

Assessment Regulations

Academic Quality and Development
2022/23



UNIVERSITY OF
WINCHESTER

Document Title	Assessment Regulations
Role of Document Author and Department	Quality Office Academic Quality & Development
Role of Responsible person and Department	Director of Academic Quality & Development
Approving Body	Senate
Date of Approval	22 June 2022
Date Effective From	1 September 2022
Review Date	Annually
Indicate whether the document is for public access or internal access only Indicate whether the document applies to collaborative provision? <i>(Strikethrough text, as appropriate)</i>	Public Access Internal Access Only Applies to Collaborative Provision
Description	
<p>This document collates the strategies, regulations and guidelines relating to assessments and applies to all taught provision at the University and its Collaborative Partners.</p> <p>A summary of changes to this document appears on page 3.</p>	

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This list summarises the changes since 2016/17. The date confirms when the changes were implemented.

1 September 2022	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of normally (throughout). 2. Introduction of new section detailing the Number and Types of Assessment for Undergraduate Programmes. (B2) 3. Clarification about minimum word counts. (B3) 4. Programmes should not test the same module learning outcome on more than two modules. (B5) 5. Removal of default formatting requirements. (B6) 6. Students may not resubmit an assessment up to 5 days after the deadline if they have already made a submission by the deadline. (B9) 7. Clarification that wherever possible second attempts will not be scheduled any later than the last day of the University defined summer resit period. (B13) 8. Removal of the requirement of previously attempting the assessment to be eligible for the PAB to consider a third attempt. (B14) 9. Extending the usual cases third attempts can be applied to include foundation year students who have successfully passed all but one module and second year students with extenuating circumstances who have successfully passed all but one module and who are due to be on placement in the next academic year. (B14) 10. Adapting assessments for apprentices entering with partial RPL. (B15) 11. Confirmation that all student assessments will be kept for 5 years in line with Office for Students Requirements. (B18) 12. Clarification about the marking of group work. (C1) 13. Clarification that marked assessed work must be returned to students at the end of 15/20/30 working days (except for late submissions which may be returned earlier) and that moderation or second marking (as applicable) must take place before marks are returned to students. (C4) 14. Clarification that students are responsible for checking that they are submitting the final or correct version of their work. (C5) 15. Clarification about moderation sample sizes when there are EC extensions. (Appendix 6) 16. Revised grade descriptors (called assessment criteria in the previous version). (Appendix 7) 17. New appendix 8 – assessment criteria. 18. References to anonymous marking policy added. (C2 and Appendix 6)
1 September 2021	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removal of IS and EIS as examples where hard copy submissions take place at the same time as electronic submissions (B5) 2. Removal of references to submission through Turnitin (B5 and B6) 3. Additional guidance about when an error in submission on Canvas can be considered a bona-fide attempt (B8) 4. Timing of assessments – update to reflect new academic year structure (B9) 5. Inclusion of Time Constrained Assessments as assessments that should be deferred if a student has extenuating circumstances (B10)

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Explanation about when third attempts at assessments are permitted (B13) 7. Guidance on the use of extra time for Timed Constrained Assessments if required by a Learning Agreement (B16) 8. References made throughout to the new Supporting Students to Succeed: Extenuating Circumstances and Support to Study Procedures
31 August 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timing of assessments – update references from Programme Committee to Student Staff Liaison Committee (B9) 2. Timing of assessments – update to remove detail that is duplicated in the Exam Regulations (B9) 3. Update references to Exam Boards to note change to Progression and Award Boards
31 August 2019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Module Description - remove reference to Formative Assessment, remove reference to assessment criteria (B4) 2. Update references to note cessation of Programme Committee meetings 3. Remove references to personalised marking and personalised feedback. Update to note introduction of anonymous marking for written work (C2, C6, C7, Appendix 6, removal of Appendix 7) 4. Clarification of wording regarding Academic Appeals (F) 5. Removal of outdated section on Grade Descriptors (Appendix 2) 6. Appendix 7 added – Assessment Criteria
16 May 2019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explicit reference to the fact that an IS and an EIS refers to the module and not simply an assessment called IS or EIS. (B3, B5, B8, B9, B10, B12, C5 and D4) 2. Include maximum word count for level 3 and reduce maximum word counts for levels 4 – 6 (B3) 3. Adding learning outcomes and assessment criteria to the list of items to be included in the Module Description (B4) 4. Amendments to the periods allowed for marking time and deadlines for the return of work to students (C4-5) 5. Personalised feedback for assessments clarified (C6) 6. Format and purpose of feedback clarified (C7) 7. Requirement for double marking clarified (Appendix 6 paragraph 6.7)
1 September 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. eSubmission guidance revised and moved from Appendix 6 to Section B, following the decision to require coursework to be submitted electronically. (Following the removal of Appendix 6, Appendices 7 & 8 have been renumbered as 6 and 7 respectively) 2. Compensation is automatic if the student meets the criteria and may include a Core module if the student is transferring to a programme which does not require the module to be Core. (D4) 3. Retention of students' work to be used as 'exemplars' to be formally requested in all cases, including Master's dissertations. (B16) 4. Baseline requirement for marking practical assessments, which are not available for post hoc scrutiny changed to single marking with AV recording or double marking with option for AV recording. (Appendix 7)
17 January 2018	Reduction of moderation samples from 20% to 10% (Appendix 7)

1 September 2017	Introduction of Grade Point Average (GPA)
------------------	---

ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUMMARY OF CHANGES</u>	3
<u>SECTION A INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT</u>	8
<u>Section A1 Introduction/Scope</u>	8
<u>Section A2 Exemption from and Suspension of the Regulations</u>	8
<u>SECTION B DEFINING ASSESSMENTS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS</u>	8
<u>Section B1 Defining Assessments</u>	8
<u>Section B2 Number and Types of assessment for Undergraduate Programmes</u>	9
<u>Section B3 Word Counts for Assessments</u>	10
<u>Section B5 Assessment Pattern in Module Description</u>	10
<u>Section B6 Format and Submission of Assessments</u>	11
<u>Section B7 Submission Requirements</u>	11
<u>Section B8 Problems Uploading Assessments</u>	11
<u>Section B9 Penalties for failing to meet submissions requirements</u>	11
<u>Section B11 Deferrals and extensions for assessments</u>	12
<u>Section B10 Timing of assessments</u>	12
<u>Section B12 First Attempts at Assessments</u>	13
<u>Section B13 Second Attempts at Assessments</u>	13
<u>Section B14 Third Attempts at Assessments</u>	14
<u>Section B16 Adapting assessments for students with protected characteristics</u>	14
<u>Section B15 Adapting assessments for students transferring in or out of modules mid-year or for students on higher/degree apprenticeship programmes</u>	14
<u>Section B17 Students with a temporary or permanent disability, chronic illness or additional need</u>	15
<u>Section B18 Retention of students' assessments</u>	15
<u>SECTION C MARKING AND MODERATION PROCESSES</u>	15
<u>Section C1 Marking Assessment</u>	15
<u>Section C2 Marking process</u>	15
<u>Section C3 Moderation: Internal and External</u>	16
<u>Section C4 Marking time and return of work to students</u>	16
<u>Section C5 Feedback – format and purpose</u>	16
<u>Section C6 Queries about marks, transcription errors or marking procedures</u>	17
<u>Section C7 Academic misconduct, including plagiarism and poor academic practice</u>	17
<u>SECTION D AWARD CALCULATION PROCESSES AND PROGRESSION AND AWARD BOARD PROCESSES</u> 17	
<u>Section D1 Calculation of module results</u>	17
<u>Section D2 Award of Credit</u>	17
<u>Section D3 Calculation of awards, classifications and upgrade rules, exit awards</u>	18
<u>Section D4 Compensation</u>	18
<u>Section D5 Compensation on Grounds of Extenuating Circumstances</u>	18
<u>APPENDIX 1 QUALIFICATION DESCRIPTORS</u>	19
<u>Qualification Descriptors</u>	19
<u>Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 8</u>	19

Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 7	19
Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 6	20
Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 5	21
Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 4	21
Descriptor for study at Level 3	22
APPENDIX 2 MARK SCHEME FOR LEVELS 3 - 8	23
Pass Grades and Marks for Levels 3 – 8	23
Other Grades	23
Grade Point Average	24
APPENDIX 3 IN-YEAR TRANSFERS AND CREDIT ISSUES FOR YEAR-LONG MODULES	26
Resolving Credit Issues for In-Year Transfers	26
Year-long modules with assessment split 50:50 over the two semesters	26
Year-long modules with assessment split unevenly over the two semesters	26
Customised Assessments	26
Setting Customised Assessments: Example	26
Collective Responsibility	27
APPENDIX 4 SETTING WORD LIMITS AND PENALTIES	28
Setting Word Limits with Penalties is Optional	28
Calculating the number of words	28
Specifying Penalties	28
Word Count Declarations	29
Second Attempts following Word Limit Penalties	29
APPENDIX 5 SUBMISSION PROCESSES FLOWCHART	30
APPENDIX 6 MARKING AND MODERATION PROCESSES	31
Marking Policy	31
Definitions	31
Process of Moderation	31
Reconciling Marking Differences	33
Appeals Against the Marking and/or Moderation Process	34
APPENDIX 7 – GRADE DESCRIPTORS	35
APPENDIX 8 – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	44

SECTION A INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Section A1 Introduction/Scope

The assessment regulations set minimum requirements and standards for students and staff. They collate the strategy, regulations and guidelines relating to assessments, including the definition of assessment types and formats, the relationship between programmes and assessments, marking schemes, award calculations and classification methods.

The *Assessment Regulations* apply to all taught provision of the University of Winchester and to all students undertaking that provision whether at the University of Winchester or at a Collaborative Partner, unless specifically exempted by Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures Committee (e.g. disallowed under accreditation agreements with Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies).

Alongside the Regulations, the University operates a wide range of institutional policies and procedures. Key aspects of these policies and procedures are incorporated within the Regulations and reference is made there to the full policy or procedures below:

- Academic Appeals Regulations
- Academic Misconduct Policy
- Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes
- Academic Regulations for Postgraduate Research Programmes
- Accessible & Inclusive Learning Policy
- Exam Regulations
- Conduct of Progression and Award Boards for Taught Programmes including Collaborative Partners - Guidelines
- External Examiners of Taught Programmes - Policy and Procedures
- Invigilation Policy
- Learning and Teaching Strategy
- Master's Dissertation – Presentation Guidelines
- Supporting Students to Succeed Procedures for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Degrees:
- Extenuating Circumstances and Support to Study Procedures

Section A2 Exemption from and Suspension of the Regulations

In exceptional circumstances, a programme or subject may seek an exemption from one or more of the Regulations, normally at the time of validation or revalidation. Application to do so shall follow appropriate consultation with other programmes and subjects as required, and, must be made explicit at the time of validation or revalidation and shall be explicitly approved by the Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures Committee. Approved exemptions will be noted in the Programme Specification and a central record is held in Academic Quality and Development.

In exceptional circumstances, and following appropriate consultation, a programme or subject may seek to obtain formal approval through the Academic Regulations, Policies and Procedures Committee to suspend one or more of the Regulations temporarily. Where this approval is secured, students shall be explicitly notified before implementation. (An example of this might occur where a programme is running out or an external event prevents the normal procedures to apply.)

