the average score of the 9 modules is 60% and above, he/she is allowed to re-sit the failed modules up to a maximum of 3
- d. If a candidate fails with 30% or below in more than one module, this candidate has failed and is not allowed to do any re-sit. This candidate may apply to retake the programme.
- e. Candidates who fail after re-sitting not more than four modules but have an average score per module of more than 30% are allowed to retake these modules in the next intake on payment of an appropriate fee. Exception will only be given to a candidate who fails with 30% or below and not

more than one module but have a total average score of the nine modules that is 60% and above. Such candidates will also be allowed re-sit up to a maximum of three.

- f. Candidates who fail more than four modules after re-sitting, will fail the KP. They are normally allowed to retake the whole program in the next intake on payment of an appropriate fee.
- g. Students who have permission to retake modules, components or the whole programme in the next year can do so, but will have to pay the tuition fees for the part that they retake. The management of the KP will yearly determine the said fee.
- h. Students who retake modules, components or the whole programme will have to graduate within three years after they have enrolled to the KP. After three years the credits they obtained will become invalid.

Score	Result
All 9 modules have a score of at least 60 %	Pass the first phase the of programme (Modules)
All modules have a score of at least 50 % and the average score over all nine modules is at least 60 %	Pass the first phase the of programme (Modules)
The average score of all nine modules is less than 60 %. No module scores less than 30 %	Fail the first phase of the programme (Modules). Re-sit of the exams less than 60 % up to a maximum of four modules
Any score is 30% and below in only one module, but the average score of the nine modules is 60% and above	Fail of the first phase. Re-sit of failed modules up to a maximum of three
Any score is 30% and below in only one module and the average score of the nine modules is less than 60%	Fail. No re-sit

Any score is less than 30% in more than one module whatever the average score may be of the nine modules	Fail. No re-sit
In principle only one re-sit (per module) is possible, except under special circumstances approved by the Vice Rector Academic.	
Failing after re-sit of four modules or less (The average score is less than 60 % and/or there are modules with a score of less than 50 %) There are no modules with a score below 30 %)	Retake of the modules scored less than 60 % is possible
Failing after re-sit of five modules (The average score over all nine modules is less than 60 % and/or there are more than five modules with a score of less than 50 %)	Retake of programme

- i. If a candidate has to retake one or more modules in the next year she/he is allowed to continue with the phase 2 of the programme which is internship.
- j. If a candidate has to retake the whole programme in the next year he/she is not allowed to continue to the next phase in the same sitting.

70.1 Moot Court

All candidates shall participate in Moot Court proceedings as required. The Moot Court assessment shall be a component of the examination. If the candidate fails to pass the Moot Court assessment with a score of 60%, he/she is allowed to resit. Only one such attempt shall be permitted except under special circumstances approved by the Vice Rector Academic.

70.2. Internship & Internship Report

Unless subject to exemption from the requirement to undertake an internship under the KP Internship Regulations, all candidates must be assessed on their internship. The Internship will count as a component of the examination. The Internship Regulations are to be found in Appendix 5 of these Regulations.

- a) The internship ends with the Internship Report submitted by candidates.
- b) The internship assessment comprises 15% of the examination

- c) If the candidate fails to pass the internship with a score of 60%, he/she is allowed to resit. Only one such attempt shall be permitted except under special circumstances approved by the Vice Rector Academic.

Final grade

69. The relative weight of the various components of the examination is reflected in the final grade, meaning that the total of the nine modules make 70 % of the final grade, the moot court 15%, and the internship 15 %. (Total 100 %)
70. Candidates with more than two years of experience in the field of legal practice may be exempted from the internship. This means that their final grade is based on a maximum of 85, which will be converted to a percentage. All components of the examination must be passed before the award of the in Legal Practice.
71. The final grade for the in Legal Practice shall be awarded on the following basis:

Component of Examination	Contribution to the final grade	Contribution to the final grade Candidates with internship exemption
<p><i>Module assessment</i></p> <p>This assessment consists of three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous assessment: assignments maximum 25 % • Research exercise(s) 25% • Written exams after modules: After each of the nine modules, candidates will undergo a written Exam. The average for the written exams will count up for a maximum of 50 % <p>Total of continuous assessment, Research Exercise(s) and written exam =100%</p>	70 %	70
<p><i>Moot court:</i> In the course of studying the nine modules every student will do a practical session referred to here as moot court which will be evaluated at 100%</p>	15%	15%

<p><i>Internship & Internship Report</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The internship, done under the supervision of a mentor, ends with the Internship Report drafted by candidate. The mentor gives an evaluation mark and the KP academic staff marks the Internship report which counts for a maximum of 100%</p>	15 %	
<i>Maximum total marks</i>	100	

