



Fairfield School of Business

Assessment Regulations and Procedures

Version 6.1

Approved by Executive Committee

Last Amendment: August 2019

The following regulations set out the School's processes and procedures governing the assessment and of students' practical work and recognition of achievement against the UK Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies.

Assessment procedures may vary between FSB's taught programmes where these are awarded under differing validation arrangements; these regulations should be read in conjunction with those of the relevant awarding university.

More information on assessment regulations for individual programmes can be found within Programme Handbooks.



Document Information

Document owner(s)*:	The Principal
Date of next review:	September 2020
Document Status:	IN USE
Dissemination:	For general publication

*The document owner is responsible for maintaining and updating the content of this document and ensuring that it reflects current practice at the School.

Contents

1. Guiding Principles.....	2
2. Mapping against the QAA UK Quality Code.....	3
3. Definitions of Summative and Formative Assessments.....	3
4. Qualification Descriptors.....	4
5. Awarding Bodies' Regulations.....	6
Pearson Edexcel HNC/D Level 4 and 5.....	6
London Metropolitan University (LMU).....	15
6. General Regulations.....	18
7. Disposal and Retention of Work.....	21
8. Review and Update.....	21



1. Guiding Principles

- 1.1. Fairfield School of Business (FSB) works with its awarding body partners to ensure that awards conferred under validation arrangements are consistent with the UK Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies (FHEQ) and align with UK benchmark standards.
- 1.2. Responsibility for designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing assessment strategies for programmes and awards resides with FSB's awarding bodies, who retain full control over academic standards in relation to assessment of students' practical work.
- 1.3. The School is responsible for conducting student assessments in line with the relevant awarding body regulations; all final grades will be ratified by awarding body partners, who will certify the appropriate award.
- 1.4. FSB will use assessment of students' practical work to:
 - i.* evaluate students' assimilation of the programme's content and acknowledge, abilities, skills and competencies gained towards a recognised award;
 - ii.* provide a mark or grade that enables a student's level of understand to be determined against set learning outcomes, and to enable progression;
 - iii.* promote students' learning by providing feedback, intended to highlight strengths, weakness and gaps in their understanding of subject matter;
 - iv.* assure to the public (including potential employers) and higher education providers, that an individual has attained an appropriate level of achievement that reflects the academic standards set by the awarding institution and UK benchmark standards, including the frameworks for higher education qualifications (FHEQ). This may include demonstrating fitness to practise or meeting other professional requirements, as required by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies;
 - v.* reflect on the adequacy and effectiveness of its pedagogical approaches, as well as its learning resource and student support provision.
- 1.5. FSB will ensure that:
 - i.* clear, accurate, consistent and timely information on all assessment tasks and procedures is made available to students, staff and other external assessors or examiners;



- ii. assessments are conducted under fair and equitable conditions and suitable and appropriate adjustments are made for students with special educational needs;
- iii. assessments are scheduled in a way that does not overwhelm students or conflict with other study commitments;
- iv. procedures are in place to ensure that student's attainment in assessments is measured accurately and consistently;
- v. expertise from qualified industry professionals and academics external to the School is incorporated into the assessment process;

NB: External examiners are appointed by the School's University Partners.

- vi. The school is vigilant to the various forms of academic malpractice that can occur, both unintentional and deliberate, and will have in place appropriate procedures for addressing these.

- 1.6. In addition to the regulations of the award's validating partner, this policy should be read in conjunction with the following School documents: *Mitigating Circumstances Policy; Academic Misconduct Policy; and Awarding Bodies (validators) regulations.*

2. Mapping against the QAA UK Quality Code

This policy is aligned to the expectations and core practices of the Revised Quality Code for Higher Education; the QAA's Quality Code is the definitive reference point for all UK higher education institutions and sets out how academic standards are established and maintained and how the quality of learning opportunities are assured and enhanced.

3. Definitions of Summative and Formative Assessments

- 3.1. Summative assessment demonstrates the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria used to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme, and which contributes to the final mark given for the module.
- 3.2. Formative assessments are different from summative assessments in that they do not contribute towards the final grade for a course or programme. They are primarily for the benefit of the students in gauging their knowledge and ability at the time of the assessment and through the feedback that they receive.



