Assessment Procedures: Wrexham University Validated Degrees

2024-25

BLOOMSBURY INSTITUTE LONDON

Index

Committee Approval

Committee	Committee Action	Date
QAEC	Recommended for approval	17 January 2024
Academic Committee	Approved	26 January 2024
	Date in force	**29 January 2024**

This Assessment Procedures: Wrexham University Validated Degrees document will be reviewed annually by our Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee. Any amendments require the approval of our Academic Committee.

1.   Introduction

It is through these Assessment Procedures that Bloomsbury Institute has established and will maintain standards of quality assurance throughout the whole assessment process on our validated degrees.

The Assessment Procedures: Wrexham University Validated Degrees lays out the responsibilities of staff, forms and timelines involved in the operational activities for the creation and implementation of Assessment Briefs and assessment activities.

These procedures are subject to any regulations, policies and procedures established by Wrexham University (WU).

The assessment process is monitored by the Assessment Team through the completion of an **Assessment Approval Log** and **Assessment Marking Log**. There are separate Logs which can be easily filtered at course level as follows:

- Foundation Year

- BSc (Hons) Accounting and Finance

- BA (Hons) Business Management

- LLB (Hons) Law and Legal Practice

- MBA/MSc Management and Accounting and Finance

These Logs record each stage of the assessment procedures set out below for each item of assessment within each module.

In the context of assessment, the Quality Code sets as a Guiding Principle a requirement that "assessment is inclusive and equitable". This is designed to ensure that every student has "an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement through the assessment process, with no group or individual disadvantaged." We have an inclusive learning approach towards teaching and assessment, and this approach enables us to ensure that no students (including those with a specific learning difficulty) are disadvantaged.

2.   Related documents and procedures

The key documents and procedures which are linked to the Assessment Procedures: Validated Degrees document are as follows:

- Disability Policy

- Information Control Procedures

- Wrexham University Academic Regulations Section 3 & 4

- Wrexham University Academic Quality Handbook – Chapter 5 External Examining

- Wrexham University Extenuating Circumstances Policy

- Wrexham University Academic Misconduct Policy

- Wrexham University Assessment Policy

- UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: External Expertise

- UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: Assessment

3.   Forms

The key forms which are used throughout the assessment process are as follows:

Internal forms:

- Assessment Task Form: AF1T

- Marking Standardisation Form: AF2*

- Moderation Form: AF3*

- Submission Date Change Request Form: AF6*

- Late Grade Change Form: AF7*

*These forms are available online for users. The forms without asterisks are made available on a case-by-case basis.

Forms provided by Wrexham University:

- Wrexham University External Moderation Form

- Wrexham University Assessment Task Approval Form

4.   Key definitions

4.1   Assessment

Modules can be assessed in different ways, depending upon the nature of the module, its level, content and learning outcomes. Generally, there are five types of **assessment**:

- **Assignment:** e.g., essay, problem question, case study and seen examination. Assignments may be text-based or non-text based. Text-based assignments consist of essays, problem questions, case studies and seen examinations. Non-text-based assignments include presentations and moots.

- **Presentation/oral assessments:** a class assessment that can occur during teaching hours. This can be an individual work or a group work.

- **Examination:** any unseen examination (i.e., where the student is not provided with the questions beforehand).

- **Portfolio**: e.g., different forms of interlinking assessments combined to evidence achievement against the learning outcomes.

- **In-class test:** a class assessment (time-constrained assessment (TCA)) that can occur during teaching hours.

To facilitate diversity of assessment methods, most modules will be assessed by a mixture of all five assessment types.

4.2   Item of assessment

Each 30-credit module will normally have at least two separate **items of assessment.**

4.3   Assessment Review Team

The Assessment Review Team (ART) is responsible for the review of the assessment cycle, including reviewing processes and providing final advice and guidance including where assessment issues are not resolved.

The team comprises the Assessment Manager and designated Academic staff members with relevant experience of higher education assessment procedures across Levels 0, and 4 to 7.

4.4   Assessment Review Team meetings

The team meets at least twice each academic year or, more frequently, if required, as a result of inconclusive matters, such as standardisation and/or moderation. Inconclusive matters may be referred to a member of ART, or a meeting may be called depending upon the nature of the issue.

The first meeting (usually held after the end of the Autumn term) will review and reflect on the cycle of assessment tasks and assessment brief production (including but not limited to rigour, validity, realism, load, etc.).

The second meeting (to be held after the end of the Spring term) will review and reflect on the assessment cycles [Terms 1, 2 and 3] of standardisation, marking, moderation, and grades release for both first sit and resubmission/resit.

4.5   Assessment Team

The **Assessment Team** completes all the administrative elements and is responsible for the oversight of the assessment cycle. This includes supporting and reviewing processes and procedures and providing advice and guidance regarding any assessment-related matters. Where applicable, the Assessment Team may report any arising matters to the Assessment Review Team.

4.6   Assessment Task

All **assessment tasks** are written by the Module Leader (see **Section 5**).

4.7   Assessment Brief

Once the assessment task has been approved, the task is inserted into the Assessment Brief, which includes the following:

- Assessment structure and weighting

- Details of each assignment:

    o   The assignment task (e.g., question/s),

    o   Guidance to complete the assignment (including assessment criteria)

    o   Submission requirements

- Details of any unseen examination:

    o   Duration of the examination (including, if applicable, reading time)

    o   Material which may be brought into the examination (if applicable)

    o   Structure (e.g. number of questions set; number of questions to be answered; whether there are any compulsory questions; allocation of marks)

- o   The syllabus content that will be examined

- Learning outcomes for the item of assessment

- Appendix 1: Submission Check List

- Appendix 2: Declaration of authorship

- Appendix 3: Use of external editorial or proof-reading services

- Appendix 4: Extension and Extenuating Circumstances and Word Count

4.8   Marking Scheme

The Module Leader must also provide a Marking Scheme to the Assessment team for each item of assessment and a grading criterion for students.

4.9   Marking team

A Marking team is established for every module. If a module is delivered by more than one academic, the Marking team comprises the Module Leader and the Module Tutor(s). If the module is delivered by one academic, the Marking team comprises the Module Leader and an academic who will undertake standardisation and moderation for that module's assessments.

4.10   Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC)

The Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee (QAEC) is an intermediate committee, sitting above the Course Committees and below the Academic Committee, the purpose of which is to contribute to the effective setting and maintaining of academic standards and the assuring and enhancing of academic quality.

As set out in our Corporate and Academic Governance Framework, the QAEC is responsible for, *inter alia*:

- Recommending to Academic Committee the approval and/or amendment thereto of Assessment Procedures: Validated Degrees

- Receiving reports from our awarding bodies and other external quality assurance organisations such as the QAA

- Receiving External Examiner Reports and approving External Examiner Response Forms.

In addition to the QAEC, we have a newly constituted Senior Academic Leadership Team (SALT), the role of which is to support effective operational management and leadership throughout the Academic Division.   Information which relates to maintaining academic standards and the enhancement of academic quality is disseminated and discussed within the SALT. Issues relating to assessment and the operation of these Assessment Procedures will be considered by the SALT and (if appropriate) referred to the QAEC.

5.   Setting the Assessment Task

Bloomsbury Institute set the dates for assessments and write the assessments for all our validated degrees.

As stated at **Section 4.1** above, modules can be assessed in different ways, depending upon the nature of the module, its level, content and learning outcomes.

5.1 Assessment task, examination paper and marking scheme

An assessment task is written by the Module Leader or another allocated team member for each item of assessment. The tasks are submitted for approval using the Assessment Task Form [**AF1T**].