72. The candidates will be marked at the end of the KP in the following 4 categories:

- FAIL less than 60% of the total marks for the examination
- PASS: 60 – 69% of the total marks for the examination
- CREDIT: 70- 79% of the total marks for the examination
- DISTINCTION 80 – 100% of the total marks for the examination

Examination Rules for the in Legal Practice Work Based learning Mode (WBL)

- 73.** The Work Based Learning is a mode of the KP which is intended for students who are currently in practice and have two years or more professional experience. The learning will be achieved partly by formal tuition and partly by work based learning.
- 74.** The components of the examination for the WBL shall be the module assessments and the Learning Log.
- 75.** The rules for the module assessments for the WBL shall be the same as those contained in Article 70 of these Regulations.
- 76.** The Learning Log is a reflective journal containing a series of work based tasks. The candidate shall be supervised during the WBL by a mentor appointed by KP. The candidate shall attend such meetings as required by the Mentor. If there are repeated failures to attend such meetings without

reasonable excuse, the mentor may recommend to the Examination Board that the candidate fails this component.

77. The final grade for the in Legal Practice Work Based Learning shall be awarded on the following basis:

Component of Examination	Contribution to the final grade
<p><i>Module assessment</i></p> <p>This assessment consists of three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous assessment: assignments maximum 25 % • Research exercise(s) 25% • Written exams after modules: After each of the nine modules, candidates will undergo a written Exam. The average for the written exams will count up for a maximum of 50 % <p>Total of continuous assessment, Research Exercise(s) and written exam =100%</p>	70%
<p><input type="checkbox"/> <i>Learning Log</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The learning log done under the supervision of a mentor must be submitted to KP by a date notified to the student after the end of Module 9. The report is marked by the Mentor and KP out of 100 and counts for a maximum of 30%</p>	30 %
<p><i>Maximum total number of marks</i></p>	100%

78. The candidates will be marked at the end of the KP in the following 4 categories:

FAIL less than 60% of the total marks for the examination

PASS: 60 – 69% of the total marks for the examination

CREDIT: 70- 79% of the total marks for the examination

DISTINCTION 80 – 100% of the total marks for the examination

Examination Rules for the in Legal Practice Executive Mode

79. The in Legal Practice Executive Mode is intended for senior members of legal professions who can demonstrate that they have already, in part, achieved the learning outcomes for the in Legal Practice.
80. The component for the examination for the executive mode shall be the module assessments, the moot court and the reflective journal.
81. Each module assessment shall comprise a research paper counting 40% of the marks, a individual assignment counting 30% of the marks and a group assessment counting 30% of the marks.
82. Apart from the rules in Article 82 and 86, the provisions of Article 70 above shall apply to the Executive Mode assessment.
83. All candidates shall participate in Moot Court proceedings as required. The Moot Court assessment shall be a component of the examination. If the candidate fails to pass the Moot Court assessment with a score of 60%, he/she is allowed to resit. Only one such attempt shall be permitted except under special circumstances approved by the Vice Rector Academic.
84. The purpose of the reflective journal is for the candidate to record their progress through the course and reflect on the relationship between their professional work and the taught elements of the course. The reflective journal must be completed by a date after the end of the module teaching to be communicated to the candidates by the Academic Registrar.
85. The final grade for the in Legal Practice Executive Mode shall be awarded on the following basis:

Component of examination	Content	% of total assessment
9 Module Assessments	Continuous assessment in each module: Group work -30% Research Paper -40% Individual assignment 30%	60
Moot Court		10
Reflective Journal		30

TOTAL		100
-------	--	-----

86. The candidates will be marked at the end of the KP in the following 4 categories:

FAIL	less than 60% of the total marks for the examination
PASS:	60 – 69% of the total marks for the examination
CREDIT:	70- 79% of the total marks for the examination
DISTINCTION	80 – 100% of the total marks for the examination

I. IN LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING (KP)

General Examination Rules

- 87.** Every candidate assessment shall generate a single mark between 0 and 100 %, expressing the extent to which the learning outcomes of the programme have been achieved.
- 88.** The overall assessment of the candidate is based upon the results of the two components of the Examination: (Module assessment and research paper) and shall generate a single mark between 0 and 100 %.
- 89.** The candidate is required to take part in all the two components of the Examination and must pass it.
- 90.** The module assessment component counts for 80 % of the overall mark of KP, the Research Paper counts for 20%.
- 91.** The KP module assessment comprises assessment of the twelve modules of the course.