SECTION B DEFINING ASSESSMENTS AND SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Section B1 Defining Assessments

All assessments will be defined in the Module Descriptions, which accompany the Programme Specification approved at (re)validation or via the Programme Amendment process, defined by Senate Academic Development Committee.

The content and structure of the programme and its assessment strategy provide students with the opportunities for learning and assessment they need to enable them to demonstrate that they have met the programme learning outcomes.

Assessment types and forms, including formative and summative forms, are designed and proposed by Programme Teams and approved via (Re)Validation. Programmes are encouraged to include formative assessments and consider both traditional and innovative assessment types when determining their overall assessment strategy.

When setting assessments, programmes shall take into account the educational aims and intended learning outcomes of a particular programme and module, as well as what can reasonably be expected of students at a given 'level', the purpose of the assessment (including whether it is for formative or summative purposes) and practical considerations such as group size, space and resources.

The Programme shall describe each assessment type in their Programme Specification, especially any which are distinctive, and indicate the appropriate category for each one.

The language of learning, teaching and assessment shall be English except in the case of Collaborative Partners, who have obtained a specific exemption within their formal agreement.

Students shall not submit the same assessment for two or more modules even if they are repeating the module. Where students wish to reuse some work from one assessment in another, they shall self-reference, as appropriate.

Students are responsible for keeping a copy of all submitted work including copies of all research data and materials prepared for the assessment in question even if they are not required to be submitted.

Section B2 Number and Types of assessment for Undergraduate Programmes

This section applies to undergraduate programmes only.

There is a limit of 12 summative assessments per level. Related assessments (such as a report and a presentation, or a performance and a written self-reflection) which receive separate marks each count separately and must be recorded as individual assessments on the module descriptor.

A portfolio can count as a single summative assessment if it meets the following criteria:

- a. It comprises a number of related components that are marked together as a whole.
- b. All work within the portfolio should have a single submission date and all elements must be marked together to give a single mark/grade for a module.
- c. A student who fails the portfolio will be required to resubmit all the constituent components.

Any undergraduate programme that has been (re)validated since September 2019 must include a summative time constrained assessment on a mandatory or core module at each level. A variety of time constrained assessments can be used but the maximum period for any pre-seen element is two weeks.

The following are examples of time constrained assessments:

- Traditional examination
- Sit down exams where the paper or topics are notified to the students in advance
- Take away exams where students can use books and web resources but submit answers within a set period
- Live assessments e.g. vivas, clinical tests, performances, critiques, practical skills tests such as physiological or biomechanical tests and other kinds of activity
- Online quizzes or digital tests
- Group based assessments which might be game based, involve role play or simulation or 'tabletop assessment'.
- Presentations may count as a time-based assessment but only if the period of time between notification of the requirement to present as part of assessment falls within the maximum window

of two weeks. Presentations which are timetabled from the beginning of a module to take place at some point during the semester do not count.

Section B3 Word Counts for Assessments

A word count is normally required for written coursework and is a guide to students and staff about what is expected for each assessment.

The **maximum** word counts for written coursework submissions for modules at level 4 – 7 inclusive are as follows:

Level 3	normally no more than 150 words per credit
Level 4	normally no more than 200 words per credit.
Level 5	normally no more than 250 words per credit
Level 6	normally no more than 250 words per credit
Level 7	normally no more than 200 words per credit

There are no institutional minimum word counts. Minimum word counts should be determined locally, based on advice from validation/amendment processes.

For Independent Study modules the following is expected:

Master's Independent Study module	as specified in the relevant Programme Specification but between 15 – 20k for a module of 60 credits.
Extended Independent Study module	as specified in the relevant Programme Specification but between 8 - 10k for a module of 30 credits.

In setting a word count, the programme shall take into account:

- a) the assessment criteria;
- b) the range of issues expected in an answer;
- c) the expected depth/breadth of the answer;
- d) the need to encourage students to write succinctly and clearly;
- e) the need to ensure equity for all the students completing the assessment.

Word *counts* shall not be used as word *limits* and, therefore, there is no University-wide policy for penalising students who succeed or exceed word counts. If programmes wish to set a word limit, then they shall follow the Guidelines in Appendix 4 for *Setting Word Limits and Penalties*.

Section B5 Assessment Pattern in Module Description

A student's achievement in each module shall be assessed so that a student may be awarded a final mark and/or grade for each module. (For example, some module assessment patterns may be graded Pass/Fail only). If an assessment covers more than one module a separate final mark shall be awarded for each module.

The Module Description shall define:

- a) name of assessment type/ a brief description of what the assessment entails
- b) word count for written assessments and duration for exams/practical assessments
- c) For exams, whether the exam will take place as a university proctored exam or arranged locally by the faculty and whether the exam will take place online or in a physical location.
- d) weight of the total mark for each assessment as a percentage or whether one or more elements are graded Pass/Fail only
- e) whether any element graded Pass/Fail only must be passed in order to pass the module overall
- f) whether a minimum pass mark is required for each assessment or whether the module may be passed on aggregate

- g) the module's learning outcomes.

Each module must have assessment criteria for each assessment (which can be based on the model University Assessment Criteria available on Canvas) and clearly identify for students which learning outcome(s) relates to which each assessment criteria. Programmes should not test the same module learning outcome on more than two modules.

Section B6 Format and Submission of Assessments

Students are notified of assessments via a Module or Programme Handbook made available to students on Canvas at the beginning of the module.

It is the responsibility of the student to submit all work for assessment and all attend practical assessments and exams in accordance with the requirements for each module or programme, as defined in the Programme/Module Handbook. The format of the Dissertation for a Masters' Independent Study module is defined in the *Master's Dissertation – Presentation Guidelines*.

Coursework shall be submitted electronically via Canvas.

If both an electronic and a hard copy submission are required, the time and date set shall be same for both and shall normally be set between 9.30 am and 3.30 pm on weekdays.

Where students are required to submit work in hard-copy to a Faculty Office, a receipt shall normally be issued. Where a receipt is issued, the student is responsible for retaining this as proof of submission.

See also paragraph B9 below for more details about Timing of assessments.

Section B7 Submission Requirements

Programmes shall specify their expectations/requirements, e.g. whether files shall be submitted in a particular format or whether they shall have a marking grid attached. Programmes shall also clearly state the penalties or criteria that will apply for work that does not meet clearly articulated programme requirements.

Students are responsible for uploading their own work to Canvas and for checking that they are submitting the final/correct version of their work and that this has uploaded correctly.

If a student wishes to resubmit an assessment in order to make changes, additions or corrections, they may only do so before the submission deadline.

Section B8 Problems Uploading Assessments

If students are experiencing problems uploading their assessment to Canvas, they must contact Canvas Support, who can either assist or provide evidence of a technical issue if the problem cannot be resolved before the deadline. Evidence from Canvas support *may* be permitted in cases where the student wishes to seek an extension due to delayed submission due to technical issues related to Canvas.

Section B9 Penalties for failing to meet submissions requirements

Late Submission Rule

All assessments, including those for the Independent Study module and the Extended Independent Study module, submitted up to five working days after the deadline (i.e. one week late) shall be accepted as a first attempt but the substantive mark shall be capped at the minimum pass mark. Students may not resubmit an assessment up to 5 days after the deadline if they have already made a submission by the deadline. Any work submitted after the one-week late submission deadline and before the deadline for permitted second attempts shall be accepted as a second attempt, capped at the minimum pass and there shall be no further opportunities for submission.

Second attempts submitted after the deadline, without approved extenuating circumstances, shall be deemed a fail and given a mark of 1% only, to indicate submission.

Refer to Appendix 5 - Submission Processes Flowchart for further details.

Submission

A fail grade and mark of 1% shall be imposed as a penalty in the following circumstances:

- a) Corrupt, illegible or incorrect file format submitted: this includes a file that cannot be opened directly
- b) Wrong assessment submitted.

Where a problem is identified before the due date for submission has passed, the student may resubmit the work. If the problem is identified following the deadline, the assessment shall be graded as a Fail and given a mark of 1% to indicate submission only.

If a student has submitted work to the wrong module on Canvas or to an incorrect section of the right module on Canvas, but they have made a bona-fide attempt, and can submit valid evidence in proof of that, the submission should be accepted. Consideration of the case and evidence is an academic responsibility.

Incorrect presentation

Marks shall normally only be deducted if presentation is specified within the marking criteria, for example incorrect text format.

Section B11 Deferrals and extensions for assessments

Deadlines for all assessments may only be extended by a previously agreed extension: no substantive mark may be awarded for late work for which no extension has been agreed.

Students may apply for a deferral (for exams, time constrained assessments and practical assessments) and/or an extension (for coursework) using the approved form and submit it together with written evidence of extenuating circumstances, supported by a disinterested person of demonstrable professional standing in relation to the type of evidence, in accordance with the *Supporting Students to Succeed Procedures for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Degrees: Extenuating Circumstances and Support to Study Procedures*.¹

Where an extension request for the major assessment of the Independent Study module would result in missing the deadline for marks to be considered at the Progression and Award Board, the extension shall normally be extended to the next scheduled submission date for Independent Study modules, i.e. either the first working day of February or the last working day of September.

Where an original assessment cannot be replicated, for example in the case of group work, the programme has discretion to set an alternative assessment subject to the maintenance of the purposes of the original assessment and module learning outcomes.

Refer to the University's *Supporting Students to Succeed Procedures for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Degrees policy and Extenuating Circumstances and for further details*.

Section B10 Timing of assessments

Assessment shall take place during the semester in which the module is offered. However, if a semester 1 module is linked with a semester 2 module, a common or joint assessment may be held anytime during semester 2, up to the end of the assessment period.

Submission deadlines shall normally be set for any date or time within semester weeks (including assessment weeks), (please see the paragraph below for programmes that operate outside the standard semester dates). If a programme only consists of modules taught across both semesters, the semester 1 assessment weeks should be used for formative activities and assessments.

¹ Students who are pregnant or are shortly due to become a parent should refer to the *Pregnancy, Adoption and Becoming a Parent While Studying- Guidelines*.

If programmes want to set a deadline outside their normal teaching and assessment periods, i.e. during the Christmas or Spring vacation period, they must seek explicit approval for each assessment from the programme's Student Staff Liaison Committee. Where unanimous agreement is confirmed, the new arrangement shall remain in use unless the Programme decides to move the deadline back to the established teaching and assessment periods. The 'normal' expectation is that undergraduate programmes will not set assessments out of semester dates.

For those programmes that operate outside the standard semester dates, assessment deadlines will be set by the programme team at the beginning of each academic year and will be communicated to students via the appropriate Canvas pages, Programme Information pages and Student Staff Liaison Committee meetings.

Exceptions to the above may be approved for students who are granted an extension or deferral due to extenuating circumstances or where the programme has an exemption from the Regulations to teach outside the semester periods or extend the module across two academic years.

The major assessment for the Independent Study module (for Masters' Programmes) shall be submitted on the following dates of the student's intended final year of study as follows:

- a) For students who initially registered for their programme in October, the deadline shall be the last working day of September;
- b) For students who initially registered for their programme in January, the deadline shall be the first working day of February.

A full-time student will submit at the end of their first year of study; a two-year part-time student shall submit at the end of their second year of study and a three-year part-time student shall submit at the end of their third year of study.

The date of submission and return of work shall be recorded in the Module/Programme Handbook (as appropriate). The date for second attempts and return of work shall also be recorded.