The Module Leader must also provide a marking scheme for the assessment task and examination, to include the academic disciplinary content that should be included within the assignment.

5.1.1 Examination paper

Examination questions are written by the Module Leader. These are converted into an examination paper by the Assessment team using the standard Examination Template. The Examination Template includes the following:

- Front Page

  o Date, time and duration of the examination (including, if applicable, reading time)

  o Number of questions to be answered (including, if applicable, any compulsory questions)

  o Allocation of marks

  o Material which may be provided during the examination

- Examination Questions

A reserve examination paper must be produced by the Module Leader in case there is a security issue with one of the papers.

Note: If a past examination paper is not available (e.g. because this is the first time the module has been delivered), a sample examination paper must also be provided. The sample examination paper may be made available to students at the start of the term, together with the Assessment Brief.

5.2 Approving assessment tasks and examinations

The Assessment team draws up and distributes the *Assessment Tasks and Briefs Timeline* and the Course Leaders allocate reviewers and proofers to each module. At this stage, the Assessment team also distributes (via SharePoint) the up-to-date Module Specification (sourced from the Quality team) to the Module Leaders. This is to ensure the most relevant specifications are being used to create the tasks.

The Module Leader writes all assessment tasks for modules within their remit, including examination/in-class test papers (first sit and re-sits/resubmissions) and marking schemes, using the Assessment Task Form [**AF1T**].

The Assessment Task Reviewer reviews the assessment tasks and marking schemes and completes the relevant section of the Assessment Task Form. The Assessment Task Reviewer liaises with the Module Leader over amendments (if any), with feedback recorded on the Assessment Task Form. All changes to assessment tasks must be recorded with the use of "track changes" and supported by a commentary using the "New Comment" function. Any assessment subcomponents should also be flagged in the form. This process continues until the assessment task and examination are agreed.

The tasks are then proofread. The proof-reader liaises with the Module Leader over any changes required. The proof-reader completes the relevant section of the Assessment Task Form. Once the tasks have been finalised, the Module Leader sends the Assessment Task Forms, examination or in-class test papers and marking schemes to the Assessment team who will carry out a review to ensure that the proposed items of assessment are in line with the Module Specification "assessment section" and ready for approval by External Examiners, where applicable.

The Assessment team will upload the internally approved tasks in the relevant folder and will forward the completed WU forms and relevant documents to Wrexham University who will liaise with the relevant members of staff as well as External Examiners for approval, (if applicable). The Assessment team records this on Log 1. Wrexham University will inform the Assessment Team once the review of the assessment tasks is completed, and the Assessment team will in turn forward any feedback/comments to the relevant Module Leaders and Course Leaders.

The Assessment team saves the Wrexham University Assessment Task Approval Form and logs receipt on the Log 1. Outcomes from this process are made available to the Assessment Review Team.

The Assessment team embeds the final agreed assessment task into the Assessment Brief.

By Week 1 of the academic year, the Module Leader publishes the Assessment Brief on Canvas, together with the Module Study Guide.

5.3 Presentation to students

Assessment Briefs will be presented to students at the beginning of the term, by Week 1. Assessment Briefs should be posted in the Syllabus area of each module area in Canvas. AS1 and AS2 should be posted at the beginning of the term (by Week 1). The resit Assessment Briefs should be posted once the final submission date for first sit has lapsed.

5.4 Submission date changes

The Assessment Team create the Assessment Calendars based on the assessment weeks specified in the Programme Specification and share these with Course Leaders and Module Leaders before the start of the academic year for approval. If a Module Leader wishes to change the submission date for any item of assessment after approval, the Module Leader needs to complete a Submission Date Change Request Form [**AF6**] and get the form approved by the Course Leader. Once received, the Assessment Team will review the viability of the change and seek to accommodate the request where it can be aligned with already scheduled administrative assessment activities.

5.5 Examination and in-class test arrangements

Examinations and in-class test papers must be securely stored by the Assessment team unless they are seen examinations.

Working with the Timetabling Manager, Disability and Wellbeing Manager, IT and relevant academic staff, the Assessment team will be the overall lead for making all necessary examination and in-class test arrangements.

For paper-based examinations/ in-class tests, the responsibilities of the Assessment team include:

- Setting the examination and in-class test timetable (to include any special arrangements for any students who are eligible for a reasonable adjustment to the standard examination)

- Arranging and training invigilators

- Printing copies of all examination and in-class test papers

- Setting up each examination and in-class test room on the day of the exam

- Collecting completed examination and in-class test scripts

- Recording attendance

- Receiving invigilator reports and taking any action, as required

- Distributing examination and in-class test scripts for marking

- Receiving marked scripts

- Arranging External Examiners' moderation (if applicable)

- For online examinations/ in-class tests, the responsibilities of the Assessment team include:

  o providing IT with data to set up Assessment Shells

  o creating Examination Papers and Answer Sheets, and sharing them with MLs

  o Setting the examination and in-class test timetable and arranging any computer labs if necessary

  o deploying arrangements of extended times where relevant

  o Informing the Module Leaders of the students entitled to special arrangements

  o Checking the exam and in-class test for technical issues

  o Arranging External Examiners' moderation (if applicable)

Module Leaders are required to set up the examination/ in-class test on Canvas

6.   Marking the assessment and ensuring standards

To ensure that the standards of assessment are maintained, and the required level of achievement reached with regards to learning outcomes at an item of assessment level and subsequently at module level, marking schemes and grade criteria are agreed and distributed. Where appropriate to do so, assessments are marked anonymously.

For first sit marking should be completed and marks should be released no later than **15 working days** after original submission deadline. For resubmission marking should be completed in **10 working days** and marks released no later than **15 working days**. The marking deadline will remain the same, irrespective of whether extensions have been granted to students. Accelerated modules delivered in Term 3 will have a **reduced** marking deadline, that will be provided in advance by the Assessment Team.

The following stages are completed before and after grades are being released to students.

- Marking of assessment

- Standardisation

- Internal moderation

Grade Distribution Report is produced for each module which informs completion of the Module Monitoring Report (MMR) and subsequent Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (AMER).

These stages are now considered in further detail.

6.1　Marking Scheme and Grade Criteria

The Module Leader must distribute a marking scheme to the Marking Team, to include the academic disciplinary content that should be included within an answer. Academic disciplinary content is an outline indicator of what is expected from the students in terms of the content.

A detailed grading criteria should be added to the AF1T form, so that the Assessment Team have this information. The grading criteria should be shared with student by academics in a separate document.

All written assignments will include clear guidance in the Assessment Brief on the 'word limit' to address the requirements of the assignment.

If a student's work exceeds the stipulated word limit by more than 10%, a penalty must be imposed. Assignments must be marked in their entirety and the penalty imposed at the end.

The penalty for exceeding the word count will be 5 marks per 1,000 words excess (e.g., 1,000-word assignment would have 5 marks deducted if 1,101-2,100 words submitted, 10 marks deducted for 2,101-3,100 words and so on).

Abstracts, citations in footnotes, reference lists, bibliographies and appendices are excluded from any word limit requirements.

All cases where the word-count penalty has been applied should be recorded in the Module Assessment Board minutes.

If a student's work is under the word limit, the full work will be marked on the extent to which the requirements of the assignment have been met. If a student's work is substantially under the word limit, it is likely to fall short of the requirements of the assignment.

6.2　Standardisation

Standardisation ensures there is a shared understanding of the marking criteria, and the awarding of grades is clear and in line with modules' level learning outcomes.