92. Candidates who attend less than 80 per cent of such sessions may be excluded from the module exam. In specific cases (illness
93. , specific social circumstances) the DVCA can, based on the documentation filed by the Academic Registrar, allow the candidate to sit for the exam.
94. A Candidate who fails module assessment assignment or exam shall be allowed to re-sit the assignment or to re-sit the exam at a specified time. Only one such attempt shall be permitted except under special circumstances approved by the DVCA.
95. A candidate who fails to attend a required exam or fails to complete other assessed work by the stated deadline shall be deemed to have failed and shall be awarded a mark of zero for that exam or assessment.
96. The DVCA may allow mitigation in the light of the candidate's circumstances, based on the documentation filed by the Academic Registrar.

Module Assessment

97. Each module will be assessed by class assignment(s) which will count for 50% of the module mark, and the final examination will count for 50%.
98. The exams are marked by the lecturers of the module within two weeks after the date the exam was due.
99. The marking process is coordinated and controlled by the Academic Registrar
100. The marking process is supervised by the DVCA.

Research Paper

101. The research paper of KP will be an assignment on a specific law in which the student is required to write a piece of legislation and an explanatory memorandum on a topic agreed by the KP approval by the DVCA. The pass mark for the research paper is 60%.

Scores

102. Candidates pass when they have an average score of at least 60% in module assessments for all the 12 modules together, and have no module score below 50%

103. Candidates are allowed to re-sit modules with scores below 60% up to a maximum of 4. On re-sit, the candidate can achieve a maximum mark of 60% in the re-sit exam. Candidates may select 4 modules they wish to re-sit among the failed ones.

104. The average score of all the 12 modules is less than 60%, no module score is below 30%. Fail of the first phase, re-sit of modules scored 60% to a maximum of 4.

105. A candidate fails the Program if any score is less than 30% in more than two modules whatever the average score may be of the 12 modules.

106. Re-sits will take place in the fourth week after the end of the KP programme.

107. Candidates who were absent on the date of the exam and have approval from the DVCA are allowed to do a special exam. In the special exam the candidate can achieve a maximum mark of 100%.

108. Candidates who fail after re-sitting a maximum of 4 modules but have no score in any module of 30 % and less, are allowed to re-take these modules in the next intake on payment of an appropriate fee.

109. Candidates, who fail a total of 6 modules including re-sits, will fail the KP program. They are allowed to retake the whole programme in the next intake on payment of an appropriate fee.

- 110.** If a candidate fails for more than 6 modules after re-sitting he/she will not normally be allowed to retake the programme.
- 111.** If a candidate scores a mark between 50% and 59% for the research paper, the candidate shall be allowed to resubmit (with revisions) the research paper by a date fixed by the Examination Board. If a candidate scores a mark below 50% for the research paper, the candidate may, at the discretion of the Examination Board, be required to retake the research paper.
- 112.** Students who retake module(s), components or the whole programme at a stated time can do so, but will have to pay the tuition fees for the part that they retake.
- 113.** Students who retake modules, components or the whole programme will have to graduate within two years after they have enrolled to the KP. After three years the credits they obtained will become invalid.
- 114.** The final grade for the in Legislative Drafting shall be awarded on the following basis:

Score	Result
All 12 modules have a score of at least 60 %	Pass the first phase of the programme (Modules)
All modules have a score of at least 50 % and the average score over all 12 modules is at least 60 %	Pass the first phase of the programme (Modules)

The average score of all 12 modules is less than 60 %. No module scores less than 30 %	Fail the first phase of the programme (Modules). Re-sit of the exams less than 60 % up to a maximum of 4 modules
Any score is less than 30% in not more than two modules, but the average score of the 12 modules is 60% and above	Fail of the first phase. Re-sit of failed modules a maximum of 4
Any score is less than 30% in any two modules and the average score of the 12 modules is less than 60%	Fail. No re-sit
Any score is less than 30% in more than two modules whatever the average score may be of the 12 modules	Fail. No re-sit
Score of at least 60% in the research paper	Pass second phase
Score of 50%-59% in the research paper	Resubmit with revisions
Score of under 50% in the research paper	Examination Board may require retake of research paper
In principle only one Re-sit (per module) is possible, except under special circumstances approved by the Vice Rector Academic.	
Failing after re-sit of 4 modules when the average score of the 12 modules is at least 60 % and above, but there are no modules with a score below 30 %	Retake of the modules scored less than 60% is possible. A maximum of 4.
Failing after re-sit of 4 modules; the average score of the 12 modules is less than 60 %	Retake of programme
Failing more than 6 modules after re-sit.	Fail – Retake of Program