Information about the arrangements and timetabling of exams can be found in the University's Exam Regulations.

Section B12 First Attempts at Assessments

All students are expected to submit their assessments and sit exams and practical assessments as set by the programme. Marks awarded for first attempts that are submitted on time shall be a substantive mark between 0 – 100% or graded Pass/Fail only.

Section B13 Second Attempts at Assessments

Students shall normally be permitted an automatic second attempt for all failed first attempts. Deadlines for second attempts are determined by the programme, except for resits for semester 2 exams which are held during the University defined summer resit period in July or August. Deadlines for second attempts for semester 2 modules and the Extended Independent Study module are normally scheduled during the summer vacation period and wherever possible will not be any later than the last day of the University defined summer resit period.

Where a student has passed the module overall but fails an element of assessment, they shall normally be permitted a second attempt at the failed element, on condition that they have satisfied any other specified requirement(s) for the module. The second attempt shall normally be capped at the minimum pass mark for that level, eg 40% for levels 3 – 6 and 50% for level 7. The better mark of the two attempts shall be included in the calculation for the overall module mark.

Where a student fails an element of assessment and has not satisfied any specified requirement(s) for the module, the student shall not have the automatic right to a second attempt. However, the Progression and Award Board has discretion to permit a second attempt.

For a second attempt at written coursework, a student shall normally be required to resubmit the original assignment. A resit for an exam or a practical assessment may be based on a new exam or practical

assessment. However, if repeating the original assessment is not feasible or practicable, the programme may opt to set an alternative assignment, subject to the maintenance of the purposes of the original assignment and module aims. This may include setting one alternative assignment to meet the learning outcomes of two or more of the original failed elements of assessment.

Where a module only requires students to achieve an overall aggregate pass, a student who has achieved the overall pass but has failed an element shall not normally be required to pass that element via a second attempt. However, the student may ask the Progression and Award Board for permission to submit a second attempt for a failed element if an opportunity has not already been offered. The deadline for such requests shall be within 5 working days of the date of the letter confirming the decision of the Progression and Award Board.

Section B14 Third Attempts at Assessments

Progression and Award Boards have the authority to offer a student the opportunity to complete a third attempt at an assessment. This option only applies to:

- final year students who have successfully passed all but one module
- second year students with extenuating circumstances who have successfully passed all but one module and who are due to be on placement in the next academic year
- students at any level who have been trail-failing modules and have not successfully passed the year
- foundation year students who have successfully passed all but one module (if the foundation year student is in a repeat year, the third attempt can only be offered if the student was not offered a third attempt at that module in the previous year)

Third attempts at assessments may also be offered as part of the resolution to a successful academic appeal.

Students offered the opportunity to submit a third attempt will usually receive the highest of the marks achieved for the assessment, unless otherwise stated in the Academic Appeal outcome letter.

Section B16 Adapting assessments for students with protected characteristics

The interests of students and/or protected characteristics shall be taken into consideration and reasonable adjustments to assessments shall be made provided that these do not compromise academic standards as expressed through the learning outcomes. See also the *Pregnancy, Adoption and Becoming a Parent While Studying- Guidelines*.

Section B15 Adapting assessments for students transferring in or out of modules mid-year or for students on higher/degree apprenticeship programmes

Students who transfer mid-year and need to join/leave year-long modules, especially in the case of students involved in the American Exchange and Visiting Programmes, require careful management to ensure that they are not left short of credits at the end of the academic year.

Programme Leaders, for all subjects involved, and the student concerned have a collective responsibility to ensure that they are aware of how the transfer is being managed and that the process will ensure that the student will complete the requisite number of credits for their studies at the University of Winchester for the academic year in question.

In order to adhere to ESFA funding rules, students on higher/degree apprenticeship programmes must not re-learn skills that they already have. Such students might therefore achieve partial module credits through Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL). In such cases, the Programme will determine whether an alternative/bespoke assessment is required: the assessment would be approved via Programme Amendment Committee.

Refer to Appendix 3 for In-Year Transfers and Credit Issues for Year-Long Modules for further details.

Section B17 Students with a temporary or permanent disability, chronic illness or additional need

The University encourages students to disclose any disability or additional need at pre-entry, enrolment or during the period of their study. Students, who have formally notified the University of a disability, condition or chronic illness, shall normally have agreed a formal Learning Agreement with Student Support and Success and academic staff to provide additional support for learning and assessment.

Where the student's disability is of a temporary nature or the result of an emergency e.g. a broken bone, a Learning Agreement may be approved for a specified time period.

A Learning Agreement shall be arranged on an individual basis as a reasonable adjustment for students who may otherwise be disadvantaged by a temporary or permanent disability or additional need, whether temporary or permanent, provided that this does not compromise the validity of the assessment or assessment methods. Any alternative assessment method that is approved shall be capable of assessing the same learning outcomes by alternative means and capable of being implemented, within the provisions available to the University.

If a Learning Agreement indicates that the student is entitled to extra time for exams, then they are also entitled to the equivalent extra time for time constrained assessments (TCAs). This is usually articulated as a percentage of the duration of the assessment eg 25% extra time for a 24 hour takeaway exam paper would result in an additional 6 hours to complete the assessment.

Where students require a deferral or extension for an assessment or simply wish to inform programmes of their extenuating circumstances, they should do so in accordance with the *Supporting Students to Succeed Procedures for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Degrees: Extenuating Circumstances and Support to Study Procedures* Refer to the *Exam Regulations* for further details.

Section B18 Retention of students' assessments

Where Programmes wish to retain an assessment by an individual student as an exemplar for other students, they shall obtain written permission from the student concerned. Work retained in this way shall normally be disposed of after five years.

All student assessments will be kept for 5 years in line with Office for Students Requirements.

SECTION C MARKING AND MODERATION PROCESSES

Section C1 Marking Assessment

All assessments (Levels 4-7) will be marked with reference to the University's generic Grade Descriptors (Appendix 7) which are aligned to the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ). These Grade Descriptors must be used as provided and cannot be amended. Assessments will also be marked with reference to Assessment Criteria. Assessment Criteria for individual assessments must use the category headings (not all categories are required for each assessment) from the University Wide Assessment Criteria (Appendix 8). It is suggested that the wording of each category is adapted for each individual assessment, with the exception of the Academic English Standards which must not be adapted from what is specified in Appendix 8 and must be included in any assessment using written or spoken English.

Students taking part in group assessments shall receive individual marks.

All marks and grades for modules at L3 – 8 inclusive are provisional until confirmed by a Progression and Award Board, usually held at the end of the academic year or 12-month period of study.

Please refer to Appendix 2 for a full range of the marks and grades used by markers when grading work as well as the grades used on transcripts to indicate the status of modules, where the final outcome is pending or the module has not been passed.

Section C2 Marking process

Where possible all summative assessments will be marked anonymously in line with the *Anonymous Marking Policy*.

Markers shall record a substantive mark on all assessments, even if they know that the mark for an assessment shall be capped. This provides feedback to the student and is also required if a student were to successfully appeal against a Progression and Award Board decision to cap a mark and subsequently be awarded a substantive mark.

Section C3 Moderation: Internal and External

Internal moderation is a process separate from that of marking and provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers.

External moderation is achieved via scrutiny by External Examiners of assessments, marking criteria and processes and Progression and Award Board processes. For details of the sample of work to be seen by External Examiners, please refer to the *External Examiners of Taught Programmes – Policy and Procedures*.

Additional internal and external scrutiny is also effected by (re)validation of programmes when programmes, learning and teaching and assessments are reviewed by a panel of internal academic staff and students and external academics and professionals.

Please refer to Appendix 6 for regulations governing the process of moderation, reconciliation of marking differences and how students may lodge an appeal concerning the marking and/or moderation process.

(NB Students cannot appeal against the academic judgement of a marker.)

Section C4 Marking time and return of work to students

Marking of student work is an activity which is a normal part of the duties of academic staff. It is not driven by the semester dates which apply to student attendance and shall not be delayed by student vacation periods.

All summative assessments shall be marked and returned to students at the end of 15 working days after the published submission date. Moderation must be completed within the 15 working days. The only exceptions to this are:

- a) examinations which are marked off-line and results will be returned to students with their Progression and Award Board outcome letter;
- b) work which is double-marked such as undergraduate final year dissertations which shall be marked and returned to students at the end of 20 working days of the published submission date. Double marking must be completed within the 20 working days;
- c) the Master's Independent Study which shall be marked and returned to students at the end of 30 working days after the published submission date. Double marking must be completed within the 30 working days;
- d) where students are on placement, the programme may return the work after the placement has been completed;
- e) assessments which are being investigated following an allegation of poor academic practice or academic misconduct. If the investigation is still on-going at the point when the assessment is due to be returned, the Academic Conduct Officer shall inform the student that the work is being investigated in accordance with the *Academic Misconduct Policy*;
- f) in cases of staff illness, the Department shall publish a deferred return date at the earliest opportunity. Where staff illness continues for more than 10 working days, the Department shall try to designate alternative markers; and
- g) In the case of late submissions by students who have an extension approved because of an extenuating circumstances application, summative assessments shall returned to students as soon as they have been marked.

A sample of work is normally sent to the External Examiner within 10 working days of the mark and feedback being returned to students.

NB: Working days refers to weekdays with the exception of days when the University is closed as a result of English bank holidays or University statutory and closure days (e.g. period between Christmas and New Year).

Section C5 Feedback – format and purpose

Feedback shall be provided via Canvas and may be written or use audio/visual software.

In addition to feedback on individual assessments Programmes may provide feedback via:

- a) discussion in class;
- b) generic feedback delivered electronically via Canvas.

Students may also ask to discuss feedback on their work or seek clarification in person from the module leader or marker(s).

Section C6 Queries about marks, transcription errors or marking procedures

Queries about marks, feedback, transcription errors or marking procedures should be raised at the time of the assessment or as soon as possible after assessments are returned.

Students cannot request that an assessment be remarked, moderated or submitted to the External Examiner.

Marks can only be formally appealed after a Progression and Award Board.

Section C7 Academic misconduct, including plagiarism and poor academic practice

Where a marker or student believes that they have identified an instance academic misconduct the marker shall investigate the matter fully in accordance with the *Academic Misconduct Policy* and the student shall pass the relevant details to their Faculty Office or the RKE Centre who shall refer the matter to an Academic Conduct Officer.

SECTION D AWARD CALCULATION PROCESSES AND PROGRESSION AND AWARD BOARD PROCESSES

Section D1 Calculation of module results

The mark for each assessment, entered on the University's student record system, shall always be a whole number. Where an assessment is made of two or more elements, each element shall normally be entered separately on the University's student record system (SITS) and the final mark shall be calculated as an aggregate of the marks for all of the elements, based on the weightings shown in the module description.

The rule for rounding to a whole number for assessments with multiple elements and for overall module results calculated by the student record system (SITS) is as follows:

- a) If the first digit immediately following the decimal place is 4 or lower then no change is made to whole number and the numbers to the right of the decimal place are removed (thus 44.49 would become 44)
- b) If the first digit immediately following the decimal place is 5 or higher then add one to the digit to the left of the decimal place and all numbers to the right of the decimal place are removed (thus 44.51 would become 45)

Where a module is graded Pass/Fail only, no mark shall be allocated and the result will not contribute to the calculation for award classification.