Standardisation is carried out on a sample of scripts, before the marking and moderation process starts. The sample is selected by the Module Leader. A Marking Team will be established for every module. If a module is delivered by more than one academic, the Marking Team will comprise the Module Leader and the Module Tutor(s). If the module is delivered by one academic, the Marking Team will comprise the Module Leader and an academic who will undertake moderation for that module.

There is no standardisation when there is only one academic delivering the module, unless the module is being delivered for the first time, or the academic delivering the module is new to the module and is therefore marking the module for the first time. In such cases, standardisation must take place.

The Marking Team completes a standardisation exercise through which the Marking Team agrees the grades for a sample of between three and five assessments before the marking starts. This exercise is completed as follows:

- The Module Leader (ML) provisionally marks the sample of assessments

- The ML circulates the assessments [without revealing what grade the ML awarded the assessments] to each member of the Marking Team who are required to mark each assessment

- The members of the Marking Team submit the marked assessments to the ML

- The ML convenes a standardisation meeting between the members of the Marking Team to agree the grades for the sample

- If the Marking Team cannot agree the grades for the sample, the matter is referred to a member of the Assessment Review Team [through the Assessment team] and ultimately to a formal meeting of the Assessment Review Team

All the above stages are recorded in the Marking Standardisation Form (**AF2**) and sent to the Assessment team within 7 working days of the assessment date.

6.3 Moderation

Once first marking has been completed, moderation should take place to ensure that:

- assessments have been marked in line with the expressed aims and learning outcomes of the assignment/examination, and in terms of the marking criteria

- the final mark is arithmetically correct (e.g., when an assessment is comprised of different subcomponents)

- internal consistency of assessment within a module has been maintained

- all first and second markers have interpreted and applied the marking criteria in a comparable and consistent way

- the resulting total mark has face validity compared to the feedback

- feedback is helpful and sufficient.

It is completed as follows:

- Module Leader collates a sample of assessments for moderation, to include all assessments at grades 70-100% and 4-39%, and 10% of assessments at grades 60-69%, 10% of assessments at grades 50-59% and 10% of assessments at grades 40-49%. Each grade should include a range of grades within the same grade boundary.

  Note: the sample should not be less than 10% of assessed student work or if the total number is 5 or less, then all assessments will be moderated.

- In cases where multiple markers have marked the same assessment, the sample selection method would apply to all markers. In other words, the sample selection should take place for each marker as per the above-mentioned percentages.

- For Foundation Year modules, the sample is reduced to 25% of assessments at grades 70-100% and 4-39%, and 5% of a range of assessments at grades 60-69%, 50-59% and 40-49%. If the total number is less than 5, then all assessments will be moderated.

- For examinations, the moderated scripts should be submitted with the moderation form to the Assessment team.

- A different member of the Marking Team (referred to as the "moderator") will moderate an assessment. The moderator will state whether the awarded grade is agreed or not.

- For 'Live' assessments (e.g., presentations and assessed seminars) moderation can be either synchronous or asynchronous:

  o Synchronous moderation occurs when both the first and second marker are present during the 'live' assessment. It is carried out almost immediately when the markers discuss and agree the feedback and grade during a face-to-face discussion.

- o Asynchronous moderation occurs where it is not possible or necessary for both markers to be present for the 'live' assessment. In this situation, all 'live' assessments should be recorded by the first marker and the moderator will review a sample.

- If the moderator disagrees with the grade awarded, a discussion must be held between the original marker and the moderator. Once agreement is reached, a note of the discussion should be kept in the moderation form. This note should include a record of how grade difference was resolved. If an agreement is not reached, then it will be referred to a member of Assessment Review Team.

- All Principal Modules (i.e. research projects and dissertations) are second marked and, therefore, the moderation carried out by the Module Leader only needs to include 3 assessments at grades 70-100% and 3 assessments at grade 4-39%, and 1 assessment at each grade 60-69%, 50-59% and 40-49%. respectively. If the total number is less than 8, then all assessments will be moderated.

6.3.1   Difference in grades

At **Levels 3 and 4**, if grades awarded by the moderator differ from those of the first marker by one full percentage grade boundary or greater, all scripts marked by the first marker must be moderated.

Example 1:

- First marker: any percentage grade from 90+%

- Second marker: any percentage grade between 70-79%

Outcome: No requirement for all scripts to be moderated.

Example 2:

- First marker: any percentage grade from 90+%

- Second marker: any percentage grade between 60-69%

Outcome: All scripts to be moderated.

At **Levels 5, 6**, and **7** if grades awarded by the moderator differ from those of the first marker by more than one percentage grade boundary, all scripts marked by the first marker must be moderated.

Example 1:

- First marker: any percentage grade from 90+%

- Second marker: any percentage grade between 80-89%

Outcome: No requirement for all scripts to be moderated.

Example 2:

- First marker: any percentage grade from 90+%

- Second marker: any percentage grade between 70-79%

Outcome: All scripts to be moderated.

All the above stages are recorded in the Moderation Form (**AF3**), which is sent to the Assessment team by the Module Leader.

6.4   External moderation

The External Examiners are sourced by Wrexham University and their role is to ensure that academic standards for the award, and/or specified modules that they have responsibility for, are maintained, with particular reference to those parts of the programme, which contribute to the final award classification.

Ultimately, they play a crucial part in ensuring the marking standards. They are not to re-mark assessed work. Where marking standards are judged to be acceptable, the External Examiner will confirm this.

Once internal moderation has been completed for all modules at Level 5 and above (also for Level 4 modules if required by a professional body), external moderation will take place on a smaller sample, which will contain scripts that were internally moderated and those that were not. The minimum size of any sample shall be 10% or 5 internally moderated pieces of work.

Where the External Examiner disagrees with one or more grades, one of the following may be applied, at the request of the External Examiner:

- An individual grade can be changed provided the External Examiner moderates all the assessments.

- The External Examiner requires all the assessments to be remarked (and then re-moderated by the External Examiner).

All the above stages are recorded in the Wrexham University External Moderation Form

6.5   Re-sits / Resubmissions

Where a module is an overall pass, the student is not required to resubmit unless:

- The student has not attempted an item of assessment and has a 0% mark

- The student has an approved Extenuating Circumstance.

Where a module is an overall fail, the student is required to resubmit any failed item of assessment (0-39). Where an assessment comprises of two or more subcomponents and the student has failed the assessment overall, the student must resubmit all subcomponents.

6.5.1   Standardisation

The standardisation for re-sits/resubmissions must be carried out if the item of assessment is new (i.e. AS1r or AS2r), or the designated marker has not marked the item of assessment before.

If the student is submitting the same item of assessment and the marker has marked this within the first sit/submission assessment cycle, then standardisation is not required.

Standardisation of re-sits and resubmissions must be recorded on the Marking Standardisation Form (**AF2**).

6.5.2   Moderation

For re-sits/resubmissions, moderation is only carried out on all 4-39% grades, all initial merit bare pass (40%) grades, and any scripts that have been submitted after extenuating circumstances at first sit [i.e., the grade will not be capped]. Moderated scripts are recorded on the Moderation Form (**AF3**).

6.5.3   External moderation

It is not necessary for re-sit/resubmission scripts to be sent to the External Examiners for moderation.

6.6 Canvas grades

The Module Leader is responsible for inserting grades into Canvas. The numerical value specified in the Grade Distribution Table (section 7) should be entered in Canvas. The following rules apply:

- First Sit/Submission grades should be inserted in the columns in Canvas as follows:

    o Initial column: merit grade

    o Moderated column: moderated grade

    o Final column: initial grade or agreed grade between first marker and moderator

Note: if the submission is late, then **only** the Final grade should be capped at 40%. If the submission is being investigated for academic misconduct, the holding grade (2%) should be inserted **only in** the Final column.