Final grade

115. The relative weight of the various components of Examination is reflected in the final grade, meaning that the total of the 12 modules make 80 % of the final grade and the Research Paper 20%

PASS: 60 – 69% of the maximum total number of %

CREDIT: 70- 79% of the maximum total number of %

DISTINCTION 80 – 100% of the maximum total number of %

APPENDIX 1 Invigilation Procedure

1) Invigilation shall be organised by the Academic Registrar who should:

a) publish information on the date, time and place of each exam one week before the exam period starts;

b) draw an exam timetable and invigilation schedule, which is discussed and approved in the academic unit meeting one week before the exam period starts.

c) ensure that the exam papers are available at each exam in sufficient quantity and that the chief invigilators can collect the secured exam papers and scripts at the office of the Academic Registrar 30 minutes before the exam starts;

d) ensure that sufficient exam script books which identify students only by number are available and that they are securely stored both before and after any exam;

- e) prepare an exam attendance list, which every candidate signs after handing in their exam script(s) and exam paper.
- f) Plan a suitable seating arrangement for the candidates in the examination room.
- g) Prepare a mark record form for completion and signing by those responsible for the marking of the exam. This form should be delivered with the scripts to those responsible for marking and should be returned to the Academic Registrar after the marking is complete.

Accommodation

- 2) Exams of different durations should not normally be scheduled in the same rooms. Where two or more groups of candidates are undertaking different exams in the same room, a clear indication of the division(s) between the groups must be available in advance.
- 3) Two invigilators per room should be present in each exam. If more than fifty candidates are to be examined in any room, an additional invigilator should be present for each additional thirty candidates or part thereof.
- 4) Sufficient invigilators should be designated to cover all exams.
- 5) Under no circumstances whatsoever must the examination room be left unattended by at least one invigilator during any part of an exam.
- 6) The Academic Registrar should ensure arrangements are in place to designate one invigilator in each examination room as the Chief Invigilator, with overall responsibility for the conduct of the exam in a particular room.
- 7) Invigilators may not delegate their appointment. If an invigilator is unable to fulfil his or her duties because of circumstances beyond their control, they should propose an alternative invigilator to the Academic Registrar for designation.
- 8) Candidates should neither be permitted to enter an exam after it has started except with the permission of the Chief invigilator, nor leave within the first hour after the start of the exam.

- 9) At the beginning of an exam the Chief Invigilator should remind candidates of the length of the exam, warn them that they may not talk to each other or look at each other's work during the exam and tell them when they may start. The Chief Invigilator should take a register of all those present at the beginning of the exam and again at the end to ensure that all candidates have handed in their scripts.
- 10) A Clock should be put on the wall in every examination room to enable candidates to check the time. Candidates should be informed about the end time 30 minutes before the end of the exam. When the Chief Invigilator announces the end of the exam, all writing must cease.
- 11) Any candidate who wishes to leave the examination room during an exam for an unavoidable reason, with the intention of returning should seek for permission and be accompanied by an invigilator.
- 12) Invigilators have a responsibility to ensure that the exam for which they are appointed runs smoothly and is conducted in accordance with any specific institutional rules.
- 13) Talking among candidates or looking at each other's work will not be permitted in exams and will be grounds for exclusion from the exam by the Chief Invigilator, who also has the power to initiate disciplinary proceedings for cheating. In any of the above circumstances a contemporaneous note of the events should be made and signed by the Chief Invigilator.
- 14) The Chief Invigilator should collect all exam scripts and papers in order and list/lists of candidates, from the Academic Registrar not later than 30 minutes before the start of the exam and ensure that an adequate supply is maintained throughout the exam.
- 15) Invigilators must:
 - a) Arrive in the examination room at least 15 minutes before the planned start of the exam.
 - b) Ensure that the examination room is suitably prepared. They should see that there are sufficient places for the number of candidates expected, that each place is provided with the materials and equipment indicated on the rubric of the exam paper.
 - c) Ensure that the correct exam papers and scripts are distributed to candidates before the exam starts and that each exam paper is complete.

16) In the event of a candidate becoming ill or similar emergency, the Chief Invigilator should send immediately for health personnel and submit a full report to the Academic Registrar.

17) At the conclusion of the exam, the Chief Invigilator shall:

- (a) announce the end of the exam and instruct candidates to stop writing;
- (b) remind candidates that all work, including rough work, must be handed in and that no answer book, official stationery or equipment is to be removed from the examination room;
- (c) Remind candidates to complete the front of their exam script(s).
- (d) before dismissing the candidates, ensure that all exam scripts are collected from each candidate who has signed the candidate list and check that the registration numbers of the candidates on the list correspond with the registration numbers on exam scripts collected
- (e) Remind candidates that they must remain silent until their scripts have been collected and they have signed the exam attendance list.