Section D2 Award of Credit

Students are required to take modules in accordance with the pathway defined for their programme.

Students are awarded credit for all modules for which they successfully complete the assessment and other specified requirements as stated in the Programme Specification and Module Description.

Where a student is permitted to retake a module, either via repeat study or trail fail, for which credit and/or marks have already been received, any previously received credit and/or marks shall no longer count as part of the student's academic profile for the programme but will appear on the student's transcript. The student is also required to attend and retake all elements of the repeated module(s) and submit new work for all assessments when they repeat study. However, a student may only be required to submit the assessments if they are permitted to trail fail without attendance. This shall be confirmed between the Programme and the student. See also Section C of the *Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes* for details about trail fails and assessment.

Students may apply to audit one or more modules but they shall confirm their intention to audit the module within two weeks of starting it. No credit may be given for audited modules, although they shall be recorded on intermediate and final transcripts. Approval for a student's request to audit a module is at the discretion of the Module Leader.

Section D3 Calculation of awards, classifications and upgrade rules, exit awards

The *Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes* defines the credit requirements for awards and the award calculation rules. Programmes may set additional requirements that specific-named modules shall be included.

The method for calculating a final award shall be to calculate the result correct to a whole number, using the same rounding method as described above.

Section D4 Compensation

Except when forbidden by accreditation, the Progression and Award Board will be able to compensate failure *once* at each level of a programme (excluding level 3 and level 8), provided that the student has met the following conditions:

- a) no more than one optional or mandatory module worth up to 20 credits has been failed at that level;
- b) a module mark of no more than 10 marks below the minimum pass mark defined for that level has been achieved for the failed module;
- c) all the other modules required to be taken for the programme at that level have been passed (with the exception of the Master's Independent Study module);
- d) the learning outcomes required for that level of study have been achieved (with the exception of those solely associated with the Master's Independent Study module).

Additionally:

- e) the module may be compensated whether or not the student is permitted a second attempt.²
- f) a Core module may only be compensated if a student is transferring to another programme and the new programme does not require the module to be Core.

Compensation may not be applied for work that is not submitted, unless covered by valid evidence of extenuating circumstances.

The mark for the failed assessment(s) shall remain unchanged; instead the overall mark for the compensated module(s) shall be capped at the minimum pass mark and shall be clearly identified on the student's transcript.

The student may elect not to accept the compensation and may request permission to submit a second attempt for the assessment or retake the module(s) for a substantive mark, provided that they have not already been offered an opportunity to do so. This might involve a repeat period of study. The deadline for such requests shall normally be within 5 working days of the date of the letter confirming the decision of the Progression and Award Board.

² Suggested criteria are detailed in the *Conduct of Progression and Award Boards for Taught Programmes including Collaborative Partners - Guidelines*

Section D5 Compensation on Grounds of Extenuating Circumstances

The Progression and Award Board has, in exceptional cases, wider discretion to compensate at all levels for failure due to extenuating circumstances where valid evidence has been received and where there is sufficient evidence from other assessments to satisfy the Departmental or Collaborative Partner Progression and Award Board of the student's understanding of the subject matter and that the student has met the learning outcomes of the module(s) affected.

Where an assessment mark is compensated on concessionary grounds, the assessment element **shall** be raised to the minimum pass mark appropriate to the level of the module without restricting the final mark for the module.

There is no limit to the number of modules that may be compensated on concessionary grounds as long as the Progression and Award Board is satisfied that the student has demonstrated the ability to work at an appropriate level in the pathway for which they are registered and that they have met all learning outcomes. The advantage to the student is that they are not required to (re)submit or (re)take assessments or modules.

The student may elect not to accept the compensation and may wish to reattempt the assessment or retake the module(s) for a true mark. This might involve a repeat period of study.

APPENDIX 1 QUALIFICATION DESCRIPTORS

Qualification Descriptors

Each programme is required to provide a programme-specific qualification descriptor for the final award and any exit qualifications, associated with the programme, in their Programme Specification. These descriptors comply with the Qualification Descriptors defined by the QAA in *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies* (November 2014) which is a key reference point in the 2018 UK Quality Code for Higher Education Higher Education.

Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 8

Doctoral degree graduates are required to meet this descriptor in full.

A Doctoral degree (Level 8 Qualification) is awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a) the creation and interpretation of new knowledge, through original research or other advanced scholarship, of a quality to satisfy peer review, extend the forefront of the discipline, and merit publication and/or public performance and other public dissemination.;
- b) a systematic acquisition and understanding of a substantial body of knowledge which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of creative or professional practice;
- c) the general ability to conceptualise, design and implement a project for the generation of new knowledge, applications or understanding at the forefront of the discipline, and to adjust the project design in the light of unforeseen problems;
- d) a detailed understanding of applicable techniques for research and advanced academic enquiry.

Typically, holders of the qualification shall be able to:

- e) make informed judgements on complex issues in specialist fields, often in the absence of complete data, and be able to communicate their ideas and conclusions clearly and effectively to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- f) continue to undertake pure and/or applied research and development at an advanced level, contributing substantially to the development of new techniques, ideas or approaches.

And holders shall have:

- g) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of personal responsibility and largely autonomous initiative in complex and unpredictable situations, in professional or equivalent environments.

Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 7

Master's degree graduates are required to meet this descriptor in full.

A Master's degree (Level 7 qualification), is awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a) a systematic understanding of knowledge, and a critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, field of study, or area of creative or professional practice;
- b) originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline;
- c) conceptual understanding that enables the student to:
- d) evaluate critically current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline;
- e) evaluate methodologies and develop critiques of them and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses;
- f) a comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship.

Typically, holders of the qualification shall be able to:

- g) deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, make sound judgments in the absence of complete data, and communicate their conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- h) demonstrate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level
- i) continue to advance their knowledge and understanding, and to develop new skills to a high level.
- j) And holders shall have:
- k) the qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
 - i) the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility
 - ii) decision-making in complex and unpredictable situations
 - iii) the independent learning ability required for continuing professional development.

Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 6

Holders of a Bachelor's degree with Honours are required to meet the descriptor in full. The descriptor may also be used as a reference point for other qualifications at level 6 including Pass degree and Graduate Diplomas.

Bachelor's degrees with Honours are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a) a systematic understanding of key aspects of their field of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of defined aspects of a discipline;
- b) an ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within a disciplines;
- c) conceptual understanding that enables the student to:
 - i) devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of a disciplines;
 - ii) describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline;
- d) an appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge;
- e) the ability to manage their own learning, and to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original material appropriate to the discipline);

Typically, holders of the qualification shall be able to:

- f) Apply the methods and techniques that they have learned to review, consolidate, extend and apply their knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects;
- g) Critically evaluate arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgement, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution – or identify a range of solutions – to a problem;
- h) Communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences;

And holders shall have:

- i) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring:
 - i) the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility;
 - ii) decision making in complex and unpredictable contexts;
 - iii) the learning ability needed to undertake appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.

Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 5

Holders of a Diploma of Higher Education or Foundation Degree are required to meet the descriptor in full.

Diplomas of Higher Education and Foundation Degrees are awarded to students who have demonstrated:

- a) 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
- b) ability to apply 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;
- c) knowledge of the main methods of enquiry in the subject(s) relevant to the named award, and ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study;
- d) an understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretation based on that knowledge;

Typically, holders of the qualification shall be able to:

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

And holders shall:

- h) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility and decisions making

Descriptor for a Higher Education Qualification at Level 4

Holders of a Certificate of Higher Education are required to meet the descriptor in full.

Certificates of Higher Education (level 4) are to students who have demonstrated:

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

Typically, holders of the qualification shall be able to:

- c) Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to their area(s) of study and/or work
- d) Communicate the results of their/work accurately and reliably, and with structured and coherent argument
- e) Undertake further training and develop new skills w3ith a structured and managed environment

And holders shall:

- f) The qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment requiring the exercise of some personal responsibility

Descriptor for study at Level 3

Students who completed 120 credits of study at level 3 shall meet the descriptor in full

Level 3 students have demonstrated the ability to:

- a) Apply knowledge and skills in a range of complex activities demonstrating comprehension of relevant theories; access and analyse information independently and make reasoned judgements, selecting from a considerable choice of procedures in familiar and unfamiliar contexts and direct own activities, with some responsibility for the output of others

Typically, level 3 students will be able to:

- b) Demonstrate an understanding of defined areas of the knowledge base
- c) Demonstrate an awareness of current area of debate in the field of study
- d) Demonstrate an awareness of the ethical issues in the main area of study
- e) Relate principles and concepts to underlying theoretical frameworks and approaches
- f) Carry out defined investigative strategies and communicate results effectively in a given format
- g) Collect information to inform a choice of solutions to standard problems in familiar contexts
- h) Analyse a range of information using pre-defined principles, frameworks or criteria

APPENDIX 2 MARK SCHEME FOR LEVELS 3 - 8

Pass Grades and Marks for Levels 3 – 8

Table 1 Pass Grades and the equivalent percentage mark range

Level 3 – 6 Minimum pass mark is 40%		Level 7 Minimum pass mark is 50%		Level 8
A / AQ	70% or above	PD / PDQ	70% or above	UP an ungraded Pass *
B / BQ	60 – 69%	PM / PMQ	60% - 69%	
C / CQ	50 – 59%	P / PQ	50 – 59%	
D / DQ	40 – 49%	UP / UPQ	ungraded Pass for Pass / Fail modules *	
UP / UPQ	ungraded Pass for Pass / Fail modules *			

* *Ungraded Passes (UP) shall have no accompanying percentage mark.*

A Pass grade immediately followed by a 'Q', eg 'DQ', 'PQ' or 'UPQ':

indicates a module which is an overall pass but which contains one or more assessments which have failed the qualifying mark for that assessment but the Progression and Award Board has confirmed that the student has met the learning outcome(s) of the failed assessment(s) elsewhere.

A substantive mark:

reflects the student's actual achievement and may be anything between 0 – 100%. A substantive mark is awarded for the first attempt at an assignment or exam (unless the assessment is graded Pass/Fail only). It may also be awarded for a second attempt if the student is deemed to have valid extenuating circumstances.

A capped mark:

is the mark awarded for a late submission or a second attempt following failure or non-submission. All work must be given an indicative mark but where the student is submitting a second attempt (following failure or non-submission) or repeating a module, the mark recorded on their transcript will normally be 'capped' at the minimum pass mark for that level. Where a module is to be capped, then each assessment for that module shall be capped before the overall module result is calculated, i.e. the University shall not aggregate the indicative marks and then cap the module result.

Other Grades

- L** indicates that this is a first attempt at an assessment, which has an approved extension and when the mark is received, it will be for a substantive mark
- R** Indicates a failed assessment/module for which the student is permitted to submit a second attempt for a capped mark.
- Q³** **Q** Indicates a module which, although it has achieved an overall pass mark, contains one or more assessments which have failed the qualifying mark for that assessment (as detailed in the Module Description) and the student is permitted a second attempt to pass the failed assessment(s). For instance, some programmes set requirements for a minimum mark of 35% or 40% for each piece of assessment.

³ *Q grades only apply to modules which have two or more summative assessments.*

Q grades do not apply to modules passed on aggregate or modules with only one summative assessment.

QF Indicates a module which is an overall pass but which contains one or more assessments which have failed the qualifying mark for that assessment and for which no second attempt is permitted.