4. Qualification Descriptors

In assessing students' practical work the School adopts the following standards, as set out in the FHEQ¹, which will be applicable across all programmes:

4.1. Descriptor for a Higher Education qualification at Level 4

Students must demonstrate:

- *knowledge of the underlining concepts and principles associated with their area of study, and an ability to evaluate and interpret these within the context of that area of study;*
- *an ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, in order to develop lines of argument and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of their subject(s) of study.*

Holders of a Level 4 qualification will be able to:

- *evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area of study and/or work;*
- *communicate the results of their study/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent arguments;*
- *undertake further training and develop new skills within a structured and managed environment.*

Holders of a Level 4 qualification will have:

- *the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility.*

4.2. Descriptor for a higher education qualification at Level 5

Students must demonstrate:

- *knowledge and critical understanding of the well-established principles of their area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have developed;*

¹ <https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/qualifications-frameworks.pdf>



- *ability to understand underlying concepts and principles outside the context in which they were first studied, including, where appropriate, the application of those principles in an employment context;*
- *knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject(s) relevant to the names award, and ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study;*
- *an understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge.*

Holders of a Level 5 qualification will be able to:

- *use a range of established techniques to initiate and undertake critical analysis of information, and to propose solutions in problems arising from that analysis;*
- *effectively communicate information, arguments and analysis in a variety of forms to specialists and non-specialist audiences, and deploy key techniques of the discipline effectively;*
- *undertake further training, develop existing skills and acquire new competences that will enable them to assume significant responsibility within organisations.*

Holders of a Level 5 qualification will have:

- *the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and decision making.*

4.3. Descriptor for a higher education qualification at level 6

Students must demonstrate:

- *a systematic understanding of the key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline;*
- *an ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a discipline;*
- *conceptual understanding that enables a student to devise and sustain arguments, solve problems using ideas and techniques some of which may be at the forefront of a discipline and also to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research or equivalent advanced scholarship in the discipline;*



- *an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge;*
- *the ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources.*

Holders of a Level 6 qualification will be able to:

- *apply the methods and techniques they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects*
- *critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data, to make judgments, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution to a problem*
- *communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences*

Holders of a Level 6 qualification will have:

- *the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility, decision making in complex and unpredictable contexts and the learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature*

5. Awarding Bodies' Regulations

The School delivers programmes which lead to awards validated by external awarding bodies. FSB's HNC/HND provision is awarded by Pearson; undergraduate degree programmes and top-up awards are validated by London Metropolitan University. The School's assessment regulations and procedures are developed in conjunction with requirements of the awarding body. Where in doubt about what regulations are applicable to them, students should consult their Programme Handbook.

Pearson Edexcel HNC/D Level 4 and 5

Setting and Arranging Assessments

- 5.1. In finalising the draft for the summative assessment, Course Leaders and Module Leaders should ensure that:



- the material has not been assessed previously (e.g. by way of an in-course assignment, the grade for which contributes to the overall course grade or in the previous assessment);
- the assessment covers all the learning outcomes and appropriate merit and distinction criteria are identified;
- there is no overlap/similarity in material being assessed where more than one assessment is being set for a particular course;
- questions at Levels 4 and 5 in particular are designed to allow students to demonstrate independent critical awareness and understanding of the subject, analysis and judgement, and not just rote learning.

5.2. The merit and distinction grades need to be viewed as a qualitative extension of the assessment criteria for a pass within each individual unit as indicated in the Edexcel unit specification and must be contextualised within the assessment to indicate clearly what students must do to achieve a merit or distinction in relation to the given learning outcome.

5.3. The Internal Verifier (IV) must approve the final assessment to ascertain whether the assessments are fair and appropriate in relation to the course aims and learning outcomes. The Internal Verifier will provide a summary of changes to the Programme Leaders using an Internal Verification sheet. Where all substantive changes requested by the Internal Verifier have been incorporated into the assessment, the Programme leaders will ratify the final version.

5.4. The Internal Verifier will also ensure that the School standards for assessment submission dates and presentation are maintained with the requirements of the Awarding Body.

5.5. All formative assessments should be reviewed and approved by the Programme Leader.

Marking Guidelines

5.6. The Marking Guidelines are designed to assist the marker in deciding when the grading criteria have been met and to identify what the Module Leader requires to assure that the Learning Outcomes (LO) have been met.

5.7. The Module Leader will provide the marking guidelines to the Marker to identify when Pass, Merit or Distinction levels have been met. These must be checked by the Programme Leader prior to Internal Verification.