- For all re-sits/resubmissions, grades should be inserted in the columns in Canvas as follows:

    o Initial column: merit grade

    o Moderated column: moderated grade

    o Final column: capped grade (40%) or merit grade in the case of a fail grade or a merit grade in the case of Extenuating Circumstances being upheld for the first sit.

6.6.1 Canvas cut-off deadlines

The Assessment team will provide Academics with Canvas cut-off dates. Academic staff or Academic Admin staff will not be able to make any changes to grades after these dates.

It is accepted that there could be instances where a change may be required after the deadline has lapsed; however, only the Assessment team has authorisation to make such a change. For more details, please see below.

Changes to grades after Canvas cut-off

There could be instances where changes to the grades are required after the Canvas cut-off deadline has passed.

Members of the Assessment team are the only authorised individuals who can make a change to grade/s after the deadlines. The following are examples of when such changes may be required:

- Outcomes received for academic misconduct. This will result in the need to change the grade from 2% to the grade awarded as per the outcome. This could take place after a student has attended a viva and an outcome has been confirmed at this stage, or where the academic misconduct case has been referred to a Panel at the Wrexham University and an outcome has been received.[1]

- Outcomes received for extenuating circumstances. This will result in the need to change the grade from 2% to the grade awarded as per the outcome.

- Grade change because of moderation activity

---

[1] Further details of the Academic Misconduct Process can be found in Appendix 2 of this document.

- Missed grade as per the original cut-off deadline

- Late marking of assessment

- Incorrect grade

All the above changes must be reported to the Assessment Team as a matter of urgency using the AF7 form.

Any grade changes after the Canvas cut-off deadline where the AF7 form has not been used will not be considered for the purposes of Assessment Boards and the grade change may not be considered. This will ultimately impact the student's progression. If any grade change is requested after the Module Boards, then the grade should be processed through Chair's Action.

If any changes are required, the Late Grade Changes Form (**AF7**) must be completed and submitted to the Assessment team.

6.7   Grade Distribution Report

Following completion of the marking process, a Grade Distribution Report (i.e. a marks' matrix) is provided for each module cohort indicating:

- student grade scores

- aggregate scores including average and standard deviation statistics

- year-on-year comparison statistics

The Grade Distribution Report informs completion of the Module Monitoring Report and the subsequent Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report.

7.   Assessment Grading

Wrexham University marks in percentage grades. This is considered to deliver the most accurate and fair outcomes for students.

Grading & Marking Criteria	
90+	Outstanding
80 - 89	Exceptional
70 – 79	Excellent
60 – 69	Good
50 – 59	Fairly good
40 - 49	Satisfactory
30 - 39	Minimal
4 - 29	Unsatisfactory
3	Extenuating Circumstances Approved
2	Holding Grade for various reasons, e.g. EC applications and suspected AM
1	Academic Misconduct occurred
0	Non submission

Each assessment [assignment and exam] that a student completes will be marked using the common grading system: The Grade Criteria (see **Section 6.1** above and **Appendix 1**).

In addition to the above criteria-based grades, there are two grade indicators which represent either a withheld decision or an upheld decision:

- If the student has either applied for extenuating circumstances (ECs) or is under investigation for suspected academic misconduct (AM), a holding grade of 2% will be used. This holding grade can also be used for other administrative reasons.

- A 2% grade for suspected academic misconduct is added by the marking tutor during the marking process in the Final grade column in Canvas.

- A 2% grade for pending extenuating circumstances is added by the Academic Administration team in the Final grade column in Canvas.

- If an extenuating circumstances application has been upheld, then a grade of 3% is used. The Academic Administration team adds the 3% grade in the Final grade column in Canvas.

A note should also be added by the Marking Tutor and/or Academic Administration team in the note column in Canvas if a submission is under academic misconduct investigation and/or is an application of ECs has been made.

Academic misconduct or extenuating circumstances outcomes will only be applied to a whole assessment item, not to individual sub-component parts (i.e., presentation and submission).

Note: If the student has applied for ECs, then there should **not** be a submission. If the student makes a submission, then the ECs will not be considered and a general rule of 'fit to submit/sit' applies.

7.1   Passing a module

To pass a module, a student must achieve an overall grade of at least 40% in the assessment of that module and this is applicable to all programmes and levels. The items of assessment for each module and their weightings are published in the Assessment Brief. The weighting of the assessment gives an indication of its significance, and below are two examples of assessment patterns:

- 2-hour exam (weighted at 60%) and a 2,000-word essay (weighted at 40%)

- Portfolio (100%)

It is possible that because a student only needs to achieve a 40% overall, if the student achieves a fail grade in one item of assessment the student may still be able to pass the module, provided a pass grade is achieved in another item of assessment. However, if the item of assessment which is failed is weighted at (for example) 70%, it may be very difficult to pass the module.

Students on Accelerated undergraduate programmes must achieve an average mark of 40% or more over all modules to be permitted to progress on the accelerated Undergraduate Degree programme. Students who do not achieve an average mark of 40% or more will be required to continue studies on a standard undergraduate degree programme.

Students on Postgraduate programmes must achieve a grade of at least 40% and have attempted all items of assessment. They may progress to the last term where 60-credits module (Dissertation or equivalent) is delivered when:

- 120 credits have been studied and

- At least 90 credits have been passed and

- The referred module is eligible to be trailed, that is, it is not a Research Methods module, and it is not specified in the definitive programme documentation that the module is not eligible to be trailed.

Students must achieve a 40% overall module grade to pass the 60-credits module (Dissertation or equivalent).

Students are strongly advised to attempt all items of assessments to avoid the risk of being withdrawn for lack of engagement by the Assessment Board at Wrexham University. Students are encouraged to speak with their Module Leader/ Student Engagement, Wellbeing and Success (SEWS) to receive all necessary support to engage with their assessments.

Note: Some modules carry a professional body exemption and have a different pass requirement. Students may be required to achieve a module pass grade with pass grades for both items of assessment. Details on specific requirements would be provided by the Module Leaders on request.

7.1.1   Calculating the overall module grade

To calculate the overall module grade, Wrexham University completes the following steps:

- the relevant weighting is applied to the percentage mark for each item of assessment

- the weighted item values for each item of assessment are added together

Taking the example of the module above with a 2-hour exam (weighted at 60%) and a 2,000-word essay (weighted at 40%), if a student passed the exam with a 40% and the essay with a 61%, the overall grade will be calculated as follows:

- Weighted Percentage: (40%*60%) + (61%*40%)

- Weighted Percentage: 24% + 24%

- Weighted Percentage = **48%**.

A student may have passed the module overall but may still have an outstanding opportunity for an item of assessment they have not attempted. In this situation, a student is allowed or can be allowed to undertake the outstanding item of assessment to be sure they can progress.

If a student takes the resubmission/resit opportunity, the highest grade between their first sit and resit grades will be taken into consideration when calculating the overall grade for the modules. For example:

- First sit grade: 13% and resubmission grade: 38%. The resubmission grade 38% will be used to calculate the overall module grade.

- First sit grade: 38% and resubmission grade: 13%. The first sit grade 38% will be used to calculate the overall module grade.