All exam scripts, list(s) of candidates and exam papers are to be returned to the Academic Registrar immediately after the exam by the Chief Invigilator.

After the Exam

18) If it is not possible to return completed exam scripts and papers immediately to the Office of the Academic Registrar (e.g. after an evening exam) the Chief Invigilator should ensure that completed exam scripts, any unused scripts (answer book(s)) and all other forms are kept secure and returned to the Office at 08.30 hours the following morning.

19) The Academic Registrar should keep the exam scripts in the safe until they are sent for marking.

20) All exam scripts, list(s) of candidates and exam papers are to be returned to the Academic Registrar immediately after the exam by the Chief Invigilator.

APPENDIX 2

POLICY ON INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MODERATION

MODERATION: PURPOSES AND PRACTICES

Principles

- Moderation *of assessment tasks* is part of the assurance of standards – ensuring, and offering evidence that we have checked that, the tasks we set are of an appropriate standard and do test the learning objectives of a given module. Internal moderation of questions and

exercises (by other academics within the institution) is desirable for all assessment; external moderation is also desirable as an ‘audit trail’ showing that the process has been carried out and as a check that the standards of one institution are credible to another.

- Moderation of *marking* serves the same purposes and also demonstrates that the marking process has been carried out rigorously, fairly and without personal bias. External examiners can handle only a small sample of work, but a larger sample should be processed internally.
- Where possible it is also desirable and useful (for audit purposes) that the marking process and the deliberations of examination boards have also been observed and declared to be fairly and legally conducted.
- The curriculum and design of programmes is moderated during the validation process, by the input of External Advisers and Quality Office (or equivalent). Substantial changes to modules or programme between Validations should receive similar consideration – again, to ensure that the changes do not move the programme away from comparability with programmes offered elsewhere.

Moderation of assessment tasks:

The practice now laid down in the *General Academic Regulations* is that each year’s draft module assessment tasks shall be given for comment to another academic within the institution competent in the teaching of the subject matter, along with the learning objectives of the module, and a copy shall also be sent to the external examiner of the module. A written record of all comments shall be kept by an appropriate Faculty officer. The internal phase of this moderation must take place before the tasks are advertised to students. If changes are made as a result of external moderation the students must be informed of them as soon as possible after they are agreed.

There may be cases where an external examiner is appointed after the start of a module’s presentation in a given year, and it is not desirable to delay telling the students what their assessment is too long into the semester.

Internal moderation of marking

The internal moderation of marking – second-marking, check-marking of a sample – has two purposes: (a) to help maintain consistency of standards between modules, and (b) to make

accidental or deliberate bias in favour of or against a candidate more difficult. It adds to the work of the staff, however, so it should not become so extensive as to double the marking load. It is suggested that a sample of about twenty scripts is appropriate: all of a very small module (up to about 25 students) or a sample of about twenty from a larger course. All assessment tasks counting for more than 10 per cent of the module score should be double- or check-marked in this way. The sample should contain two elements; (a) fails, distinctions (marks of 80+) and cases from either side of border-lines (to maintain standards), and (b) a random sample chosen by the second marker from the main run of marking, plus all scripts handed in late, to assure against bias in individual cases. The size of the random sample should be such as to make the total up to 18 (before late scripts) once all fails, all distinctions and one script nearest above and below each borderline (50, 60, 70, 80) has been included – but the random element of the sample should include at least five scripts even if this takes the total above twenty.

Because they count for a substantial proportion of the final marks, all final-year Projects should be second-marked. The most expeditious way of arranging this is for them to be marked by both the potential examiners for the oral defence, who will need to read them in any case for that reason.

Selection of external examiners

All modules at Level 4 or higher require an external examiner. Current policy is that all external examiners should be approved by someone outside the institution. A Register of staff inside Rwanda qualified to serve as external examiners has been compiled and is being held by the Vice Rectors' Group; maintaining it will become one of the tasks of the National Council when this becomes active. Where an institution wishes to appoint someone not on the Register, from inside or outside the country, a copy of the person's c.v. should be lodged with and approved by the holders of the Register, giving teaching and examining experience, experience of acting as an external adviser in the validation of programmes or an inspector of programmes for government or a professional body, and a brief list of recent publications. (It seems a not unreasonable principle that those judging work at honours or masters level should have a current and relevant background in research or scholarly activity.)

Each programme should have two kinds of external examiners:

- i) Module examiners, who will comment on the marking standards of one or, preferably, several modules, and
- ii) A programme examiner, not necessarily familiar with the subject matter of the entire programme (though he or she will probably also be a module examiner), who assures the quality of the marking and deliberation process as a whole.