The Departmental/Collaborative Partner Progression and Award Board may replace the Q or QF grade with the pass grade appropriate to the aggregate mark, followed by a Q, if they are satisfied that the student has met the learning outcomes of the failed assessment(s) in one or more other modules at the same level or above. Where the Q or QF grade is changed to a pass grade, the pass grade shall be followed by the letter 'Q' as detailed in the table above.

(Because the compensation regulation only applies to modules with an overall mark below the minimum pass mark, modules with grade Q or QF cannot be compensated.)

F Indicates a failed assessment/module for which no opportunity for a second attempt exists.

W Indicates that a student withdrew from the module before completion.

AP Indicates that there is a case of alleged plagiarism against an assessment within the module. This code is only used when the alleged plagiarism is under investigation (refer to the University's *Academic Misconduct Policy* for further details). If the alleged plagiarism is not proven, then the module grade will be changed to that appropriate to the aggregate mark by senior Registry staff.

PR/PF Indicates a case of plagiarism proven through the University's *Academic Misconduct Policy*. Used only by senior Registry staff. (The assessment shall be given a mark 1% to indicate work was submitted.)

CP Indicates that the module was a compensated pass.

CN Indicates that one or more of the assessments for the module was compensated due to approved extenuating circumstances.

Grade Point Average

Once the weighted mean average of module marks has been calculated, according to Award Calculation Rules defined in the *Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes*, this shall be converted to the equivalent grade point score to provide a cumulative Grade Point Average. Please note that Grade Point Average will only be applied to students who started an Undergraduate programme before September 2022.

Table 1 Grade point scores and the equivalent percentage mark range

Grade point score	Percentage mark range
4.25	75 +
4.00	71 – 74
3.75	67 – 70
3.50	64 – 66
3.25	61 – 63
3.00	57 – 60
2.75	54 – 56
2.50	50 – 53
2.25	48 – 49
2.00	43 – 47
1.50	40 – 42
1.00	38 – 39

Grade point score	Percentage mark range
0.75	35 – 37
0.05	30 – 34
0.00	29 or less

APPENDIX 3 IN-YEAR TRANSFERS AND CREDIT ISSUES FOR YEAR-LONG MODULES

Resolving Credit Issues for In-Year Transfers

- 3.1. Full-time undergraduate students shall complete 120 credits each academic year. Part-time undergraduate students shall complete the modules for which they are registered by the end of week 2 of each semester.
- 3.2. Where the Programme deems it impossible to divide a year-long module, they shall make this clear to all parties and ensure that this is taken into account when responding to a student's request to transfer. This may require a student to undertake additional study in order to transfer.
- 3.3. If a student is transferring mid-year, they shall complete all Semester 1 modules as originally registered (ie they shall complete assessments whether these are scheduled in semester 1 and/or 2 if the module itself runs only in semester 1).
- 3.4. Students who do not complete the module shall be deemed to have failed the module and this may mean that they are unable to proceed/graduate if they have an incomplete profile for the current academic year as a result.

Year-long modules with assessment split 50:50 over the two semesters

- 3.5. If the student is part-way through a year-long module, they shall agree with the Programme Leader, who owns the module, whether they shall either:
 - a. complete that module and all assessments as scheduled in the module handbook; or
 - b. be permitted to complete 50% of the assessment and be credited with half the normal credits for that module (eg 15 credits of a 30 credit module).
- 3.6. If the student wishes to transfer into a year-long module, they must agree with the Programme Leader, who owns the module, whether the student shall either:
 - a. be required and supported to catch-up on missed teaching and complete the module and all assessments as scheduled in the module handbook; or
 - b. be required and supported to complete 50% of the assessment and be credited with half the normal credits for that module (eg 15 credits of a 30 credit module).

Year-long modules with assessment split unevenly over the two semesters

- 3.7. Where a module does not split the assessments evenly over the academic year, the Programme Leader, who owns the module, shall decide whether the student shall either:
 - a. complete the module as required in the module handbook; or
 - b. be given an individually customised assessment to enable them to complete 50% of the assessment load and be credited with half the normal credits for that module (eg 15 credits of a 30 credit module)

Customised Assessments

- 3.8. Customised assessments may be set to enable students leaving a module at the end of the semester 1 to be assessed on teaching and learning covered in semester 1 only. Students joining a module at the start of semester 2 should be assessed on teaching and learning covered in semester 2 only. Where necessary, programmes shall ensure that additional support is provided if work covered in semester 1 is necessary to the students' future studies.
- 3.9. For students joining a module, additional formative assessments could be used to enable the student to become familiar with the subject/programme before completing a summative assessment.

Setting Customised Assessments: Example

Module has 3 assessments:

Ass 1 due in week 10 of S1	weighted 30%
Ass 2 due in week 6 of S2	weighted 30%
Ass 3 due in week 14 of S2	weighted 40%

Leaving this module: option A

A student leaving the module at the end of S1 might have already completed Ass1 and be set a customised assessment weighted 20% to be submitted at the end of S1 or early in S2.

Total assessment weighing = 50%. If passed, the module is credited to the student's profile with half the normal credits.

Leaving this module: option B

A student leaving the module at the end of S1 who has not already completed Ass1 would be set a customised assessment weighted 50% to be submitted at the end of S1 or early in S2.

Total assessment weighing = 50%. If passed, the module is credited to the student's profile with half the normal credits.

NB *Care needs to be taken that the student is not unduly advantaged if feedback is given on Ass1 before they have submitted their customised assessment.*

Joining this module: option A

A student joining the module at the end of S1 would be set a customised assessment weighted 10% to be submitted in week 6 when other students are submitting Ass 2 and then submit Ass 3 in the normal way

Total assessment weighing = 50%. If passed, the module is credited to the student's profile with half the normal credits.

Joining this module: option B

A student joining the module at the end of S1 would a customised formative assessment to be submitted in week 6 when other students are submitting Ass 2 and then submit a customised Ass 3 in week 14 and this be weighted 50% instead of the usual 40%.

Total assessment weighing = 50%. If passed, the module is credited to the student's profile with half the normal credits.

NB *In both A and B above, care needs to be taken that the student is not unduly disadvantaged for missing teaching from semester 1.*

The above options are suggestions for how programmes might go about customising assessments to enable students to complete 50% of the module's assessment. Programmes are welcome to vary them to suit local circumstances, assessment types, timing of events etc. In all cases, programmes shall ensure that all students affected are treated consistently and fairly.

Collective Responsibility

- 3.9 In all cases, the Programme Leader for the Subject/Programme being left and the Programme Leader for the Subject/Programme being joined AND the student are all responsible for ensuring that they are aware of how the transfer is being managed and that the process will ensure that the student will complete the requisite number of credits for the academic year. By signing the form, the staff members and the student acknowledge that they understand the process and have taken steps to ensure the transfer will enable the students to complete their academic commitments.
- 3.10 If these procedures are not followed, students are unlikely to achieve sufficient credits and, if this happens, students will not be able to proceed with their studies or graduate without being required to repeat study.

APPENDIX 4 SETTING WORD LIMITS AND PENALTIES

Setting Word Limits with Penalties is Optional

- 4.1 Word counts for assessments are normally defined by programmes in the individual Module Descriptions contained in the Programme's Definitive Document or in the Programme or Module Handbook. A word count is a guide to students and staff about what is expected for each assessment.
- 4.2 Word counts are not intended to be used as word limits and therefore, there is no University-wide policy for penalising students who undershoot or exceed word counts. If programmes wish to set a word limit, then they are required to follow these Regulations.
- 4.3 The Programme/Module Leader shall make the word limit and penalties clear to students:
 - a) by verbally informing the students when discussing assessments;
 - b) by including details in the Module and/or Programme Handbook.
- 4.4 Programmes may set their own penalties for equivalent infringements of time-limited or other forms of assessments e.g. for presentations or performances, see paragraph 4.9 below for some examples. In such cases, the Module and/or Programme Handbook shall specify these in the marking criteria for those assessments.

Calculating the number of words

- 4.5 The Module and/or Programme Handbook shall specify the method of calculating the number of words for assessments and shall specify what must be included and excluded.
- 4.6 The following is an *example* of how this might be expressed only:

Included in the word count:

 - a) every word from the introduction to the conclusion, including headings;
 - b) quotations included in the body of the text (see also f) below);
 - c) in-line references;

Excluded in the word count:

 - d) title pages;
 - e) abstracts;
 - f) indented quotations of 3 lines or more;
 - g) bibliographies;
 - h) list of references;
 - i) footnotes/endnotes, unless excessive;
 - j) appendices (which might be confined to diagrams, tables, maps, and visual images and would normally be no more than half the size of the main work);
 - k) original diagrams, graphs, images etc (if included would normally be considered as equivalent to a ½ page of text regardless of their size ie approximately 100 words, regardless of font size.)

Specifying Penalties

- 4.7 The Module and/or Programme Handbook shall state in the assessment criteria for each assessment whether penalties shall be imposed for exceeding and/or undershooting word limits and, where penalties will apply, must include the details of penalties:
 - a) applying to submissions for substantive marks;
 - b) applying to submissions for a capped mark;
 - c) applying to submissions for modules graded pass/fail only;
 - d) whether deductions could result in the overall mark dropping below a pass;

- 4.8 The following infringements could incur a marking penalty:
- a) any excess and/or deficiency;
 - b) an excess of 10% or more of the word limit, with no penalty for undershooting the word limit;
 - c) an excess or deficiency of 10% or more of the word limit;
 - d) an escalating penalty scale for greater excesses only or for greater excesses or deficiencies;
 - e) omitting or recording the wrong word count.
- 4.9 Penalties include:
- a) where any excess is penalised, this could mean that work beyond the word limit would not be marked (although it could receive feedback);
 - b) a percentage of the raw score deducted, e.g. 10% for a lesser infringement and 20% for a greater infringement;
 - c) result capped to the minimum pass mark;
 - d) automatic fail for second attempts and/or modules graded pass/fail only;
 - e) omission of the word count from the cover sheet could mean work is not accepted for marking;
 - f) significantly incorrect word count recorded on the cover sheet could mean work capped at minimum pass mark;
- 4.10 Penalties for time-limited forms of assessment (e.g. presentations or performances) could include:
- a) markers could cease marking once the limit is exceeded (although they could still provide feedback);
 - b) a percentage of the raw score deducted, e.g. 10% for a short, defined infringement and 20% for a long defined infringement;
 - c) result capped to the minimum pass mark;
 - d) automatic fail for second attempts and/or modules graded pass/fail only.

Word Count Declarations


- 4.11 Staff shall check the declared word count on the cover sheet against the word limit specified for that assessment: where the word count exceeds the specified word limit, the appropriate penalty shall be applied.
- 4.12 Word count declarations shall be checked where it appears to markers that the word limit for the assessment has been breached; in addition some assessments should be randomly selected for testing. Where an assessment is selected for testing an electronic version in Microsoft Word format shall be supplied if requested and the word count shall be checked using the latest version of Microsoft Word installed on the University computing network.

Second Attempts following Word Limit Penalties

- 4.13 A second attempt shall not be permitted where assessments are subject to a word limit penalty, which reduces the mark to the minimum pass mark (ie 40% for L3 – 6 work / 50% for L7/8 work).
- 4.14 A second attempt shall be permitted where assessments fail to meet the assessment criteria for a pass at the first attempt and the failure includes a word limit penalty.