Grades guidelines for Item of assessment	
90+	
80 - 89	
70 – 79	
60 – 69	PASS
50 – 59	
40 - 49	
30 - 39	
4 - 29	FAIL
3	

2	
1	
0	

7.2 Resubmitting / Re-sitting assessments

If a student fails a module overall and has a fail for an item of assessment (i.e., achieves a percentage grade between 4-39%), the student needs to rework their original submission. If a student receives a percentage grade between 0-2%(including any academic misconduct) or an 3% grade for an upheld extenuating circumstances claim, then the student will need to use the Resubmission Assessment Brief (AS2r).

For resit examinations and TCAs, a new exam or TCA paper will be used. The resubmission/re-sit period will be published in the Academic Calendar and Module Study Guides.

For undergraduate students, two resubmission/re-sit opportunities are allowed. All resubmission/re-sit opportunities will be at the discretion of the board decisions. For postgraduate students, only one opportunity is permitted. If the student passes at the second attempt, the mark will be capped at '40%', unless the student has successfully applied for extenuating circumstances.

Note: No extensions can be granted for resubmission/re-sit work, and, therefore, all resubmission/re-sit work must be completed by the deadline given.

Outstanding resubmissions may affect a student's ability to graduate, even if the work has been marked and grades provisionally released.

7.2.1 Compensation, Trailing and Repeating

Compensation:

For undergraduate programmes, failure may be compensated in the light of overall performance, as specified below:

- A minimum of 90 of the 120 credits required at that level have been passed

    and

- the average grade for all modules at that level (for which a percentage grade is awarded) is at least 40%

    and

- a mark of at least 35% has been achieved in the failed module(s). In this respect, compensation will apply to a 30-credit module. and

    and

- all assessed elements of the module have been attempted. Derogation from regulations may apply.

Compensation shall not be permitted for an award of Postgraduate Certificate. For further information about Postgraduate diploma, refer to Academic Regulations for Taught Postgraduate Awards (Taught Masters, Master of Research, Postgraduate Diploma, Postgraduate Certificate, Professional Graduate Certificate in Education).

Trailing

Undergraduate students may commence study (progress) at the next level trailing 30 credits at the lower level provided that:

- A minimum of 90 credits at that level have been passed;

- All pre-requisite modules have been passed

Student trailing credits must pass the module at a subsequent occasion to satisfy the requirements of the award. A student may trail 30 credits only into the next level of study and must pass the 30 credits by the end of that level of study, in order to proceed further.

Trailed modules will be awarded a mark out of a maximum 100% if the module is deferred; or the mark will be capped at the bare pass mark for a further attempt.

Trailing students are not required to attend classes. Trailing students and Module Leaders will be contacted by the Assessment Team, who will provide them with a submission date. A submission portal will be opened for when in the relevant module within the VLE.

Repeating

Undergraduate students may be provided with the opportunity to repeat a module or year. Where a student is allowed to repeat, the student will be allowed 'a further attempt with attendance at a module (or modules) that has been failed, within the attempts permitted by the Regulations, normally during the following academic year.'

A repeating student will attend classes, and will be submitting on the submission dates provided in the Assessment Briefs.

Note: Students that are either trailing or repeating have only one further attempt, if they fail, they cannot resubmit. Any module that is trailed or repeated will be capped to a bare pass. (40%)

7.2.2   Resubmission / Re-sit support sessions

Support sessions will be timetabled for students who must resubmit an assignment and/or re-sit an examination where possible.

If a student has failed an assignment and wants to complete the resubmission assignment early, the student will be provided with in-year support by the Learning Enhancement Team, Module Leader and/or Module Tutor. However, the student can only formally resubmit the assignment during the resubmission period assigned to their intake.

7.3   Extensions and extenuating circumstances

Applications for extensions alongside supporting evidence (e.g., medical certificates), should be submitted via the Student Self-service Portal, SSP.

Applications for extenuating circumstances (EC) are submitted via e:Vision (Wrexham Student Portal) to Wrexham University (WU) directly. Bloomsbury Institute is not directly involved in the EC process. The Academic Administration team will be informed by Wrexham University when students have submitted an EC application and the outcome of the latter.

7.3.1   Extensions

If a student experiences unforeseen circumstances that may prevent him/her submitting an assignment at the first opportunity, it is possible for them to request an extension of up to one week (7 calendar days). The length of extension requested will be evaluated by the Academic Administration team.

The granting of an extension will depend upon the nature of the difficulty the student is experiencing, whether the difficulty could and should have been anticipated, and the extent to which the circumstances were outside of the student's control. For example, health difficulties would usually provide legitimate grounds for an extension; last minute computer issues or clashing deadlines would not. Any subsequent requests to extend the length of an extension that has already been granted after the original submission deadline cannot be granted. However, in exceptional circumstances, if an extension of up to one week is not enough, students should contact the Academic Administration team again to discuss the reasons for extensions greater than 1 week.

If a student faces any difficulties and an extension may not be enough, the student should make a claim for Extenuating Circumstances. Students are strongly encouraged to speak with the Academic Administration or SEWS teams before applying for Extenuating Circumstances.

Note: No extensions can be granted for examinations/in-class tests, presentations, group work, and no extensions can be granted for resubmission/re-sit. Extensions are only permitted for the whole item of assessment and not for any subcomponents, unless the subcomponent is a presentation, examination/in-class or group work.

7.3.2   Extenuating circumstances

Extenuating Circumstances (EC) are defined as circumstances, normally exceptional and outside the control of the student, which have prevented a student from performing in an assessment at the level expected or required of a student or from undertaking the assessment.

Extenuating Circumstances are defined as a serious or acute problem, or an event beyond a student's control or ability to foresee, which has prevented completion of assignment/s or attendance at examination/s. If a student is experiencing unforeseen or unexpected events – such as serious illness or severe disruption to their personal life – that may affect the student's ability to take assignment/s or sit examination/s, the student should meet with their Module Leader, Course Leader, Academic Administrator, the Disability or SEWS teams to discuss available options.

If a student is unable to sit an exam or submit an assignment, the student may be able to claim EC, which, if accepted, would allow the student to complete the assessment for the first time later, and receive an uncapped mark for it. If the EC are upheld for a first sit item of assessment, the assessment would be taken at the next sitting or the assignment would be submitted at the next submission opportunity (resubmission/resit). The outcome of an EC application will determine whether the grade is capped or not. If the EC is upheld for a resubmission/resit item of assessment, there will be no further opportunity to resubmit/resit that assessment. Wrexham University will consider the EC at the Award Board and the module will be disregarded both from the accumulated failure count and from the number of opportunities a student must repeat a module.

A claim for EC, *should* normally be submitted within 15 working days of the date of assessment via the online submission process on e:Vision.[2] Evidence provided must include original copies of documents, or copies which can be proved to be authentic. Please refer to Wrexham University Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Procedure. Students will need to provide additional evidence and show good reason for lateness if their claim is submitted after the 15-day deadline, or their claim is submitted by the deadline, but no appropriate evidence has been provided.

Note: Wrexham University's Fit to Sit statement will apply to all examinations. Please refer to the Extenuating Circumstances Procedure (Wrexham University).[3]

7.4   Students with disabilities

If a student has a disability or specific learning difficulty and requires additional support, they are advised to contact the Disability and Wellbeing Manager at disability@bil.ac.uk.

---

[2] https://evision.glyndwr.ac.uk/urd/sits.urd/run/siw_lgn

[3] https://www.bil.ac.uk/qem/section-3/

7.5 Plagiarism and cheating

Plagiarism is passing the work of another off as the student's own, whether by copying from a textbook, an internet site, another student etc. In the latter case, the student whose work is copied is at risk of being regarded as having colluded in the plagiarism and is therefore at risk of the imposition of a penalty. This is regarded by us, Wrexham University (and all universities) and professional bodies as a very serious matter. Instances of suspected plagiarism will be investigated by one of our Academic Integrity Officers using our Academic Integrity Procedure[4]

Procedures are in place to deal with both suspected and proven plagiarism.