Calculation of Overall Grades and Grading Criteria

5.8. All units will be individually graded as 'pass,' 'merit' or 'distinction'.



- 5.9. To achieve a pass grade for the unit, students must meet all the assessment criteria (Learning Outcomes) set out in the specifications of each unit. This gives transparency to the assessment process and provides for the establishment of national standards for each qualification.
- 5.10. 6.3.3 Merit and distinction grades are awarded for higher-level achievement. The merit and distinction grades are for grading the total evidence produced for each unit and describe the learner's performance over and above that for a pass grade.
- 5.11. Module Leaders will use the exemplar characteristics cited in the appendices of the HND specification guide.
- 5.12. In order to achieve a pass in a unit, all learning outcomes and associated assessment criteria must have been met; additional descriptors for merit and distinctions will indicated advanced levels of achievement.

Conditions for a QCF Award

Pass qualification grade

- 5.13. Learners who achieve the minimum eligible credit value specified by the rule of combination will achieve the qualification at pass grade (see section Rules of combination for the Edexcel BTEC Levels 4 and 5 Higher National qualifications).

Higher National Qualification grades above pass grade

- 5.14. Learners will be awarded a merit or distinction qualification grade by the aggregation of points gained through the successful achievement of individual units. The graded section of both qualifications is based on the learner's best performance in units at the level or above of the qualification to the value of 75 credits. Further examples are provided below:
- 5.15. The number of points available is dependent on the unit grade achieved and the credit size of the unit (as shown in the '*Points available per credit at specified unit grades*' table below).

Conditions for an RQF award (applicable to students starting after September 2016)

- 5.16. To achieve a Pearson BTEC Higher National Diploma qualification a student must have:
- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at level 5;
 - Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at level 5;
 - Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at level 4;



- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at level 4.
- To achieve a Pearson BTEC Higher National Certificate qualification a student must have:
- Completed units equivalent to 120 credits at level 4;
- Achieved at least a pass in 105 credits at level 4.

5.17. The overall qualification grade for the HND will be calculated based on student performance in Level 5 units only. And for HNC it will be calculated based on student performance in Level 4 units only.

First Attempt

- 5.18. Assignments should state clearly the deadlines for submission of assessments (e.g. essays or practical) associated with a course.
- 5.19. The assessment for HNC/HND programme normally take place in the fixed period at the end of each semester, which is normally the last teaching week, although this may vary according to the requirements of individual courses.
- 5.20. Submission will only be accepted through the prescribed method by the School. Anyone submitting their assessment other than by the prescribed method will invalidate their submission.
- 5.21. Oral presentation / demonstration can be part of the assessment process which will cover one or more learning outcome.
- 5.22. Where an oral presentation / demonstration is a compulsory component of the assessment for a module, prior arrangements for dates and venue must be made and approved by the Internal Verifier following discussions between the Programme Leader and the Assessment Officer.

Re-Submission

- 5.23. All re-submissions will normally be subject to the payment of an additional fee.
- 5.24. A re-assessment opportunity for only the most recent semester units will normally be offered in the following semester.
- 5.25. A student who undertakes a reassessment will have their grade capped at a Pass for that unit.
- 5.26. A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component of assessment for which a Pass grade or higher has already been awarded.



- 5.27. All re-assessments can be attempted either from the original assignment or from a new assignment.
- Students who have not attempted the assignment in their first attempt will attempt new re-sit assignment;
 - Student with referrals can either continue with the same assignment or use new re-sit assignment.

Awards offered by the School enrolling on awards before September 2016 (QCF)

- 5.28. Students who have failed less than 4 units at the end of their course registration period may be allowed to resubmit the failed units.
- 5.29. Students will not be required to register and will be allowed to resubmit the failed units according to the re-submission schedule

Awards offered by the School enrolling on awards from September 2016 (RQF)

- 5.30. Students who have failed less than 2 units at the end of their course registration period may be allowed to resubmit the failed units. Students are normally only allowed one reassessment opportunity for each unit. Should a student not submit work that consolidates a pass grade, the unit will be recorded as a “Fail”.
- 5.31. A student who, for the first assessment opportunity, has failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification shall be expected to undertake a reassessment.
- Only one opportunity for reassessment of the unit will be permitted.
 - Reassessment for course work, project or portfolio-based assessments shall normally involve the reworking of the original task.
 - For examinations, reassessment shall involve completion of a new task.
 - A student who undertakes a reassessment will have their grade capped at a Pass for that unit.
 - A student will not be entitled to be reassessed in any component of assessment for which a Pass grade or higher has already been awarded.