APPENDIX 5 SUBMISSION PROCESSES FLOWCHART

- 5.1. This flow chart illustrates the process described in Section B of these Regulations relating to first and second attempts, including late submission, for all assessments for modules taken at the first attempt or retaken where students' repeat study or trail fails. It does not cover the provisions of Section B14 Third Attempts at Assessments.
- 5.2. The one week period refers to five working days when the University is open and may, therefore, include student vacation periods.



APPENDIX 6 MARKING AND MODERATION PROCESSES

Marking Policy

- 6.1. The requirements below are a minimum level of acceptable practice, but Departments/Programmes may moderate more than the minimum required if they feel it appropriate e.g. when running a new module for the first time; when required by a professional body; or if an external examiner has expressed particular concern about the grading of a module.
- 6.2. Where possible all assessments will be marked anonymously in line with the *Anonymous Marking Policy*.

Definitions

- 6.3. The following terms relating to marking are defined by the University as follows:
 - a) Moderation refers to the overall process by which the University confirms that an assessment has been marked in line with its expressed aims and learning outcomes and the assessment criteria. It provides assurance for students of fairness and equality of marking and assures internal consistency of assessment within a module and a programme.
 - b) Single marking refers to the process where assessments are marked once by a single marker who may be one of a team of markers.
 - c) Double marking refers to the process by which an entire set of assessments is marked independently by two markers without knowledge of each other's grades before coming to together to seek agreement.
 - d) Moderating refers to the process by which a sample of marked work is reviewed by a moderator with sight of the first mark to confirm that the marks are appropriate with respect to the module aims and learning outcomes and assessment criteria
 - e) Third marking refers to the process of adjudication when two double markers cannot agree, in which case a third internal marker is employed. The third marker should be an appropriate and experienced member of staff designated by the Programme Leader.
 - f) Anonymous marking refers to the marking of student work, which is not identified by name at the time of marking.

Process of Moderation

- 6.4. The first marker(s) shall normally be a member of the teaching team for the module or first supervisor for the project.
- 6.5. The moderator shall normally be a member of the teaching team for the module, or as designated by the Programme Leader. The role of the moderator is to ensure the appropriateness of the marking, taking into account consistency, fairness, application of the agreed marking scheme and academic standards. A moderator may not change marks.
- 6.6. To ensure that there is no bias in the marking procedures, all assessments submitted by a student shall normally be first marked and, where required, moderated by someone who does not have a personal interest, involvement or relationship with a student being assessed. In cases where this is not possible, the following procedure shall be followed:
 - a) single marked assessment: the student's assessment shall be first marked in the normal way but shall then be moderated by a moderator chosen by the Programme Leader, or the Head of Department. This is for cases where the Programme Leader has a personal link with the student;

- b) moderated assessment: the student's assessment shall be included in the sample if the first marker has the personal link to the student or excluded from the sample where the moderator has a personal link to the student;
- c) double-marked: the student's assessment shall be marked in the normal way

6.7. All assessments shall have clearly defined assessment criteria, as detailed in module handbooks. All markers and moderators shall have a copy of the assessment criteria and, except in the case of double marking, a full list of marks for the assessment in question (not just for the sample).

6.8. When double marking, both markers shall record their comments and signature on the assignment cover sheet (or equivalent) together with a single agreed mark.

6.9. Baseline requirements for moderation are as follows:

Assessment type	Marking process	Comments
Assessment at all levels which constitutes less than 20% of the module mark	Single marking	
Assessment at level 4 which constitutes 20% or more of the module mark	Single marking for assessments marked at 40% or above Moderation for failed assessments only	Sample: 10% of the failed assessments or a minimum of 7 failed assessments, whichever is the larger *
Assessment at levels 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 which constitutes 20% or more of the module mark	Moderation	Sample: 10% of the work submitted or a minimum of 7 pieces of work, whichever is the larger; and must include assessments across all grade categories from failures to firsts/ distinctions. *
Assessment which is not available for post-hoc scrutiny e.g. performances, presentations where part or all of the mark depends on the standard of presentation or the demonstration of practical skills	Single marking with AV recording for moderation purposes OR Double marking with option for AV recording for External Examiner	Programmes may opt for double marking or moderating for the whole cohort or for a sample of at least 10% of the total or a minimum of 7 assessments, whichever is the larger. Where a sample is moderated, this must include assessments across all grade categories from failures to firsts/ distinctions. * Where AV recordings are made to aid marking, these may also be made available to External Examiners.
Assessment of practice modules where the theoretical assessment is linked to practice and where the practice element must meet the competency standard set by professional statutory bodies	Single marking (observation)	Students must be observed on separate but not necessarily successive occasions as defined in the Definitive Document for the programme and communicated to the student via the Programme Handbook or equivalent.

Assessment type	Marking process	Comments
The Extended Independent Study (level 6), Independent Study e.g. dissertations or equivalent at level 7 or for the single assessment for a module worth 30 credits or more	Double marking	All assessments are marked independently by two markers without knowledge of each other's grades before coming to together to seek agreement
Marking conducted by a member of staff with less than one year's marking experience at the level in question	Moderation	Sample: 10% of the work or a minimum of 7 pieces of work, whichever is the larger; and must include assessments across all grade categories from failures to firsts/ distinctions *

* *The need to include assessments across the marking range may result in the sample size being larger than the minimum 10% or seven pieces of work. Where, because of extenuating circumstances extensions, the number of students submitting by the original deadline does not meet the minimum sample size, the sample requirement is that all assessments submitted by the original deadline shall be moderated or double marked.*

- 6.10. Where first marking is completed by a team of markers, the sample seen by the moderator(s) shall include assessments marked by each of the first markers to ensure a comprehensive sample.
- 6.11. A sample of work is sent to External Examiners in order for them to report to the University on the soundness and fairness of the assessment process and on the standards of student achievement. External Examiners are not members of the internal examining team and will not be able to be involved in moderation. Further details may be found in the *External Examiners of Taught Programmes – Policy and Procedures*.

Reconciling Marking Differences

Double Marking

- 6.12. Once double marking has been completed, the markers should discuss any adjustments and reach a consensus before the work is returned to the students. Markers must not just split the difference when they disagree significantly. As noted in G1.4 above, all double markers shall be recorded on the cover sheet.
- 6.13. In cases where the Double markers cannot agree a final mark, then a third internal marker should be designated by the Programme Leader⁴:
- The third marker shall mark the work and may discuss the marks with the double markers before making a decision;
 - In the case of assessments unavailable for post hoc scrutiny, the third marker shall normally mediate a discussion between the first two markers in an effort to resolve the difference. But if no agreement can be reached, then the third marker shall make a decision based on the comments of the first two markers;
 - In all cases, the third marker's decision shall be final;
 - Assessments referred for third marking shall normally be included in the sample sent to the External Examiner.

Moderating

⁴ Where a Programme Leader is involved in the marking process, the Head of Department shall take on this role.

- 6.14. If the moderator believes that individual marks within the sample are not at the correct level, the moderator shall not change the individual marks for the work, but shall liaise with the first marker(s) with a view to the first marker(s) reviewing and adjusting the marking for the whole batch i.e. the moderator cannot recommend the first marker to review marks for a proportion of the batch.
- 6.15. If the moderator finds any systematic irregularity or over-harsh/generous marking in the marking for the sample or the cohort, the overall module profile should be discussed with the first marker(s).
- 6.16. If the first marker and the moderator agree that a comprehensive review is required, this shall normally be undertaken by the first marker.
- 6.17. If there is no agreement following discussion between first marker and the moderator, then a mediator (normally the Programme Leader or Head of Academic Department if the Programme Leader is first marker or moderator) shall conduct further exploration in an effort to resolve the difference. If an agreement still cannot be reached, then the mediator shall make a decision based on the points raised in the discussion and their decision shall be final. This shall normally result in one of the following: no action being taken; the work is reviewed by the first marker or a third marker.
- 6.18. The issue and its resolution shall be reported to the External Examiner, in the usual way.
- 6.19. In the case of approved forms of assessment, which are not available for post-hoc scrutiny, Programmes shall develop, where possible, appropriate procedures that would enable the objectives of moderation to be achieved.
- 6.20. Accurate and clear recording of the method and result of the reconciliation of marks shall be made available to the External Examiner to provide evidence that marking procedures have been conducted in a fair and consistent way.

External Examiner

- 6.21. If the External Examiner finds any systematic irregularity in the marking for the sample or the cohort, the overall module profile should be discussed with the Programme Leader to determine whether the assessments have been marked fairly and consistently in line with the expressed aims and learning outcomes and the assessment criteria.

Appeals Against the Marking and/or Moderation Process

- 6.22. It is important for students to understand the nature of examiners' discretion and judgement when details of module marks are made available to them. The following provisions apply to the exercise of academic judgement in relation to the assessment process:
 - a) assessment of a student's work is a matter of judgement, not simply of computation;
 - b) marks, grades and percentages are not absolute values, but symbols used by markers to communicate their judgement of different aspects of a student's work;
 - c) the academic judgements of markers cannot, in themselves, be questioned or overturned.
- 6.23. Students may only appeal against a mark in accordance with the criteria defined in the *Academic Appeals Regulations*.

APPENDIX 7 – GRADE DESCRIPTORS

The university's grade descriptors are generic and university-wide and should be operationalised by individual programmes or departments in the context of their specific discipline/s.

STATEMENT OF LEVEL: 4 (based on sector frameworks and benchmarks)

At this level students should be working towards developing a rigorous approach to the acquisition of a broad knowledge base; employing a range of specialised skills; evaluating information using it to develop ideas, plan and develop investigative strategies and to determine solutions to a variety of unpredictable problems showing awareness of creativity in their discipline; and operating in a range of varied and specific contexts, taking responsibility for the nature and quality of outputs; communicating accurately and reliably with an ability to clearly structure argument/presentation of information; developing new skills in a managed environment. Presenting evaluating and interpreting qualitative/quantitative data; develop arguments and make sound judgements in line with basic principles of subject.