Cheating or attempting to cheat in exams is also regarded as a serious matter. This will be reported, and the student will be dealt with in accordance with the relevant procedures.

Wrexham University provides guidance for students on Academic Integrity and it is available through their own Academic Integrity Portal.

The Learning Enhancement service provides students with support, guidance and tuition in all areas of academic skills and English language. The service is aimed at improving academic performance, regardless of existing level, and can be accessed by emailing: lee@bil.ac.uk.

8. External Examining

As per the UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: External Expertise, external examining provides one of the principle means for maintaining UK academic standards within autonomous higher education providers. External examining is, therefore, an integral and essential part of institutional quality assurance. External Examiners are individuals [drawn from academia and from industry, business and the professions], who are appointed in accordance with the criteria set out in Indicator 5 of the QAA Code for External Examining. Not every External Examiner is necessarily required to meet all the criteria.

External Examiners are appointed to provide each degree-awarding body with impartial and independent advice, as well as informative comment on the degree-awarding body's standards and on student achievement in relation to those standards. The specific responsibility of each External Examiner is dependent on the role allocated by the degree-awarding body on appointment and may be at different levels depending on the nature of the provision and the way in which a degree-awarding body's decision-making processes about assessment are structured.

In principle, External Examiners should test that:

- The types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the respective level of study and the expected outcomes.

- The marking scheme/grading criteria have been properly and consistently applied, and that internal marking is therefore of an appropriate standard, fair and reliable.

In viewing samples of students' work, External Examiners are not normally able to expect or encourage an Examination Board to raise or lower marks for individual students, on the basis that such a practice would be unfair to those candidates whose work is not part of the sample.

Degree awarding bodies ensure that External Examiners are clearly briefed to carry out the role. Briefing includes confirmation of the module(s), programme(s) or award(s) to which the External Examiner is appointed; evidence that he/she requires to provide oversight; clarity about their precise role in respect of scripts sent (for example, sampling or adjudicating in cases of disagreement); his/her remit in relation to endorsing the outcomes of the assessment process; and the type of commentary that he/she is expected to provide on the outcomes of the assessments conducted within those programmes / modules.

---

[4] https://www.bil.ac.uk/app/uploads/2023/06/Academic-Integrity-Procedure-Wrexham-Glyndwr-University.pdf

Wrexham University operates a two-tier examination system and appoints Module External Examiners and a smaller group of Framework (or Principal) External Examiners. The External Examiners for programmes at Bloomsbury Institute are Module External Examiners. All External Examiners are appointed for a period of four years.

To fulfil their role, External Examiners view students' work. The volume of assessment samples is of sufficient size to enable the External Examiners to form a view as to whether the internal marking process has properly assessed students' performance against standards. External Examiners are not responsible for the assessment of individual students to the point that External Examiners do not carry out marking of assessed work.

External Examiners are required to submit an Annual Report (using WU's Annual Report Form template) by the deadline indicated in their letter of appointment. The standard deadlines are:

- Undergraduate programmes (Levels 4-6): 31 July of each academic year.

- Postgraduate programmes (Levels 7 and 8): 31 October of each academic year.

The reports are submitted to the WU Quality Unit which then distributes them. Reports on Bloomsbury Institute programmes are sent to the Deputy COO and the Head of Quality while External Examiner Reports are circulated to WU counterparts. The Head of Quality will then distribute the reports to the relevant Programme and Course Leaders.

Course Leaders complete an External Examiner Response Form, which is approved in the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee prior to submission to WU. The final versions of the External Examiner Reports and Bloomsbury Institute's responses are published on our Quality and Enhancement Manual on our website.[5] Any relating actions as a result of these activities are monitored by relevant committees.

9.   Resources used

Biggs, J. B. (2003) Teaching for Quality Learning at University, Open University Press/Society for Research into Higher Education.

Advance HE Advice and Guidance https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/teaching-and-learning/assessment-and-feedback-higher-education

Hine, B. and T. Northeast. (2016) *Using feed-forward strategies in higher education. The terrifying novel assignment: using feed-forward to improve students' ability and confidence on assignments that test new skills.* New Vistas, 2 (1). pp. 28-33.

Sadler, D. R. (2010) *Beyond Feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal.* Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 35: 535-550.

UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: External Expertise https://www.qaa.ac.uk/the-quality-code/advice-and-guidance/external-expertise

UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: Assessment https://www.qaa.ac.uk/the-quality-code/advice-and-guidance/assessment

---

[5] https://www.bil.ac.uk/qem/qaa-quality-code/external-examining/

Appendix 1: Grade Criteria

%	Level 4 Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors
90-100	Outstanding: Outstanding knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study]. Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] is unique and insightful. The work demonstrates outstanding ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make sound judgements. Presentation is remarkable with no errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of extensive reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is exemplary. Outstanding evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
80-89	Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing).
70-79	Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There may be some minor inaccuracies/omissions.
60-69	Very Good: Good knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study]. Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] shows some originality and insight. The work demonstrates ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make sound judgements. Presentation is good with no significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of a good range of reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is good. However, the work is not as strongly original or distinctive as a first class piece of work, and there may be some omissions, or irrelevancies. Good evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
50-59	Fairly Good: Sound knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with no major inaccuracies or omissions. Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] lacks originality, is largely descriptive and superficial. The work demonstrates some ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation is satisfactory and does not contain a large number of significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of some appropriate reading and scholarship, though the range may be narrow. Argument structure and coherence is satisfactory. Some evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
40-49	Satisfactory: Basic knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with some inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] is limited, descriptive and superficial. The work demonstrates limited ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style are poor with meaning sometimes impeded by ungrammatical sentence construction. There is limited evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is limited; work may be incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
35-39	Marginal Refer/Fail: Some basic knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Lacks evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study]. Poor presentation, evaluation and interpretation of data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style are poor with minimum evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. (Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level).
30-34	Refer/Fail: Minimum knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with serious inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Lacks evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study]. Little or no presentation, evaluation and interpretation of data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style are poor with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. Minimum evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
4-29	Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] overall, work is irrelevant with very little material of any value. No evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study]. No presentation, evaluation and interpretation of data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style is unacceptable with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is poor, work is incomplete. No evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
0-3	Refer/Fail: Non-submission/AM occurred/EC approved