Retaking the Academic Year:

Awards offered by the School enrolling on awards before September 2016 (QCF)

- 5.32. Students who have failed more than 50% of the units/units (i.e. 5/8) from any academic year will not be allowed to progress to the next year. In this case, students may be offered to re-take the whole year in accordance with the Assessment Regulations.

Awards offered by the School enrolling on awards from September 2016 (RQF)

- 5.33. Students who have failed more than 2 units from any academic year will not be allowed to progress to the next year.

Unit Re-take:

Awards offered by the School enrolling on awards before September 2016 (QCF)

- 5.34. Students who have failed more than 4 units at the end of their course registration period may be offered to retake the failed units (in accordance with the Assessment Regulations).
- 5.35. A student who, for the first assessment opportunity and reassessment opportunity, still failed to achieve a Pass for that unit specification:
- At the discretion of the Assessment Board, decisions can be made to permit a repeat of a unit
 - The student must study that unit again with full attendance and payment of the unit fee
 - The overall unit grade for a successfully completed repeat unit is capped at a Pass for that unit
 - A student will be offered a reassessment in that unit if they fail at the first attempt of the repeat
 - Units can only be repeated once.

Awards offered by the School enrolling on awards from September 2016 (RQF)

- 5.36. Students who have failed more than 2 units/modules from the first academic year will not be allowed to progress until they re-submit and pass 6 modules.



Marking

- 5.37. Marking will be conducted by nominated markers who can be internal staff members or externals; FSB reserves the right to appoint suitably qualified and experienced markers when required. Any external marker will be subject to interview by academic staff and will be issued with a job description and given an induction on the marking process.
- 5.38. Markers must produce, for the Module Leader a feedback sheet or observation sheet for the presentation part of the assessment for each assessment with their final grade along with the summary result sheet to the Module Leader(s).
- 5.39. The standard of the results for assessments will be assured by a system of moderation which requires, as a minimum, a range of assessment to be Internal Verified.
- 5.40. Internal Verification should normally be undertaken internally, with the second markers assessing an assessment.
- 5.41. Internal Verification is required for:
- At least 15%-20% of the sample assessment for which the first marker has awarded the grades.
 - Only in exceptional circumstances should an external marker be asked to be the Internal Verifier.
 - Where assignments are Internal Verified and the markers differ in their marks, these should be discussed with the Programme Leader and an appropriate decision should be made.
 - In exceptional circumstances assignments may be triple marked if there is substantial discrepancy between the first and second marking.
- 5.42. Where the moderation of marking differs radically from the first marking, the whole cohort of assessments will need to be remarked.
- 5.43. All markers will provide statistics and a report of their work which will be presented by the Head of Assessments to the Assessment Board and Academic Board.
- 5.44. Where the work is forwarded to the External Marker it should be provided with all the necessary details required to complete the task such as the marking guidelines, feedback structure etc.



Remarking

- 5.45. If a request for re-marking is made, it should be approved by the Assessment Board.
- 5.46. Remarking will be done by a different internal marker to ensure objectivity.
- 5.47. Remarking might result in a higher or lower grade, which will be considered as a final grade.
- 5.48. Each re-marking will be subject to fee.
- 5.49. The Assessment Board reserves the right to hold oral examinations (viva voce) in exceptional circumstances.

Compensation Units (Applicable to Sept 16 Starters only)

- 5.50. Students have the option to take compensation units.
- 5.51. A student can still be awarded a HND if they have not achieved a minimum of a Pass in one of the 15 credit units at Level 4 and one of the 15 credit units at Level 5.
- 5.52. A student can still be awarded a HNC if they have not achieved a minimum of a Pass in one of the 15 credit units.

Approval/Moderation of Grades and Results

- 5.53. Normally, Programme Leader serve as moderator: i.e. they confirm the standard of the marking by agreeing or revising, as appropriate, the grades being recommended by the internal markers, and by adjudicating where internal markers cannot agree on the grade to be awarded. If a Programme Leader has concerns as to the standard of the internal marking, s/he may request the Head of Assessments to arrange for the assessment for a group of students to be reviewed by another, senior, internal marker, before being re-submitted to the course coordinator for approval.
- 5.54. Programme Leader(s) will verify and present the results in a Pre-Assessment Board meeting to discuss discrepancies or issues before the results are submitted to the Assessment Office.



