

ASSESSMENT AND REGULATION RULES OF EMARO

1. STRUCTURE OF EMARO

EMARO consists of two years:

First year, denoted by M1, contains taught modules (Semesters 1 and 2, denoted by S1 and S2),

Second year, denoted by M2, contains taught modules (semester 3, denoted by S3) and research dissertation (semester 4, denoted by S4).

During the first three semesters students must accumulate 30 ECTS for each semester by passing each module at 60% of the maximum mark or above to progress.

The fourth semester consists of an assessment of the students' research thesis (30 ECTS).

Examination Boards, nominated by the management committee of EMARO, will be held at the end of each semester to determine students' progression to the subsequent semester(s). Students who validate the four semesters will be awarded the two master degrees of the institutions where they studied the first and third semester.

2. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

2.1 Institutions shall inform students, by means of a handbook and/or EMARO website, of the means by which modules shall be assessed and the method of reassessment for redeeming a failure.

2.2 All formal written examinations at the consortium institutions shall, so far as national practice allows it, be marked in the anonymous state. This means that candidates in such examinations shall be identified only by their student number.

2.3 Methods of assessment, which involve observation, interaction and oral/oral elements, and in particular the dissertation (thesis) element of the degree, shall not be subject to anonymity.

2.4 Examining Committee shall be presented with all marks of assessment undertaken during the concerned semester(s). Marks for modules shall be recorded out of a hundred according to the marking criteria in 3 below.

2.5 Resit (taking an exam again) marks must be clearly identified in the presentation of marks to the Examining Board.

2.6 All results will be disclosed to students electronically after the formal Examination Boards.

3. MARKING CRITERIA

Due to the collaborative nature of EMARO, the consortium is committed to the ECTS grading structure. Examinations and assessments will be marked out of a hundred. The marks equate to ECTS grades as given in Tables 1 and 2. Statistical ECTS will be used if the number of students is sufficiently acceptable.

Table 1: Statistical ECTS grading scale policy

ECTS Grade	Description	% of successful students
A	Excellent -outstanding performance with only minor errors Very	10%
B	Good -above the average standard but with some errors	25%
C	Good - generally sound work with a number of notable errors	30%
D	Satisfactory - fair but with significant shortcomings	25%
E	Sufficient - performance meets the minimum criteria	10%
FX	Fail - some more work required before the credit can be awarded	0%
F	Fail - considerable further work is required	0%

Table 2: ECTS correspondance to the marks between 0 and 100.

A	B	C	D	E	F/FX
$100 \geq \text{mark} \geq 90$	$90 > \text{mark} \geq 80$	$80 > \text{mark} \geq 70$	$70 > \text{mark} \geq 65$	$65 > \text{mark} \geq 60$	$\text{mark} < 60$

4. MODULE RULES

4.1 Modules shall be assessed individually, as prescribed by the relevant institution(s). The assessment method of a module may take the form of a written examination paper, projects or other course work assignments.

4.2 In addition to satisfying the assessment requirements of a module, each student must satisfy the attendance requirements. It is the responsibility of Institutions to monitor satisfactory attendance and assessment in each module. Students who do not satisfy the attendance and assessment requirements of a module will be reported to the appropriate committee in the partner institution concerned.

4.3 A mark will be assigned to each student, based on his/her performance.

4.4 The Pass mark for modules will be set at 60. Credits will be awarded to candidates who pass a module. All modules pursued must be passed.

4.5 Late submission of assessed work shall result in a mark of 0 being awarded and a decision of fail being recorded, unless an extension has been granted prior to the deadline.

5. PROGRESSION RULES

An examination committee shall be held at the end of each semester to determine whether or not students qualify to validate the semester.

5.1 Students must obtain a mark of 60/100 or better to validate a module.

5.2 Students must accumulate 30 ECTS credits to validate a semester.

5.3 Students who fail a module(s), at the discretion of the Examination committee, will normally be permitted one further attempt at the second session examination. This session will take place at the end of M1 for the S1 and S2 modules, and will take place at the end of S3 for the modules of S3. No second session is foreseen for S4. See section 8 regarding the marking policy for redeemed modules.

5.4 Students who are eligible to progress to the next semester shall not be allowed to repeat any module for which credit has been awarded in order to improve their performance.

5.5 Students will be permitted to pass from S1 to S2 whatever their results. Students must complete M1 successfully for being permitted to proceed to M2. This means that they must accumulate 30 ECTS credits from the modules of S1 and 30 ECTS credits from the modules of S2.

5.6 Students who are repeating failed modules and who fail to qualify to proceed to the next year at the second attempt will be informed that they have failed EMARO scheme.

5.7 Students who fail a semester have the right of appeal in accordance with the appeals procedure adopted by the Consortium Board of Studies.