%	Level 5 Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors
90-100	Outstanding: Outstanding knowledge and critical understanding well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed. The work demonstrates outstanding application of key theories and principles to practice with outstanding knowledge and critical evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analysis and interpretations of data is remarkable. There is outstanding critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques providing unique and insightful answers to problems that arise from that analysis. The work demonstrates outstanding communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences. The student has an outstanding ability to effectively implement [area of study] approaches. Presentation is remarkable with no errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of extensive reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is exemplary. Outstanding evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that requires personal responsibility and decision-making.
80-89	Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed thought there may be negligible errors.
70-79	Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors and some minor inaccuracies/omissions.
60-69	Very Good: Good knowledge and critical understanding well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed. The work demonstrates good application of key theories and principles to practice with good knowledge and critical evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analysis and interpretations of data is good. There is proficient critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques providing answers of some originality and insight to problems that arise from that analysis. Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is good. The student's ability to effectively implement key [area of study] approaches is good. Presentation is accomplished with no significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is good. However, the work is not as strongly original or distinctive as a first class piece of work, and there may be some omissions, or irrelevancies. Good evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that requires personal responsibility and decision-making.
50-59	Fairly Good: Sound knowledge well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with some critical understanding and no major inaccuracies or omissions. The work is largely descriptive and superficial with some application of key theories and principles to practice and reasonable knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analyses and interpretations of data is adequate. Critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques is limited, so that answers to problems that arise from that analysis lack originality and insight. Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is sound and the student is able to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation is satisfactory and does not contain a large number of significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of some appropriate reading and scholarship, though the range may be narrow, whilst argument structure and coherence is satisfactory. Some evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that requires personal responsibility and decision-making.
40-49	Satisfactory: Basic knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with some inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. The work is descriptive and superficial with limited application of key theories and principles to practice and limited knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analyses and interpretations of data is inadequate. The works lacks critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques. Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is poor and the student shows limited ability to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are poor with meaning sometimes impeded by ungrammatical sentence construction There is limited evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is limited; work may be incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
35-39	Marginal Refer/Fail: Some basic knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. The work lacks application of key theories and principles to practice, is descriptive and superficial with insufficient knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. Little or no evidence of the student understanding of how their knowledge is limited or how this affects their analyses and interpretations of data. The work lacks critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques. Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is poor and the student shows limited ability to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are poor with minimum evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. (Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level).
30-34	Refer/Fail: Minimum knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with serious inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Little or no application of key theories and principles to practice, is descriptive and superficial with insufficient knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student does not evidence understanding of how their knowledge is limited or how this affects their analyses and interpretations of data. The work lacks critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques. Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is poor and the student does not evidence ability to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are poor with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.

4-29	Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed, work is irrelevant with very little material of any value. Unsatisfactory application of key theories and principles to practice, with unacceptable knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. No evidence understanding of how their knowledge is limited or how this affects their analyses and interpretations of data. No critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques. Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is unacceptable and unable to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are unacceptable with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is poor, work is incomplete. No evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.
0-3	Refer/Fail: Non-submission/AM occurred/EC approved

%	Level 6 Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors
90-100	**Outstanding:** Outstanding systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Outstanding accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Outstanding conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Outstanding conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. An outstanding appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences outstanding application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is outstanding critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates outstanding communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Outstanding evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. An outstanding learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.
80-89	**Exceptional:** In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed thought there may be negligible errors.
70-79	**Excellent:** In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors and some minor inaccuracies/omissions.
60-69	**Very Good:** Very good systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Very good accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Very good conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Very good conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. A very good appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences very good application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is very good critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates very good communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Very good evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. A very good learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.
50-59	**Fairly Good:** Fairly good systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of [area of study]. Fairly good accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Fairly good conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Fairly good conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. A fairly good appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences fairly good application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is fairly good critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates fairly good communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Fairly good evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. A fairly good learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.
40-49	**Satisfactory:** Satisfactory systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of [area of study]. Satisfactory accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Satisfactory conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Satisfactory conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. A satisfactory appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences satisfactory application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is satisfactory critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates satisfactory communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Satisfactory evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. A satisfactory learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.
35-39	**Marginal Refer/Fail:** Limited systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Limited accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Limited conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Limited conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. Limited appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences limited application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is limited critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates limited communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. limited evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. Limited learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature. (*Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level*).

30-34	**Refer/Fail:** Minimal systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Minimal accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Minimal conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Minimal conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. Minimal appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences minimal application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is minimal critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates minimal communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Minimal evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. Minimal learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature. (*Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level*).
4-29	**Clear Refer/Fail:** Unsatisfactory systematic understanding of key aspects of **[area of study]**, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Unsatisfactory accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within **[area of study]**. Unsatisfactory conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Unsatisfactory conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. Unsatisfactory appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline). Work evidences unsatisfactory application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is unsatisfactory critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem. The work demonstrates uunsatisfactory communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Unsatisfactory evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. Unsatisfactory learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature. (*Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level*).
0-3	Refer/Fail: Non-submission/AM occurred/EC approved

%	Level 7 Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors
90-100	**Outstanding:** Outstanding systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates an outstanding knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with outstanding practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work evidences outstanding critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of outstanding systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Outstanding communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Outstanding self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of an outstanding ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. An outstanding display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.
80-89	**Exceptional:** In most areas, the qualities required for the grade above are displayed, though there may be negligible errors.
70-79	**Excellent:** In most areas, the qualities required for the grade above are displayed. There may be negligible errors and some minor inaccuracies/omissions.
60-69	**Very Good:** Very good systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates a very good knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with very good practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work evidences very good critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of very good systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Very good communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Very good self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a very good ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. A very good display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.
50-59	**Fairly Good:** Fairly good systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates a fairly good knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with fairly good practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work evidences fairly good critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of fairly good systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Fairly good communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Fairly good self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a fairly good ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. A fairly good display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.
40-49	**Satisfactory:** Satisfactory systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates a satisfactory knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with satisfactory practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work evidences satisfactory critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of satisfactory systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Satisfactory communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Satisfactory self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a satisfactory ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. A satisfactory display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.
35-39	**Marginal Refer/Fail:** Some systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates some knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with some practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work evidences limited critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is some evidence of systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Limited communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Some self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a limited ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. A limited display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.(*Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level*).

30-34	**Refer/Fail:** Minimal systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates minimal knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with minimal practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work evidences minimal critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. Evidence of systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data is lacking. Limited communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Minimal self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a limited ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. Minimal display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.
4-29	**Clear Refer/Fail:** Unsatisfactory systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work lacks knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is unoriginal without practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline. Work lacks critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. Evidence of systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data is insufficient. Poor communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Inadequate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with little to no ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level. Work does not display the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.
0-3	Refer/Fail: Non-submission/AM occurred/EC approved

Appendix 2: Suspected Academic Misconduct Process

Suspected cases of academic misconducts have been divided into three different levels of offences which will follow the relevant processes: Indiscretion, minor breach and major breach.

1. While marking, the Module Tutor (MT) suspects academic misconduct (AM) took place and so the MT:

    -   Marks the work on *face-value*.

    -   Inserts the 'face-value' grade in the *INI* column on Canvas.

        o   Inserts 2% (in the *Final* column on Canvas) and adds a note in the Note Column on Canvas for Academic Administrators (AAs) to be aware of the reason why the grade is withheld This should be done prior to releasing the grades. If it is done before the Canvas cut-off deadline, the ML changes the grade on Canvas. If it is done after the Canvas cut-off deadline, the Late Grade Change Form (**AF7**) needs to be completed by the ML, and sent to the Assessment Team (AT)

    -   Investigates to determine whether there is evidence that AM took place.

    -   The referring tutor/module tutor should report the case to the Course Leader (CL)

2. CL checks the suspected assignment including supporting evidence CL will then meet with the Head of Programme (related to subject area) to determine the level of offence and the correct process to follow.

3. Indiscretion – this level of offence is only applicable to Level 3 students that commits a first offence. For students studying at a different level, the case will be treated as an indiscretion only if **all** the following conditions apply:

    a. it is a first offence;

    b. the offence occurred within the first 12 months of the students' time at the University (regardless of level); and

    c. there are indicators that the offence has occurred due to poor academic practice rather than a deliberate attempt to gain unfair advantage. In such a case, the student should be supported in their academic writing and CL or Head of Programme should meet with the student to provide additional support. The student can also be signposted to academic study skills sessions to ensure a repeat offence does not occur.

