

SECTION 24: PROCEDURES RELATING TO PASSING AND FAILING EXAMINATIONS

Marking

Examination papers are 'blind' marked by an internal examiner - examiners do not know the identity of the candidates. Each exam question is marked separately; the overall mark for the paper is arrived at by taking the average of the marks for each individual question. Guided by UCL's Academic Regulations for marking of examinations, all scripts which the first examiner assigns a fail or a total mark between 50% and 60% (across the entire exam) script will be second marked by an internal examiner. Subsequently the two examiners must agree a mark. In the event that agreement is not achieved, the Chair of the Board of Examiners will assign a third marker. All cases assigned a fail at any point will be reviewed by an external examiner who will have access to the examiners' comments. The external examiner appointed for the paper will also review the marks awarded overall and the marks awarded to a sample of scripts across the range of marks. This ensures that marking standards are fair, and in line with the standards applied on other courses.

Marks are awarded for each question, and a final pass or fail mark is given on the basis of the mean across all answers, with an overall mean mark of 50 required to pass.

| Percentage | Notes to guide examiners |
|--------------|---|
| 70+ | Excellent answer Thorough and coherent answer, showing depth of understanding of the topic. No significant error or omission. |
| 60-69 | Strong answer Good understanding of the topic. Well organised and well expressed answer. May have minor errors and/or omissions. |
| 50-59 | Acceptable answer Satisfactory understanding of the topic. In general coherently expressed but not enough detail or sufficiently well-argued to be considered for a mark of 60+. Some errors and/or omissions. |
| 40-49 (Fail) | Limited answer Some appropriate material but misses substantial important contents. Presented in a superficial manner and/or incoherently expressed. Significant errors and/or omissions. |
| 30-39 | Inadequate answer Very limited understanding of the topic. Some relevant information but fails to answer the question. Presented in a superficial and/or incoherent manner. Major errors and/or omissions. |
| <30 | Seriously inadequate answer Virtually no relevant contents. Completely fails to answer the question. |

Artificial intelligence (AI)

UCL assessments are categorised according to how AI tools may be used. Like all assessments within the Professional Doctorate in Clinical Psychology, examinations fall under **Category 1: AI tools cannot be used**. Use of AI tools within examinations therefore falls under UCL's academic misconduct policy, and there is more in [Section 23](#) of the course handbook. As outlined in UCL guidance, staff should not use AI detection software to check work, where there is suspicion that AI has been used. Instead, markers should discuss their concerns where needed with relevant course or module leads, the Assessment Team or the Academic Director.

Feedback of results

After the marks have been ratified by the Examination Board, trainees will receive notification of the outcome of the examination through Portico.

The overall outcome of the examination is Pass/Fail, and the marks for individual answers are not recorded on the transcripts or Portico, and therefore are not released to trainees.

Procedures for candidates who receive an overall mark of “fail”

Scripts which receive an overall mark of “fail” will be discussed by the Board of Examiners. The candidate will automatically be required to re-sit the paper. This must be passed in order for the candidate to continue on the course.

Complaints

Section 30 details complaint procedures. Briefly, trainees with concerns about the procedures which have been followed in marking their exams should initially raise this with the Chair of the Examination Board, who will consider the complaint and the steps to be taken, usually in conjunction with the Course’s head external examiner. If trainees are not satisfied by the outcome of this internal procedure they can invoke the UCL complaints procedure.

UCL’s complaints procedure can be found here: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/academic-manual/chapters/chapter-6-student-casework-framework/section-8-ucl-student-complaints-procedure>