6 THESIS RULES

6.1 A principal supervisor from the second year institution will be appointed for each candidate who will be responsible for ensuring that studies are carried out in line with the institution's good practice guidelines. A second supervisor from the first year institution will also be appointed. In case of mobility during S4 a third co-supervisor from the hosting institution shall be nominated. All the supervisors are members of the thesis evaluators committee (two other members are also invited to the jury during the oral defence).

6.2 The student should submit three typed copies and one electronic copy of the dissertation to the Exam Co-ordinator, in the format prescribed by the examination committee and notified to the student by the institution at which the dissertation takes place. The student should also submit another copy to each member of the jury committee.

6.3 Dissertations submitted for examination shall normally be openly available unless security classification or restriction of access has been approved, on a case by case basis, by the Examination committee. However Examination committee may restrict photocopying of and/or access to a dissertation for a specified period of up to five years. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate's supervisor to make an application to the examination committee at least one month before the defence.

6.4 A candidate is at liberty to publish the whole or part of the dissertation work produced prior to its submission. Such published work must be approved by the supervisors.

6.5 Retention and disposal of a dissertation shall be in accordance with the policy of the awarding institution.

6.6 In all institutions the Dissertation will be examined by an examiners committee composed of the student's supervisors and at least two other members. The examination includes an oral presentation of about 35 minutes. The mark must reflect the quality of work 60%, quality of writing report 20%, and quality of oral presentation 20%.

6.7 A candidate who fails to submit the dissertation by the deadline specified for EMARO, and who has not been granted an extension of candidature due to special circumstances will fail the degree.

7 FINAL AWARD

7.1 At the end of the fourth Semester, the Examination Committee will be held to determine award decisions on students pursuing EMARO.

7.2 The students' overall performance shall be considered and the remit of the Board will be to:

- receive notification and formally endorse M2 results;
- receive notification and formally endorse any requests for Restriction and Confidentiality on Access;
- determine the overall award;
- consider statistical data;
- conduct an annual review of EMARO.

7.3 The full set of results for each candidate will include:

- the M1 results;
- the S3 results;
- the results of the dissertation;
- an indication of any failures in modules at the first attempt;

7.3 Appeals against award decisions shall be considered in accordance with the appeals procedures adopted by the Examination committee, and administered by the partner institution concerned in conjunction with their own awarding institutional regulations.

7.4 Successful students will be awarded a double Masters degree from the European institutions where they studied the first and third semesters..

7.5 Degrees will be awarded according to national assessment structures, namely:

- France, based on the the average of M1 and M2 results: “Très Bien (90-100), Bien (80-89), Assez bien (70-79), Passable (60-70) et Echoué (<60)”.
- Poland based on the M1 and M2 result: Excellent, Very good, Good, Fairly good, Satisfactory
- Italy based on the M1 and M2 result in 110/110 (pass mark 66)

8 REDEEMING A FAILURE

8.1 Students who fail a module in S1 or S2 will fail to progress from M1 to M2 and shall, at the discretion of the Examination committee, normally be permitted one further attempt during the second session (at the end of the second semester) to redeem their failure in each such module. The mark for this further attempt shall be up to the capped threshold of 60/100 in each such module.

8.2 As regards students who fail a module, the Examination Committee has the discretion to allow a student to:

- a. be re-examined in the module as a whole (mark capped at 60); or
- b. be re-examined in those parts of the module which he/she has failed where more than one piece of work contributes towards the final module mark. (mark capped at 60)
- c. be re-examined without any restriction on mark. This would only be allowed where the student has demonstrated special circumstances to the Committee. See section 9 .

8.3 Students must not expect, as of right that they will be allowed to redeem failures, allowed to repeat failed modules or be allowed to continue. The Examination committee may take into account other circumstances relating to the candidate’s case, such as attendance and performance in classes, before taking any progression decision.

8.4 A candidate who is to be re-examined in set projects or other forms of course assessment could be required to submit for examination new work on different topics from his/her original work, which originally failed to satisfy the examiners.

8.5 Candidates who are attempting to redeem a failure and who fail on the second attempt, will be informed that they have failed EMARO.

8.6 Candidates who pass the failed modules and accumulate at least 60 ECTS credits during M1 qualify to proceed to the M2.

8.7 Candidates who pass the failed modules and accumulate at least 30 ECTS credits during S3 qualify to proceed to the S4.

9 EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

9.1 In the case of illness or other exceptional circumstances, the Examination committee may grant an extension to the submission date or permit a supplementary examination to be held as appropriate. It is recognised that the marks of such students will not be subject to the ceiling of 60. They will be considered as 'First Sit' students, which means that they will be marked according to the same grading scale as students who attempt the examinations/ course work for the first time.