Oral Assessment and Interviews

- 5.55. Oral assessments are where the lecturer asks a student questions relating to the student's programme of study, the answers to which can influence a student's overall grade for their module. There are two types of oral assessment: compulsory and discretionary. Compulsory orals contribute to the final grade, which can be a presentation, demonstration or an interview. Discretionary orals can be arranged for a particular student in certain circumstances.
- 5.56. Oral examinations, where held, must take place within the published dates and must be conducted by at least two (and no more than three) markers: normally, one first marker and one (or two) second marker(s).
- 5.57. If an oral assessment is to be a compulsory component of the assessment for a unit, the Programme Leader and Internal Verifier must gain prior permission from the Assessment Board before the commencement of the assessment.
- 5.58. The School must make the following explicit to students in module specification or assessment.
- the contribution of the oral assessment to the overall module grade and result;
 - the timing of the oral assessment;
 - the range of material that could be covered in the oral assessment;
 - the criteria for the award of grades for the oral assessment.
- 5.59. The appointed marker will submit the final grade with the observation sheet to the Module Leader. The result must be presented to Assessment Board after Internal Verification for approval.
- 5.60. In exceptional circumstances the School may, hold discretionary oral assessments, details for the selection of candidates and the purpose of the examination must be approved by the Assessment Board, as part of the process of approving the assessment arrangements for that module(s).

Advice for the student on oral Assessments

- 5.61. A 'viva voce' is an oral examination.
- 5.62. The main role of a viva voce examination is as a secondary form of assessment is:
- To investigate the anomalous unit performance
 - To investigate under-performance due to extenuating circumstances
- 5.63. The Programme Leader will arrange for viva voce to be undertaken.



- 5.64. A student who does not attend a viva voce will have their assignment considered as a non-submission and the student will have a grade of non-submission awarded to them on their transcript.
- 5.65. A non-submission requires the unit to be re-submitted via a new assignment.
- 5.66. At the discretion of the Programme Leader any student can be called for a viva voce for any module at any given time.

Assessment Regulations for programmes validated by London Metropolitan University (LMU)

Setting and Arranging Assessments

- 5.67. All undergraduate courses are governed by the University's Academic Regulations www.londonmet.ac.uk/academic-regulations

Marking and moderation arrangements

- 5.68. Initial marking of a practical assignment or examination is undertaken within FSB, usually by the Module Leader or tutor responsible for delivering the module, using the assessment criteria and grade descriptors.
- 5.69. The role of the secondary marker is to check the use of marking criteria and exercise moderation over the marks across the group of students.
- 5.70. In the event of a disagreement regarding the marks between the initial and secondary markers, this should be resolved by discussion, with the reason for the disagreement and its resolution being recorded on the assessment's cover sheet, prior to the moderation of assessment submissions. If a disagreement between initial and secondary markers cannot be resolved, the coursework or exam script will be referred to a third party, nominated by the Principal.

Moderation of coursework

- 5.71. Moderation is the process of ensuring that the appropriate quality assurance systems are in place to maintain the academic standards of the University award.



- 5.72. A sample of double-marked work is normally moderated by the School Programme Leader, prior to the work being forwarded to the External Examiner.
- 5.73. External Examiners moderate the assessment process and comment upon the standards achieved by students, in relation to relevant external benchmarks and other comparable institutions within the UK. This function is conducted through the scrutiny of marked students' work, visits to the course teams, meeting students, observing practical assessments, and attending assessment boards.

Module Passes, Resits and Retakes

- 5.74. Undergraduate work is graded on the below scale which shows the equivalent numerical grade, representing the %age of available marks:

Grade	% Equivalence
A+	95
A	85
A-	75
B+	67
B	63
C+	57
C	53
D+	47
D	43
F1	37
F2	23
F3	0

- 5.75. The lowest passing grade shall be a classification of 'D'. A student shall be awarded a pass in the module where they have achieved an overall pass mark, and have additionally passed any items of assessed work required by the Module Specification.
- 5.76. A grade of F3 is reserved for work which cannot be given any credit (e.g. non submission or work that is deemed to be invalid).
- 5.77. When an assignment or exam is based on numerical work – such as online multiple choice tests which generate a specific number of correct answers, or where there are a series of questions with a set number of marks assigned to each answer – the full range of marks from 0 to 100 should be used (i.e., they should not be 'translated' into a letter grade)



- 5.78. A student shall not be entitled to be reassessed in any component of assessment for which a passing mark has been awarded.