GRADING DESCRIPTOR LEVEL 4 (wording in boxes A-F is to give examples of standards and evidence and should be used as a guide)

Assessment Criteria (encompassing some or all of the elements below)	A* 80-100%	A 70-79	B 60-69	C 50-59	D 40-49	F 30-39	F 1-29
Research and Enquiry	Exceptional: exploration and use of a significant range of relevant resources (e.g. extensive reading) which exceeds expectations. Outstanding ability to compare, evaluate & integrate materials using a range of techniques while demonstrating acute awareness of limitations or contradictions in data.	Excellent: substantial and appropriate use of range of relevant resources; widely read. Robust ability to compare, evaluate & integrate materials using a range of techniques. The work offers evidence that the student is aware of, and can respond insightfully to, limitations or contradictions in data.	Very Good: thorough use of appropriate relevant resources, such as literature. Consistently able to compare, evaluate & integrate materials using a range of techniques. The work demonstrates awareness of and responds to limitations or contradictions in data.	Good: appropriate use of relevant resources, such as literature. Consistently able to compare, evaluate & integrate materials using appropriate techniques. The work refers to limitations or contradictions in data.	Satisfactory: sufficient relevant resources, such as literature, are drawn on. The work demonstrates ability to compare, evaluate & integrate materials using appropriate techniques. The work offers evidence that the student can identify differences in literature/theoretical positions/source materials.	Unsatisfactory: insufficient relevant resources, such as literature, are drawn on. Ability to compare, evaluate & integrate materials using appropriate techniques is not adequately demonstrated.	Poor: there is little or no evidence of research and the work does not demonstrate key aspects of research and enquiry required by this module and at this level.
Academic Skills	Exceptional: fulfilment of assessment brief has exceeded all expectations with regard to structure, content, style, argument and conventions.	Excellent: fulfilment of assessment brief with regard to structure, content, style, argument and conventions is of a high calibre.	Very Good: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen all relevant academic skills very well applied.	Good: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen most relevant academic skills well applied.	Satisfactory: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen sufficient evidence of some relevant academic skills.	Unsatisfactory: the relevant academic skills have been inadequately demonstrated. Notable failure to address assessment task	Poor: little to no evidence of ability to employ relevant academic skills. May have failed to address assessment task completely
Subject Knowledge and Understanding	Exceptional: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory all exceed expectations for task at this level. Significant analytical capability, conceptual understanding is highly developed showing deep insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work is highly advanced, and may also be highly original and/or imaginative showing creative thinking.	Excellent: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory are all at an extremely high level. Significant analytical capability, conceptual understanding is highly developed showing deep insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work is advanced, and may also be original and/or imaginative showing creative thinking.	Very Good: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory are strong and consistent. Analytical capability is well evidenced and conceptual understanding shows insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work may show aspects of creative thinking.	Good: clear evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Clear evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding. Evidence of awareness of creativity as expressed in the subject.	Satisfactory: sufficient evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding.	Unsatisfactory: insufficient evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Inadequate evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding.	Poor: little to no understanding of subject and its context
Applied and Practical Skills	Exceptional: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills exceeds expectations for the task at this level.	Excellent: excellent management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Very Good: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Good: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Satisfactory: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Unsatisfactory: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Poor: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills

Values, Qualities and Attributes	Exceptional: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all outstanding	Excellent: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all excellent	Very good: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are very good	Good: good appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Satisfactory: sufficient appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Unsatisfactory: insufficient appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Poor: little to no appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

STATEMENT OF LEVEL: 5 (based on sector frameworks and benchmarks)

At this level students are expected to generate range of ideas through the application and analysis of concepts at an abstract level and outside the original context of enquiry, with a command of specialised skills and the formulation of responses to well defined and abstract problems showing creativity; use main methods of enquiry in the subject to analyse and evaluate information and solve problems; exercise significant judgement across a broad range of functions; and accept responsibility for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes. They should be able to evidence knowledge and understanding of well-established principles of their area of study and their development; understand the limits of their knowledge and how this influences their analyses. Can communicate arguments and analysis in variety of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences.

GRADING DESCRIPTOR: LEVEL 5 (wording in boxes A-F is to give examples of standards and evidence and should be used as a guide)

Assessment Criteria (encompassing some or all of the elements below)	A* 80-100%	A 70-79	B 60-69	C 50-59	D 40-49	F 30-39	F 1-29
Research and Enquiry	Exceptional: exploration and use of significant range of relevant resources (e.g. extensive reading) exceeds expectations. Outstanding ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using a range of techniques while demonstrating acute awareness of limitations or contradictions in data.	Excellent: substantial and appropriate use of range of relevant resources; widely read. Robust ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using a range of techniques. The work offers evidence that the student is well aware of, and can respond insightfully to, limitations or contradictions in data.	Very Good: thorough use of appropriate relevant resources, such as literature. Consistently able to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using a range of techniques. The work demonstrates awareness of and responds to limitations or contradictions in data.	Good: appropriate use of relevant resources, such as literature. Consistently able to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using appropriate techniques. The work refers to limitations or contradictions in data.	Satisfactory: sufficient relevant resources, such as literature, are drawn on. The work demonstrates ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using appropriate techniques. The work offers evidence that the student can identify differences in literature/theoretical positions/source materials.	Unsatisfactory: insufficient relevant resources, such as literature, are drawn on. Ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using appropriate techniques is not adequately demonstrated.	Poor: there is little or no evidence of research and the work does not demonstrate key aspects of research and enquiry required by this module and at this level.
Academic Skills	Exceptional: fulfilment of assessment brief has exceeded all expectations with regard to structure, content, style, argument, conventions.	Excellent: fulfilment of assessment brief with regard to structure, content, style, argument, conventions is of a high calibre.	Very Good: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen all relevant academic skills very well applied.	Good: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen most relevant academic skills well applied.	Satisfactory: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen sufficient evidence of some relevant academic skills.	Unsatisfactory: the relevant academic skills have been inadequately demonstrated. Notable failure to address assessment task	Poor: little to no evidence of ability to employ relevant academic skills. May have failed to address assessment task completely
Subject Knowledge and Understanding	Exceptional: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory all exceed expectations for task at this level. Significant analytical capability, conceptual understanding is highly developed showing deep insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work is highly advanced, and may also be highly original and/or imaginative showing creative thinking.	Excellent: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory are all at an extremely high level. Significant analytical capability, conceptual understanding is highly developed showing deep insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work is advanced, and may also be original and/or imaginative showing creative thinking	Very Good: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory are strong and consistent. Analytical capability is well evidenced and conceptual understanding shows insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work may show aspects of creative thinking.	Good: clear evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Clear evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding. Evidence of awareness of creativity as expressed in the subject.	Satisfactory: sufficient evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding.	Unsatisfactory: insufficient evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Inadequate evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding.	Poor: little to no understanding of subject and its context
Applied and Practical Skills	Exceptional: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills exceeds expectations for the task at this level.	Excellent: excellent management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Very Good: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Good: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Satisfactory: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Unsatisfactory: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Poor: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills

Values, Qualities and Attributes	Exceptional: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all outstanding	Excellent: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all excellent	Very good: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are very good	Good: good appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Satisfactory: sufficient appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Unsatisfactory: insufficient appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Poor: little to no appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

STATEMENT OF LEVEL: 6 (based on sector frameworks and benchmarks)

At this level students are expected to have systematic, deep and detailed understanding of key aspects of the field; their conceptual understanding supports sustained argument and development of a wide range of ideas and their approaches to problem solving include those at the forefront of the discipline showing significant creativity. They are able to critically review, consolidate and extend a systematic and coherent body of knowledge, utilizing specialised skills across an area of study; critically evaluate new concepts and evidence from a range of sources, including incomplete information; transfer and apply diagnostic and creative skills and exercise significant judgement in a range of situations; and accept accountability for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes. They can communicate ideas, problems and solutions to specialist/non-specialist audiences and appreciate the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge. They can manage their own learning and research and comment on advanced scholarship and research in their field.

GRADING DESCRIPTOR: 6 (wording in boxes A-F is to give examples of standards and evidence and should be used as a guide)

Assessment Criteria (encompassing some or all of the elements below)	A* 80-100%	A 70-79	B 60-69	C 50-59	D 40-49	F 30-39	F 1-29
Research and Enquiry	Exceptional: exploration and use of significant range of relevant resources (e.g. extensive reading) exceeds expectations. Outstanding ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using a range of techniques while demonstrating acute awareness of limitations or contradictions in data.	Excellent: substantial and appropriate use of range of relevant resources; widely read. Robust ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using a range of techniques. The work offers evidence that the student is well aware of, and can respond insightfully to, limitations or contradictions in data.	Very Good: thorough use of appropriate relevant resources, such as literature. Consistently able to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using a range of techniques. The work demonstrates awareness of and responds to limitations or contradictions in data.	Good: appropriate use of relevant resources, such as literature. Consistently able to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using appropriate techniques. The work refers to limitations or contradictions in data.	Satisfactory: sufficient relevant resources, such as literature, are drawn on. The work demonstrates ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using appropriate techniques. The work offers evidence that the student can identify differences in literature/theoretical positions/source materials.	Unsatisfactory: insufficient relevant resources, such as literature, are drawn on. Ability to compare, evaluate and integrate materials using appropriate techniques is not adequately demonstrated.	Poor: there is little or no evidence of research and the work does not demonstrate key aspects of research and enquiry required by this module and at this level.
Academic Skills	Exceptional: fulfilment of assessment brief has exceeded all expectations with regard to structure, content, style, argument, conventions.	Excellent: fulfilment of assessment brief with regard to structure, content, style, argument, conventions is of a high calibre.	Very Good: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen all relevant academic skills very well applied.	Good: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen most relevant academic skills well applied.	Satisfactory: fulfilment of assessment brief has seen sufficient evidence of some relevant academic skills.	Unsatisfactory: the relevant academic skills have been inadequately demonstrated. Notable failure to address assessment task	Poor: little to no evidence of ability to employ relevant academic skills. May have failed to address assessment task completely
Subject Knowledge and Understanding	Exceptional: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory all exceed expectations for task at this level. Significant analytical capability, conceptual understanding is highly developed showing deep insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work is highly advanced, and may also be highly original and/or imaginative showing creative thinking.	Excellent: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory are all at an extremely high level. Significant analytical capability, conceptual understanding is highly developed showing deep insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work is advanced, and may also be original and/or imaginative showing creative thinking	Very Good: knowledge, critical evaluation, synthesis and development of a range of ideas, problem-solving, grasp and application of theory are strong and consistent. Analytical capability is well evidenced and conceptual understanding shows insight and grasp of wider issues/context. The work may show aspects of creative thinking.	Good: clear evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Clear evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding. Evidence of awareness of creativity as expressed in the subject.	Satisfactory: sufficient evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding.	Unsatisfactory: insufficient evidence of knowledge, ability to evaluate, synthesise and develop ideas, solve problems, understand and apply theory. Inadequate evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding.	Poor: little to no understanding of subject and its context
Applied and Practical Skills	Exceptional: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills exceeds expectations for the task at this level.	Excellent: excellent management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Very Good: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Good: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Satisfactory: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Unsatisfactory: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills.	Poor: management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills

Values, Qualities and Attributes	Exceptional: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all outstanding	Excellent: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all excellent	Very good: appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are very good	Good: good appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Satisfactory: sufficient appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Unsatisfactory: insufficient appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes	Poor: little to no appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes
----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

STATEMENT OF LEVEL: 7 (based on sector frameworks and benchmarks)

At this level and in this context, students should be able to apply research and critical perspectives to professional situations, both practical and theoretical, and to be able to use a range of techniques and research methods applicable to their professional activities. They will demonstrate systematic understanding, advanced conceptual grasp, acute awareness of problems. They are able to critically evaluate information, data and methodologies and propose new approaches/positions and/or offer insights into current topics/issues, including those at forefront of disciplinary enquiry.