9.2 Students who miss a submission deadline/ are absent from an examination or who fail a piece of coursework or an examination due to illness or other exceptional circumstances should notify the course leader at the institution in which they are studying before the examination or deadline for submission or if this is not possible as soon after the examination/ deadline as is possible and before the date of the examination board. To be considered as a 'First Sit' candidate the student will need to provide written evidence (for example medical certificates) to the Board.

9.3 The time limit for the completion of the degree may be extended in exceptional cases only. A reasoned application, supported by appropriate independent evidence, must be submitted by the candidate to the Examination committee, and any appropriate institutional academic committees.

Requests for an extension shall be considered with reference to the following criteria:

a- Normally, suspensions / extensions will be granted only in cases of illness, serious domestic difficulties or exceptional commitments, which can be demonstrated to have adversely affected the candidate. A full and reasoned case, supported by appropriate, satisfactory, medical or other independent evidence, and a work-plan for completion of the thesis within the extension requested, must be made by the department for consideration by the Examination committee.

b- In cases which arise as a result of illness:

i- Satisfactory medical or other relevant documentary evidence must be supplied. (The extent and nature of the illness as described in the certificate are invaluable in assessing the case.)

ii- A clear statement must be supplied, showing that the institution concerned has evaluated the situation in which the candidate finds himself / herself as a result of the illness and that it considers the requested extension to be appropriate for completion in accordance with the work-plan.

10. UNFAIR PRACTICE

10.1 Students must ensure that they do not engage in any form of unfair practice, whereby they take action which may result in them obtaining for themselves or others, an unpermitted advantage.

10.2 Unfair practice is defined as any act whereby a person may obtain for himself/herself or for another, an unpermitted advantage. An action shall be considered to fall within this definition whether occurring during, or in relation to, a formal examination, a piece of coursework, or any form of assessment undertaken in pursuit of EMARO.

10.2.1 Examples of unfair practice in examination conditions are as follows:

a- introducing into an examination room any unauthorised form of materials such as a book, manuscript, data or loose papers, information obtained via an electronic device such as a programmable calculator, pager, mobile phone, or any source of unauthorised information;

b- copying from or communicating with any other person in the examination room, except as authorised by an invigilator;

c- communicating electronically with any other person;

d- impersonating an examination candidate or allowing oneself to be impersonated;

e- presenting evidence of special circumstances to examination boards which is false or falsified or which in any way misleads or could mislead examination boards;

f- presenting an examination script as your own work when the script includes material produced by unauthorised means. This includes plagiarism.

10.2.2 Examples of unfair practice in non-examination conditions are as follows:

a- Plagiarism. Plagiarism can be defined as using without acknowledgment another person's work and submitting it for assessment as though it were one's own work, for instance, through copying or unacknowledged paraphrasing (see 10.2.3 below);

b- Collusion; Collusion can be defined as involving two or more students working together, without prior authorisation from the academic member of staff concerned (e.g Programme leader, lecturer etc) to produce the same or similar piece of work and then attempting to present this work entirely as their own. Collusion may also involve one student submitting the work of another with the knowledge of the originator.

c- Falsification of the results of laboratory, field-work or other forms of data collection and analysis.

10.2.3 Examples of plagiarism are as follows:

- use of any quotation(s) from the published or unpublished work of other persons which have not been clearly identified as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged;

- summarising another person's ideas, judgements, figures, software or diagrams without reference to that person in the text and the source in the bibliography;

- use of the services of 'ghost writing' agencies in the preparation of assessed work;

- use of unacknowledged material downloaded from the Internet;

10.3 Students suspected of having engaged in unfair practice or assisting another student to engage in unfair practice, either in coursework or examination will be subject to the unfair practice procedures at the institution in which they are studying.

10.4 Institutions will investigate any cases of unfair practice identified at their institution, by means of their usual procedures and inform the Consortium of their results.

10.5 Students accused of engaging in unfair practice will be given an opportunity either in writing or person to present their case.

10.6 Students found guilty of unfair practice will be subject to the following penalties:

- a- the issue of a written reprimand to the candidate, a record of the reprimand should be kept;
- b- the text to be ignored when marking, resulting in a reduced mark;
- c- the cancellation of the candidate's marks for the assignment;
- d- the cancellation of the candidate's mark in the module concerned;
- e- the cancellation of the candidate's mark in the module concerned and the preclusion of redeeming the failure until the next academic session;
- f- the cancellation of the candidate's marks in all of the modules for the particular level of study;
- g- the cancellation of the candidate's mark in all of the modules for the particular level of study and the disqualification of the candidate from any future Consortium examination;
- h- In the event of an Institution deciding that the above penalties are inappropriate, the Institution may use its discretion to decide upon an appropriate penalty.

10.7 Students have the right of appeal, against substantiated allegations of Unfair Practice, in accordance with the appeals procedure adopted by the Consortium Management committee.