The programme examiner should always be someone employed within the country or close enough that he or she can attend the Examination Board. The duties of the role include receiving reports from all the module examiners, attending the examination Board, certifying that regulations have been applied fairly and rigorously, and commenting to the Programme Team on elements of staff/institutional practice or student performance that seem particularly meritorious or appear in need of improvement in the next run of the module (drawing on the module examiner reports as well as his or her own direct experience). The term of office as programme examiner should normally not be more than four years. They should not have worked or studied at the institution at which they are to examine for three years before appointment, they should not be related to anyone in the institution, and they should not have examined, supervised, employed or been employed or supervised by any member of the programme's academic staff during the past five years. It is suggested that they should normally be of senior lecturer grade or above.

As suggested above, the programme examiner might also be used to comment on proposed substantial modifications to the learning outcomes or module content of programmes, between formal Validations.

Three models appear acceptable for the selection and practice of module examiners:

- i) They could be staff working in Rwanda, drawn from or added to the Register of Approved External Examiners, who could either collect or be sent scripts to moderate or come to the institution to read them.
- ii) If money is available (e.g. within donor packages or pedagogic grants) it may be possible to use people from abroad in the same way, paying for scripts to be couriered to them or for them to attend the institution to read scripts and make their report. It may

also be possible to use consultants or researchers visiting for other purposes in this way, *ad hoc*.

- iii) Otherwise, people from abroad will have to be consulted and report mostly by email. It may be desirable for students to submit a soft copy of their assignments in so that these can be attached to emails, in addition to the hard copy, and it may be necessary to scan in examination scripts. If this is not possible or practicable, funds will need to be found to copy scripts and courier them to the examiner.

Module examiners should probably be appointed for three years, extended by mutual agreement for a further three. They should not have worked or studied at the institution at which they are to examine for two years before appointment, they should not be related to anyone in the institution, they should not have examined, supervised, employed or been employed or supervised by any member of the programme staff during the past three years, and they should not be in close scholarly or research collaboration with anyone teaching on the modules they are examining. They should normally be of at least senior lecturer grade

It is not necessary to appoint a separate module examiner for every module. Examination teams should be picked so that a relatively small number of people cover all topic areas, at least in terms of general familiarity with them.

After grades have been adjusted as a result of internal moderation, module external examiners should receive a sample of two scripts from around each borderline and all failed scripts and distinctions. They may advise on the fairness or otherwise of the individual failed and 'distinction' scripts but may only comment on the general standard of the remainder, unless it is their feeling that the entire module needs to be remarked. In this case the Dean of Faculty (or the Vice Rector Academic if the Dean works on the programme) should determine whether to accept the module external examiners' advice that the addition of a constant to all or part of the range would be sufficient to meet his or her objections, to ask the module external examiner or programme examiner to remark the scripts, or to appoint a fresh internal marking team. In the last of these cases, a fresh sample of scripts should be sent to the module examiner after remarking.

Module external examiners might also be used to comment on proposed substantial modifications to the learning outcomes or the weight or method of assessment of modules, between formal Validations.

Finally, there should be clear procedures on what happens to ‘close the loop’ of external examining by reporting back. The following, current policy at KIE at the time of writing, is offered as an example of good practice:

Institute procedure for the receipt of External Examiners' reports

- i. The Directorate of Academic Quality will be responsible for forwarding reports to:
 - (a) The Head(s) of Department for action
 - (b) The Programme leader(s) for information
- ii. The reports received by the Head of Department will be accompanied by a pro-forma (Annex C) within which the Head of Department or nominee will note any issues, the actions required and any actions taken. The Departmental Response to External Examiner/s Form should be returned to the Directorate of Academic Quality, following discussion within the department.
- iii. When an external examiner has made suggestions that require a response, departments should correspond with the external examiner to check that s/he is satisfied with that response.
- iv. The Directorate of Academic Quality will forward the reports and correspondence to the Vice-Rector (Academic) as Chair of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee with a note of any issues arising.
- v. The reports and all correspondence with external examiners will be logged by the Directorate of Academic Quality. External examiner reports and departmental responses should be appended to Annual Programme Review reports prepared by departments and sent to their Faculty Academic Quality Committee (*FAQC*) Chair. The Directorate of Academic Quality will provide *FAQCs* with a list of expected and received reports for each year.
- vi. If the Directorate of Academic Quality does not receive the Departmental Response Form as part of the Annual Programme Review papers it notifies the relevant *FAQC* Chair(s) so that the matter will enter the normal annual *FAQC* procedures with reporting lines to the Dean of Faculty.