GRADING DESCRIPTOR LEVEL 7 (wording in boxes A-F is to give examples of standards and evidence and should be used as a guide)

Assessment Criteria	A* PD Excellent (80%+) to Exceptional (90%+)	A PD 70-79 Very Good	B PM 60-69 Good	C P 50-59 Satisfactory	F 40-49 Below Level 7 Threshold	F 30-39 Unsatisfactory	F ⁵ 1-29 Poor
Advanced Research and Enquiry	<p>Engagement with an exceptionally wide range of relevant resources e.g. literature which exceeds expectations. Outstanding ability to critique and evaluate/investigate using a range of techniques while demonstrating acute awareness of limitations or contradictions in data.</p> <p>For empirical studies: The process for data analysis is rigorous, transparent and creative. The findings are powerfully presented with a focused discussion with novel use of theoretical frameworks and published research. Compelling conclusions drawn from sophisticated analysis of the data, make a new contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline with the power to challenge and transform it.</p>	<p>Engagement with a significant range of relevant resources e.g. literature. Robust ability to compare and evaluate/investigate using a range of techniques. The work demonstrates awareness of, and insightful response to, limitations or contradictions in data.</p> <p>For empirical studies: The process for data analysis is transparent and rigorous. The findings are robustly presented with a focused discussion of their relationship to existing research with substantial use of theory and published research. Compelling conclusions are drawn directly from rigorous analysis of the data. Coherent and engaging lines of argument lead to insightful and important implications</p>	<p>Engagement with a wide range of relevant resources, e.g. literature. Consistently demonstrates the ability to compare and evaluate/investigate using a range of techniques. The work demonstrates awareness of and responds to limitations or contradictions in data.</p> <p>For empirical studies: The data is thoroughly analysed and findings are well presented and critically explored, in relation to key theory and published research. Perceptive conclusions drawn directly from careful analysis of the data are firmly and comprehensively articulated. Implications are clearly identified and analysed.</p>	<p>Engagement with a wide range of relevant resources, e.g. a range of relevant literature. Consistently demonstrates the ability to critique and evaluate/investigate using appropriate techniques. Limitations or contradictions in data are noted.</p> <p>For empirical studies: The data is appropriately analysed and findings are clearly presented and discussed in relation to some key theory and published research. Appropriate conclusions drawn directly from analysis of the data and are firmly articulated. Some implications are discussed.</p>	<p>Insufficient engagement with relevant resources, e.g. literature falling below the level 7 threshold. Limited evidence of the ability to critique and evaluate/investigate /using appropriate techniques. Limitations or contradictions in data are not adequately discussed.</p> <p>For empirical studies: The data tends to have been summarised, displayed or described rather than analysed. with little discussion in relation to key theory and published research. Limited conclusions are drawn, which lack clear links to the data. Limited implications are outlined.</p>	<p>Very limited engagement with relevant resources, e.g. literature, a. Inadequate evidence of the ability to critique and evaluate/investigate materials using appropriate techniques. Limitations or contradictions in data are identified but not discussed.</p> <p>For empirical studies: Limited data is presented. There is little evidence of analysis of the data with little discussion in relation to key theory / published research. In the conclusions there is very little evidence of links to the data collected. There is little evidence that the investigation will have impact.</p>	<p>Very limited engagement with resources, e.g. literature. No evidence of the ability to critique and evaluate/investigate using appropriate techniques. Limitations or contradictions in data are not recognised. For empirical studies: Limited data is presented. There is little evidence of analysis of the data with no discussion in relation to key theory / published research. In the conclusions there is no evidence of links to the data collected. There is no evidence that the investigation will have impact.</p>
Academic Skills	Fulfilment of assessment brief has exceeded all expectations with regard to requirements, structure, content, style, argument, conventions.	Fulfilment of assessment brief with regard to academic skills is of a high calibre.	Fulfilment of assessment brief has seen all relevant academic skills well applied.	Fulfilment of assessment brief has seen all relevant academic skills are satisfactorily applied.	Fulfilment of assessment brief has fallen below the Level 7 threshold in terms of evidence of all relevant academic skills.	Significant errors in academic skills.	Little to no evidence of ability to employ relevant academic skills.

Subject Knowledge and Understanding	The work has significant elements of creativity, with some original insights. The work demonstrates an exceptional knowledge base engaging with a wide, discerning and balanced range of literature key and peripheral primary and secondary sources. Ability to discriminate and justify key issues and relate them to the wider context and think in innovative ways is demonstrated. Synthesis and original application of knowledge is exceptional, demonstrating highly critical engagement with theoretical perspectives / published research. Innovative lines of thought are synthesised coherently. Arguments are confidently expressed to develop compelling and novel lines of argument, that challenge received wisdom in the subject.	The work is creative and has elements of originality a The work demonstrates a, comprehensive knowledge base engaging with a wide range of well-chosen literature. Synthesis and original application of knowledge is excellent, demonstrating critical engagement with theoretical perspectives / published research. In-depth critical evaluation and application of theoretical perspectives and current research the relevance of which is clearly understood. Lines of thought are synthesised coherently. Arguments are confidently expressed, leading to exceptional insight.	The work shows grasp of wider issues/context. The work demonstrates a substantial knowledge base, engaging with a wide range of relevant literature. Synthesis and original application of knowledge is very good, demonstrating engagement with appropriate theoretical perspectives and published research. Critical understanding and application of theoretical perspectives and current research the relevance of which is recognised.	The work shows satisfactory evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding. The work demonstrates a satisfactory knowledge base. Synthesis and original application of knowledge is good, demonstrating some engagement with appropriate theoretical perspectives and published research. Some critical evaluation of literature relating to current research in the field. Ability to discriminate key issues. Arguments are generally expressed through clear, logical lines of thought.	The work demonstrates a weak knowledge base, drawing on a limited range of literature. Inadequate evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding and falls below the Level 7 threshold. Inadequate synthesis of ideas with limited engagement with theoretical perspectives and published research. reference to literature is limited. A mainly descriptive account, with little attempt at critical analysis of issues. Limited development of arguments where lines of thought are discernible in some ways.	The work demonstrates a very limited knowledge base, drawing on a very limited range of literature. Very little evidence of analysis and conceptual understanding. Very little evidence of engagement with theoretical perspectives and published research. Reference to literature is insufficient or inappropriate Very limited development of arguments where lines of thought are unclear.	The work demonstrates an inaccurate knowledge base, drawing on a very limited range of poorly selected literature. No evidence of engagement with theoretical perspectives and published research. Reference to literature is insufficient or inappropriate No development of arguments and lines of thought are very unclear.
Applied and Practical Skills	Management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills exceeds expectations for the task at this level. For empirical studies: A clearly defined focus for the study is identified, with compelling justification, A thorough and well-reasoned justification is provided for the research design, which is very well-matched to the research questions. The strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted and implications of these for the research design are reflected on critically and with depth of insight. How they may have shaped the findings are explored in depth.	Very good management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills. For empirical studies: A clearly defined focus for study is identified, with convincing justification. A thorough and well-reasoned justification is given for the research design, which is very well-matched to the research questions. There is evidence of critical engagement with research approaches and methods for data collection and analysis. Strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted and implications of these for the research design are reflected on critically.	Good management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills. For empirical studies: A clearly defined focus for study is identified, with a secure justification. A thorough justification is given for the design of the project, which is well-matched to the research questions. The research methods and techniques for data analysis are clearly described and a secure justification is offered for them. The key strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted are reflected on with some critical exploration.	Satisfactory management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills. For empirical studies: A specific focus for the study is identified with adequate justification. A clear justification is given for the design of the project, which is appropriately matched to the research questions. The research approaches and methods for data collection and analysis are adequately described and some appropriate justification is offered for them. There is some reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted.	Engagement with and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills falls below the Level 7 threshold. For empirical studies: A specific focus for the study is identified, but there is inadequate or limited justification. The research design is sketched in outline that is generally appropriately matched to the research questions. Appropriate approaches and methods are selected. Some rationale is offered for these. There is little reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted.	Unsatisfactory management and application of, and prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills. For empirical studies: The focus of the study is unclear making it difficult to provide a rationale. The research design is poorly described, with little justification for the approaches and methods employed. The research methods are ill-matched to the research questions they are intended to explore. There is very limited reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted.	Management and application of, and evidence prowess/dexterity/capability with relevant skills are poor. For empirical studies: The focus of the study is unclear making it difficult to provide a rationale. The research design is very poorly described, with no justification for the approaches and methods employed. The research methods are ill-matched to the research questions they are intended to explore. There is no reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches and methods adopted.
Values, Qualities and Attributes	Appreciation of ethical implications and/or demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are all outstanding.	Appreciation of ethical implications and/or demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are very well-developed.	Appreciation of ethical implications and/or demonstration of values, qualities and attributes are well-developed.	Satisfactory appreciation of ethical implications and/or demonstration of values, qualities and attributes.	Appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes fall below the Level 7 threshold.	Very little appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes.	No appreciation of ethical implications and demonstration of values, qualities and attributes.

APPENDIX 8 – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Assessment Criteria levels 4 - 6

Research and Enquiry

Ability to identify relevant sources, evaluate, integrate and use materials and compare data in a range of forms and from diverse sources

Academic Skills

Academic conventions, structures, referencing, ability to respond to brief, according to subject requirements, communication and presentation

Academic English Standards: these are the standards of proficiency in English language (appropriate to the level and content of your course) by which we assess your academic writing or speaking. Work should express your understanding, ideas and/or arguments clearly through adopting an appropriate tone and grammar and, in writing, using correct spelling, and punctuation. In addition, your work should be focused, concise, and follow a clear structure. Individual programmes may also require you to adhere to subject-specific standards (such as those specified in PSRB requirements). Where this is the case, these will be communicated clearly to you.

Subject Knowledge and Understanding

Intellectual engagement, grasp of concepts, principles, key tenets of subject, theory, and context, ability to identify limitations, synthesise materials and develop relevant new ideas supporting creativity.

Applied and Practical Skills

Technical/professional/performative/field or lab based/digital etc. May include discipline specific skills such as creative writing, scientific hypothesis testing and data analysis.

Values, Qualities and Attributes

Ethical, legal, moral, subject-related and professional values, hard and soft skills; desired characteristics, behaviours and attributes e.g. self-criticality and reflection

Assessment Criteria level 7

Advanced Research and Enquiry

Ability to identify relevant sources, critically evaluate, integrate and selectively use materials and compare data in a range of forms and from diverse sources, identify, apply and critically evaluate information, data and research methodologies

Academic Skills

Proficiency in academic conventions, structures, referencing. Ability to respond to brief, according to subject requirements, and to communicate and present conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences.

Academic English Standards: these are the standards of proficiency in English language (appropriate to the level and content of your course) by which we assess your academic writing or speaking. Work should express your understanding, ideas and/or arguments clearly through adopting an appropriate tone and grammar and, in writing, using correct spelling, and punctuation. In addition, your work should be focused, concise, and follow a clear structure. Individual programmes may also require you to adhere to subject-specific standards (such as those specified in PSRB requirements). Where this is the case, these will be communicated clearly to you.

Subject Knowledge and Understanding

Critical and systematic engagement with concepts, principles, key tenets of subject, theory, context, limitations and acute awareness of problems. In-depth and advanced systematic knowledge, sufficient to develop new ideas showing creativity, and critical understanding of the subject and professional context, informed by perceptive insight into current practice, research and scholarship.

Applied and Practical Skills

Proficiency in and understanding of techniques applicable to the specific field of research or advanced scholarship being studied (technical; professional; performative; field or lab based; digital etc.). Understanding and critical evaluation of methodologies and techniques applicable to students' own research or advanced scholarship. Practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline.

Values, Qualities and Attributes

Evidence of engagement with ethical, legal, moral, subject-related and professional values. Demonstration of self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and ability to act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks.