DCU EXAMINATION APPEALS BOARD

Index of Precedents

Revised August 2026

1 Illness

1.1. Cases where extenuating personal and/or medical circumstances are regarded by the Examination Appeals Board as sensitive, embarrassing or personal which were not divulged to the Progression & Award Board will be taken into account as a legitimate ground for appeal. (Case3/Oct01)

1.2. Cases which are not sensitive, embarrassing, or personal will not be regarded as a ground for appeal if the appellant has already brought these circumstances to the attention of the Progression & Award Board and they were given due consideration or if they were not brought to the attention of the Progression & Award Board with no reason. (Case4/Oct01)

1.3. Ignorance of the requirement to bring extenuating circumstances to the attention of the Progression & Award Board is not a ground for appeal. (Case6/Oct01)

1.4. Ignorance of the requirement to re-submit extenuating circumstances to a Progression & Award Board for an ongoing condition, which was notified to a previous Progression & Award Board is not a ground for appeal. (Case60/Oct13)

1.5. Illness of itself is not a ground for upgrading an appellant's mark. In order for the Examination Appeals Board to change a mark so as to change an appellant's classification, there must be sufficient evidence that the illness resulted in a mark that would otherwise have been different. This will rarely happen when there is a significant gap between the mark attained and that required. (Case34/Oct01)

1.6. Regardless of illness, the Examination Appeals Board will not require a mark to be allocated to an assignment which is submitted after the assignment has been returned to other students taking the module. (Case 43/Oct01)

1.7. The Examination Appeals Board will normally disregard failure to register with the Disability Service in reaching its conclusion. (Case46/Oct01)

1.8. The Examination Appeals Board will not take into account any medical circumstances unless they are authenticated by an appropriately qualified professional practitioner. It is not sufficient to give the name of a practitioner whom the Examination Appeals Board may contact. (Case4/July02)

1.9. Failure to realise that extenuating circumstances impacted on examination performance will not be considered a valid reason for not divulging such circumstances to the Progression & Award Board (Case 11/July 13)

2 Material Administrative Error/Irregularity in Assessment Procedures

2.1. Students cannot rely on an assumption that the repeat paper will follow the format or pattern of the summer diet paper. (Case1/Oct 01)

2.2. Where a lecturer indicates that s/he may have misled a student as to the format or pattern of a paper and believes that a candidate may have passed or performed better had an alternative, anticipated format been used, the Examination Appeals Board will reassess the outcome. (Case1/Oct01)

2.3. Where, on checking, it is determined by the Progression & Award Board that a mark has incorrectly been recorded, the correct mark will be recorded by the Examination Appeals Board. The Chairperson of the Programme Board will be asked to ensure that all candidates taking that module, regardless of whether they appealed or not, have had their marks correctly recorded. (Case8/Oct01)

2.4. The award of marks which are at variance with those of other students who obtained similar results in the past is not, of itself, a ground for appeal. (Case2/July02)

2.5. While it is recognised that, in general, lecturers make every possible effort to supply pilot papers for new modules, failure to supply a pilot paper is not, of itself, a ground for appeal. (Case20/31/July02)

2.6. Where marked assessments are posted by DCU and there are postal delays which result in a reduction in the period during which students could consult the material for examination preparation, this will not be a ground for appeal. (Case07/Feb03)

2.7. Missing pages from an examination answer booklet are not in themselves evidence that a question was attempted, this will not be a ground for appeal. (Case18/July03)

2.8. An appeal may be considered where major changes in a previously-established assessment requirement have not been notified to students in writing. (Cases 55, 56, 57 /July03)

2.9. Not realising that all failed elements of a Category 1 module must be retaken (in cases where a candidate has obtained an overall fail grade) is not a ground for appeal. (Case 10/Sept 15)

2.10. Failure by the Examiner to give detailed justification for marks awarded on the face of a script is not, of itself, a ground for appeal. (Case1/Feb02)

2.11. Failure by a Supervisor to provide an indication of the possible final grade when reviewing or providing feedback on work in progress relating to a dissertation, practicum or project is not, of itself, a ground for appeal. (Case7/Dec13)

2.12. Where a candidate fails to submit working papers with the examination script and subsequently submits those papers to the Examination Appeals Board or to the Examiner following the examination, those workings will not form evidence acceptable by the Examination Appeals Board that the candidate would have done better had the working papers been marked by the Examiner. (Case 5/Feb 03)

3 Other Areas

3.1. The impact of examination results for admission to a postgraduate degree programme or to an employment offer is not a ground for appeal. (Case17/Jul14)

3.2. Financial pressures being experienced either by the appellant or by their family is not a ground for appeal (Case67/Oct13)

3.3. "I had to work to earn money" is not a ground for appeal (Case4/Oct01)

3.4. Difficulties with the English language do not constitute a ground for appeal. (Case 56/July05)

3.5. "I was hoping for a first" is not a ground for appeal. (Case24/Oct01)

3.6. "I was disappointed in my result" is not a ground for appeal (Case27/Oct01)

3.7. "I was surprised at my result" is not a ground for appeal (Case 3/Feb02)

3.8. "The impact of examination results on a scholarship or grant" is not a ground for appeal (Cases 22,27/Oct 16).

3.9. The award of high marks in continuous assessment is not, of itself, an indicator that high marks can be expected in a terminal examination. In different forms of assessment it would not be unexpected that a different result might be awarded. (Case2/Feb02)

3.10 Failure to attend a critical laboratory or other academic exercise is not a ground for appeal. (Case10/Feb02)

3.11 A result which, in the view of the candidate, is out of proportion to the amount of work invested is not a ground for appeal. (Case17/July02)

3.12 Difficulties securing or retaining suitable accommodation/housing by the appellant or by their family is not a ground for appeal (Case10/Jun26).