The Head of Programme formally notifies the student with the prescription for improvement stipulated and it should be made clear to the student that any future offence would be dealt with formal academic misconduct procedures. Please see below the notification to be sent to the student:

Date

<Student's Full name>
<University Email address>
<Personal Email Address>

Dear <Student first name>

Academic Integrity: Minor Indiscretion Outcome

The submission of <assignment> for module <Enter Module Code and Title> was recently referred for review under the University's Academic Integrity Procedure. On review, there was clear evidence that a large proportion of the submitted assignment included content very similar, or identical, to other published sources.

We have concluded that there was a breach of academic integrity. This has been deemed to be an "indiscretion" since this is a first offence within your first year, and it was considered that the offence has occurred because of poor academic practice rather than a deliberate attempt to gain any unfair advantage.

What happens next?

A note will be added to your student record of the indiscretion and your assignment will be marked, ignoring those sections which are not your own.

To ensure you do not make the same mistakes in future assignments, the following guidance is provided:

- *It is not sufficient when writing just to quote or copy sections of text from any other published source, with or without citation. Your assignments should be written in your own words based on your own understanding of the central ideas contained in those sources, constructed into continuous prose.*

- *You are strongly encouraged to access support and learning resources (e.g. on Academic Writing, Referencing and avoiding Plagiarism) from the Learning Enhancement Team at Bloomsbury Institute.*

- *Any further incidences of a breach of Academic Integrity will be investigated formally according to the Academic Integrity Procedure.*

Yours sincerely

Signature

<Name>
Head of Programme– <enter Programme Title>

The Head of Programme will complete the relevant section on the indiscretion referral form - and submit it to Academic Administration to make a note of the offence on the student record. If the Head of Programme / CL determine that the offence is of a more serious nature, depending on the type of misconduct investigated, they can either submit a referral for minor or major offence.

4. Minor Breach of Academic Misconduct

While marking, the Module Tutor (MT) suspects academic misconduct (AM) took place and so the MT:

- Marks the work on *face-value*.

- Inserts the 'face-value' grade in the *INI* column on Canvas.

  o Inserts 2% (in the *Final* column on Canvas) and adds a note in the Note Column on Canvas for Academic Administrators (AAs) to be aware of the reason why the grade is withheld. This should be done prior to releasing the grades. If it is done before the Canvas cut-off deadline, the ML changes the grade on Canvas. If it is done after the Canvas cut-off deadline, the Late Grade Change Form (**AF7**) needs to be completed by the ML, and sent to the Assessment Team (AT)

- Investigates to determine whether there is evidence that AM took place. CL checks the suspected assignment including supporting evidence while moderating (i.e.

before grades are released to students). CL will then (related to subject area) determine the level of offence and the correct process to follow.

When the case of suspected academic misconduct is determined as a minor breach, the referring tutor will need to submit the minor referral online form, completing the relevant section and uploading supporting evidence to investigate the case. The Programme Leader (CL) will confirm information on the form is correct and the level of offence is in line with procedure, the form will be sent to Academic Administration who will arrange the interview between the student, Programme Leader (CL) and Head of Programme or an appropriate nominee (Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) appointed by Head of Programme.

As soon as the interviewer has conducted the investigation, the relevant section on the minor referral form will need to be completed and submitted to Programme Leader to confirm the penalty and made final decision.

If the decision of the investigation is 'academic misconduct has occurred' and therefore, the relevant penalty is imposed, a copy of the form will be sent to the student in writing detailing both the offence and penalty imposed within 5 working days of the date of the interview (hearing). Consequently, the form is sent to Academic Administration for recording the case on student record and the case will then be marked as completed (closed) on the system. Academic Administration will send the form, including the penalty, to Wrexham University.

5. Major Breach of Academic Misconduct

While marking, Module Tutor (MT) suspects academic misconduct (AM) took place and so the MT:

  – Marks the work on *face-value*.

  – Inserts the 'face-value' grade in the *INI* column on Canvas.

    o Inserts 2% (in the *Final* column on Canvas) and adds a note in the Note Column on Canvas for Academic Administrators (AAs) to be aware of the reason why the grade is withheld. This should be done prior to releasing the grades. If it is done before the Canvas cut-off deadline, the ML changes the grade on Canvas. If it is done after the Canvas cut-off deadline, the Late Grade Change Form (**AF7**) needs to be completed by the ML and sent to the Assessment Team (AT).

  – Investigates to determine whether there is evidence that AM took place. CL checks the suspected assignment including supporting evidence while moderating (i.e. before grades are released to students). CL will then meet with Head of Programme (related to subject area) to determine the level of offence and the correct process to follow.

When the case of suspected academic misconduct is determined as a major breach, the referring tutor will need to submit the major referral form, completing the relevant section and uploading supporting evidence to investigate the case. The CL will confirm information on the form is correct and the level of offence is in line with procedure. The form will be sent to Academic Administration who will forward/refer the case (including the relevant form and evidence) to Wrexham University which will arrange the Committee of Enquiry that will investigate the case.

The student will be invited to attend the hearing. If the decision of the investigation is 'academic misconduct has occurred', Wrexham University will confirm the penalty given to the student to Academic Administration, which will be responsible to update the case on the student record.

If the Academic Integrity Officer decides that no academic misconduct has occurred, then AAs will ask the Module Leader to confirm the merit grade and update the grade on Canvas. If this is after the Canvas cut-off deadline, the Late Grade Change Form (AF7) needs to be completed by AAs and submits it to the Assessment team (AT).

Academic Misconduct Penalties Range

Minor Offences	
Copying of sources without quotation marks and/or in text citing but references included in bibliography or reference list. (The extent of the copied sections will also be important in determining whether this is minor or major. Consideration should be given as to whether the percentage comprises a number of small matches or fewer substantial matches)	• Formal reprimand • Work to be marked ignoring the sections proven to be plagiarised.
Submission of own previously assessed work for another assessment either within the University or to another institution	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark
Permitting another student to copy work and present it as their own (where student has gained no advantage)	• Formal reprimand only
Communicating with another candidate in an examination or in-class test and no evidence of advantage being gained	• Formal reprimand only

Major Offences	
Extensive unacknowledged use of sources (first offence) (Consideration should be given as to whether the percentage comprises a number of small matches or fewer substantial matches))	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the module with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark
Extensive unacknowledged use of sources (second offence)	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to re-submit
Extensive unacknowledged use of sources with evidence of an attempt to deceive (first offence)	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to re-submit
Use of work of others (e.g. from essay banks or from other students) and presented as student's own work	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to resubmit
Copying from or communicating with another candidate in an examination or in-class test to gain advantage	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark
Introducing into an examination room any unauthorised manuscript, printed text, calculators, books or dictionaries or annotating any permitted equipment to gain advantage	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to re-sit for a capped mark
Permitting another student to copy work and present it as their own (where the owner of the work has gained financial advantage)	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the assessment with no opportunity to resubmit. If the assessment has already been awarded a mark the Progression/Award board is entitled to revoke that mark in accordance with Paras 2.5 and 2.6 of the procedure

Impersonating another candidate in an examination or in-class test or permitting someone to act in this way on their behalf (if both are students two offences will occur)	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the examination with no opportunity to re-sit and expulsion from the University
Fabrication of research/project results	• Formal reprimand • A mark of zero for the assessment with no opportunity to resubmit and • Expulsion from Wrexham University

For further information on the Academic Integrity Process, please refer to Academic Administration.