Number of Module Attempts

- 5.79. A student who, for a first assessment, has failed a component of assessment (as set down in the Module Specification) for a module shall be expected to undertake reassessment in the component concerned, if the module has been failed overall.
- 5.80. For all undergraduate awards, there shall be a maximum of two permitted attempts within each registration to pass each module. The two attempts shall comprise one first attempt and one resit attempt, unless the approved module regulations specify otherwise.

Failure of a Module

- 5.81. Following the completion of all available reassessments a revised overall module result shall be calculated from the results of each item of assessed work for the module, with the higher mark from the initial and/or reassessment contributing according to its weighting in the Module Specification. If a component is passed following reassessment, the contributing mark shall be capped at a bare pass (i.e. a classification of 'D' or 43% of available marks), except in cases where such capping leads to a failing mark for the module where the uncapped marks would lead to a pass, the module shall be recorded as passed with a capped mark of 40%, except where a requirement to pass specific components precludes this.

Retakes

- 5.82. Retakes involve re-enrolment, registration, repayment and attendance at classes of a module, including the completion of all the assessments for that module. Retakes are offered at the discretion of the Exam Board. Exam board will consider the following guidelines to make judgment to allow retake or repeat year:
- Any student failed more than 45 credits can either re-take a module or repeat year.
 - Student failed equal or less than 45 credits will only be allowed to re-take the module.
 - Students who have not achieved any credits or their attendance to the course is not satisfactory, they might not be given an opportunity to repeat or re-take.



- In two years long programme i.e. Foundation Degrees, students need to pass 90 out of 120 credits in first academic year to progress. The remaining 30 credits must be registered as retake in the following year.
- For the award for the degree student must pass all the modules, therefore student will have only one opportunity to repeat year. If this opportunity is taken in year 1 then a repeat year might not be allowed for the second year. However, student will be allowed to re-take.

- 5.83. The module mark for a retake is not capped; the mark achieved shall stand, and shall replace the mark from the first attempt.
- 5.84. Where a retake is granted, the student must normally attempt the same module that was originally attempted.
- 5.85. Where a student fails to sit a retake attempt at the next available opportunity the missed retake shall count as one permitted attempt.
- 5.86. Transcripts shall list all takes of modules, including both first attempt and retake.

6. General Regulations

Feedback to Students

- 6.1. Feedback is an important part of the learning process and can serve a dual purpose: it can confirm a student's strengths and/or identify potential weaknesses, which may assist a student to focus on their future learning requirements, thereby serving a formative function; and it can provide motivation for future learning and assessments. Therefore, timely and appropriate feedback will be provided to students after the Assessment Board.
- 6.2. Students can expect to receive clear and focused feedback on their assessments according to their performance against the learning outcomes - by implication, on the basis of the explicit assessment criteria for tasks through which learning outcomes are being demonstrated.
- 6.3. Working on an assignment is an 'active' learning process. Students are more likely to understand and retain material that they have used in an essay or in answering a question in a case study than material that is not assessed. When students' assignments are submitted and marked, their tutors:
- Will provide comments on the assignment cover sheet in relation to the marking criteria.
 - May write comments on the assignment itself. These may, for example, highlight very specific mistakes such as grammatical errors, punctuation, and cohesion or identify spelling mistakes.



- Where appropriate, provide feedback relating to the performance of the group as a whole. This usually says what was commonly done well or not so well.
 - Some tutors will also give verbal feedback as well.
- 6.4. Feedback and advice will help students to improve their performance. To get full benefit from their assignments, students will need to engage with the comments and respond to them.
- 6.5. The feedback will be available for the most recent result either by the Assessment Office or Student Support following the Assessment Board. Any student wishing to request a re-print or request from a previous semester's feedback will *incur administration charges*.
- 6.6. Students should be informed of the assessment arrangements which should include the timescales in which students can expect to receive feedback.

Analysis of Grades

- 6.7. The School will undertake routinely an analysis of marking and marking trends to facilitate comparisons and provide evidence of standards. This will be audited through Course Committees.