The Directorate of Academic Quality will prepare an annual report highlighting themes arising from the Institutes’ external examiner reports. This report will be received and discussed at a

Plenary Meeting of the FQAT Chairs and subsequently by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee chaired by the Vice-Rector (Academic), who will address any Institute-wide issues.

APPENDIX 4

REPUBLIC OF RWANDA



HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

P.O.BOX 6311 KIGALI

NATIONAL POLICY
ON INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MODERATION

MODERATION: PURPOSES AND PRACTICES

Principles

- Moderation *of assessment tasks* is part of the assurance of standards – ensuring, and offering evidence that we have checked that, the tasks we set are of an appropriate standard and do test the learning objectives of a given module. Internal moderation of questions and exercises (by other academics within the institution) is desirable for all assessment; external moderation is also desirable as an ‘audit trail’ showing that the process has been carried out and as a check that the standards of one institution are credible to another.
- Moderation *of marking* serves the same purposes and also demonstrates that the marking process has been carried out rigorously, fairly and without personal bias. External examiners can handle only a small sample of work, but a larger sample should be processed internally.

- Where possible it is also desirable and useful (for audit purposes) that the marking process and the deliberations of examination boards have also been observed and declared to be fairly and legally conducted.
- The curriculum and design of programmes is moderated during the validation process, by the input of External Advisers and Quality Office (or equivalent). Substantial changes to modules or programme between Validations should receive similar consideration – again, to ensure that the changes do not move the programme away from comparability with programmes offered elsewhere.

Moderation of assessment tasks:

The practice now laid down in the *General Academic Regulations* is that each year's draft module assessment tasks shall be given for comment to another academic within the institution competent in the teaching of the subject matter, along with the learning objectives of the module, and a copy shall also be sent to the external examiner of the module. A written record of all comments shall be kept by an appropriate Faculty officer. The internal phase of this moderation must take place before the tasks are advertised to students. If changes are made as a result of external moderation the students must be informed of them as soon as possible after they are agreed.

There may be cases where an external examiner is appointed after the start of a module's presentation in a given year, and it is not desirable to delay telling the students what their assessment is too long into the semester.

Internal moderation of marking

The internal moderation of marking – second-marking, check-marking of a sample – has two purposes: (a) to help maintain consistency of standards between modules, and (b) to make accidental or deliberate bias in favour of or against a candidate more difficult. It adds to the work of the staff, however, so it should not become so extensive as to double the marking load. It is suggested that a sample of about twenty scripts is appropriate: all of a very small module (up to about 25 students) or a sample of about twenty from a larger course. All assessment tasks

counting for more than 10 per cent of the module score should be double- or check-marked in this way. The sample should contain two elements; (a) fails, distinctions (marks of 80+) and cases from either side of border-lines (to maintain standards), and (b) a random sample chosen by the second marker from the main run of marking, plus all scripts handed in late, to assure against bias in individual cases. The size of the random sample should be such as to make the total up to 18 (before late scripts) once all fails, all distinctions and one script nearest above and below each borderline (50, 60, 70, 80) has been included – but the random element of the sample should include at least five scripts even if this takes the total above twenty.

Because they count for a substantial proportion of the final marks, all final-year Projects should be second-marked. The most expeditious way of arranging this is for them to be marked by both the potential examiners for the oral defence, who will need to read them in any case for that reason.

Selection of external examiners

All modules at Level 4 or higher require an external examiner. Current policy is that all external examiners should be approved by someone outside the institution. A Register of staff inside Rwanda qualified to serve as external examiners has been compiled and is being held by the Vice Rectors' Group; maintaining it will become one of the tasks of the National Council when this becomes active. Where an institution wishes to appoint someone not on the Register, from inside or outside the country, a copy of the person's c.v. should be lodged with and approved by the holders of the Register, giving teaching and examining experience, experience of acting as an external adviser in the validation of programmes or an inspector of programmes for government or a professional body, and a brief list of recent publications. (It seems a not unreasonable principle that those judging work at honours or masters level should have a current and relevant background in research or scholarly activity.)

Each programme should have two kinds of external examiners:

- i) Module examiners, who will comment on the marking standards of one or, preferably, several modules, and

- ii) A programme examiner, not necessarily familiar with the subject matter of the entire programme (though he or she will probably also be a module examiner), who assures the quality of the marking and deliberation process as a whole.

The programme examiner should always be someone employed within the country or close enough that he or she can attend the Examination Board. The duties of the role include receiving reports from all the module examiners, attending the examination Board, certifying that regulations have been applied fairly and rigorously, and commenting to the Programme Team on elements of staff/institutional practice or student performance that seem particularly meritorious or appear in need of improvement in the next run of the module (drawing on the module examiner reports as well as his or her own direct experience). The term of office as programme examiner should normally not be more than four years. They should not have worked or studied at the institution at which they are to examine for three years before appointment, they should not be related to anyone in the institution, and they should not have examined, supervised, employed or been employed or supervised by any member of the programme's academic staff during the past five years. It is suggested that they should normally be of senior lecturer grade or above.

As suggested above, the programme examiner might also be used to comment on proposed substantial modifications to the learning outcomes or module content of programmes, between formal Validations.

Three models appear acceptable for the selection and practice of module examiners:

- i) They could be staff working in Rwanda, drawn from or added to the Register of Approved External Examiners, who could either collect or be sent scripts to moderate or come to the institution to read them.
- ii) If money is available (e.g. within donor packages or pedagogic grants) it may be possible to use people from abroad in the same way, paying for scripts to be couriered to them or for them to attend the institution to read scripts and make their report. It may

also be possible to use consultants or researchers visiting for other purposes in this way, *ad hoc*.

- iii) Otherwise, people from abroad will have to be consulted and report mostly by email. It may be desirable for students to submit a soft copy of their assignments in so that these can be attached to emails, in addition to the hard copy, and it may be necessary to scan in examination scripts. If this is not possible or practicable, funds will need to be found to copy scripts and courier them to the examiner. Module examiners should probably be appointed for three years, extended by mutual agreement for a further three. They should not have worked or studied at the institution at which they are to examine for two years before appointment, they should not be related to anyone in the institution, they should not have examined, supervised, employed or been employed or supervised by any member of the programme staff during the past three years, and they should not be in close scholarly or research collaboration with anyone teaching on the modules they are examining. They should normally be of at least senior lecturer grade

It is not necessary to appoint a separate module examiner for every module. Examination teams should be picked so that a relatively small number of people cover all topic areas, at least in terms of general familiarity with them.

After grades have been adjusted as a result of internal moderation, module external examiners should receive a sample of two scripts from around each borderline and all failed scripts and distinctions. They may advise on the fairness or otherwise of the individual failed and 'distinction' scripts but may only comment on the general standard of the remainder, unless it is their feeling that the entire module needs to be remarked. In this case the Dean of Faculty (or the Vice Rector Academic if the Dean works on the programme) should determine whether to accept the module external examiners' advice that the addition of a constant to all or part of the range would be sufficient to meet his or her objections, to ask the module external examiner or programme examiner to remark the scripts, or to appoint a fresh internal marking team. In the last of these cases, a fresh sample of scripts should be sent to the module examiner after remarking.

Module external examiners might also be used to comment on proposed substantial modifications to the learning outcomes or the weight or method of assessment of modules, between formal Validations.

Finally, there should be clear procedures on what happens to ‘close the loop’ of external examining by reporting back. The following, current policy at KIE at the time of writing, is offered as an example of good practice:

Institute procedure for the receipt of External Examiners' reports

- i. The Directorate of Academic Quality will be responsible for forwarding reports to:
 - (a) The Head(s) of Department for action
 - (b) The Programme leader(s) for information
- ii. The reports received by the Head of Department will be accompanied by a pro-forma (Annex C) within which the Head of Department or nominee will note any issues, the actions required and any actions taken. The Departmental Response to External Examiner/s Form should be returned to the Directorate of Academic Quality, following discussion within the department.
- iii. When an external examiner has made suggestions that require a response, departments should correspond with the external examiner to check that s/he is satisfied with that response.
- iv. The Directorate of Academic Quality will forward the reports and correspondence to the Vice-Rector (Academic) as Chair of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee with a note of any issues arising.
- v. The reports and all correspondence with external examiners will be logged by the Directorate of Academic Quality. External examiner reports and departmental responses should be appended to Annual Programme Review reports prepared by departments and sent to their Faculty Academic Quality Committee (*FAQC*) Chair. The Directorate of Academic Quality will provide *FAQCs* with a list of expected and received reports for each year.

- vi. If the Directorate of Academic Quality does not receive the Departmental Response Formas part of the Annual Programme Review papers it notifies the relevant FAQC Chair(s) so that the matter will enter the normal annual FAQC procedures with reporting lines to the Dean of Faculty.

The Directorate of Academic Quality will prepare an annual report highlighting themes arising from the Institutes' external examiner reports. This report will be received and discussed at a Plenary Meeting of the FQAT Chairs and subsequently by the Academic Policy and Planning Committee chaired by the Vice-Rector (Academic), who will address any Institute-wide issues.