Assessment Offences (Including Plagiarism)

- 6.8. Academic Misconduct will be dealt in the accordance with the Academic Misconduct Policy.
- 6.9. The following are considered to be assessment offences (this list is not exhaustive):
- Copying from another student;
 - Impersonating another candidate in relation to any assessment;
 - Permitting another person to impersonate one's self in relation to any assessment;
 - Paying or otherwise rewarding another person for writing or preparing work to be submitted for assessment;
 - Submitting assignments written by other people such as ghost writers is strictly forbidden. If this is detected, it will be considered as gross misconduct by the Assessment Board.
 - Colluding with another person in the preparation or submission of work which is to be assessed. This does not apply to collaborative work authorised by the relevant Programme Leader;



- Plagiarism (Plagiarism is the use, without adequate acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of another person in work submitted for assessment. A student cannot be found to have committed plagiarism where it can be shown that the student has taken all reasonable care to avoid representing the work of others as his or her own).

6.10. Similarity indexing software (Turnitin) will identify the percentage of similarity revealed in each script.

6.11. This percentage will vary from one subject to another as some 'repeated work', particularly in more technical subjects; will appear to have higher similarity. The School and its awarding body partners will exercise discretion in determining whether a degree of similarity constitutes plagiarism in the context of the assignment brief.

Additionally, the academic department will provide guidelines on similarity threshold in particular marking schemes.

Aims and Terms of Reference of FSB Plagiarism Panel

6.12. The purpose of the Academic Misconduct Panel is to examine the allegation of academic misconduct following a procedure that satisfies the accepted standards of fairness: by applying the regulations / policies to the facts, as presented by the evidence.

6.13. The student might be invited to an interview, and/or asked to submit a written explanation by the Assessments Board.

6.14. Following the interview or assessment of the student's written response, the Principal or the Principal's Representative will make recommendations to the Assessments Board of what action should be taken. These might include re-submission of the current assignment in full or part, submission of a new assignment in full or part.

6.15. In case of an appeal, the role of the markers will be restricted to the presentation of evidence; they shall have no role in the investigation. They may, as appropriate, submit evidence to a disciplinary hearing.

6.16. The *penalties* for assessment offences, in prescribed assessments will result in one of the following:

- Students may be allowed to re-sit the complete new assessment for that unit or part of the unit (under controlled conditions)
- Repeated assessment offences might result in a student being terminated from the course.



- 6.17. A full report of *the* investigation will be lodged with the Registry.
- 6.18. Being found guilty of an assessment offence caught after graduating, could result in a student being stripped of their grade and their future place of study being informed of the offence.

7. Disposal and Retention of Work

- 7.1. The School's policy on retention of assessed work is that the School should, as a minimum, retain students' work which contributes to their overall unit grade for up to 3 years following certification.
- 7.2. While the School may dispose of assessed work after the above dates, a sample of work will be retained that has been awarded grades in each band for internal monitoring purposes, to demonstrate that assessment standards over a period of time have been maintained. Also, a sample of work for individuals or groups of students at all levels should be retained, to demonstrate how the standards achieved by students have developed as a consequence of progression through each Level of Study.

8. Review and Update

- 8.1. These regulations will be reviewed annually or as and when the regulations of award validating partners are amended.
- 8.2. All changes to assessment regulations will be reviewed and effected by the Executive committee, and communicated to affected staff and students in a timely manner.
- 8.3. These regulations are non-contractual; changes to them may apply to all students as soon as these come into effect and replace those in place when students started their programme, however changes in assessment regulations will not be applied retroactively. The School will ensure students are made aware of the implications of such changes and will relate feedback from students to its awarding bodies.



Version History

Version 1.0 - 5.1

Original author(s): Principal

Reviewed by: Executive Committee

March 2019

Version 6.0 – 6.1

Revised by: Quality Audit Manager

Revision summary: *Some revision to structure of Document, introduction and guiding principles updated; Formatting and version control applied. Approved by Executive Committee to be effective from September 2019.*

Reviewed by: Publications Committee

August 2019

Version

Revised by: Name; Title

Revision summary:

Approved by:

DD/MM/YYYY

Version

Revised by: Name; Title

Revision summary:

Approved by:

DD/MM/YYYY

Version

Revised by: Name; Title

Revision summary:

Approved by:

DD/MM/YYYY

Version

Revised by: Name; Title

Revision summary:

Approved by:

DD/MM/YYYY
