Assessment Procedures: Birkbeck University Validated Degrees

2025-26

BLOOMSBURY
INSTITUTE
LONDON

Index

Committee Approval

Committee	Committee Action	Date
QAEC	Recommended for approval	19 November 2025
Academic Committee	Approved	02 December 2025
	Date in force	**02 December 2025**

The Assessment Procedures: Birkbeck University Validated Degrees will be reviewed annually by the Document Lead. Any significant changes beyond the scope of an annual review will require the approval of the Academic Committee acting on recommendation from the Quality Assurance and Enhancement 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: Birkbeck 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 Birkbeck, University of London (Birkbeck).

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."[1] 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:

- Academic Appeals Policy

- Academic Misconduct Policy

- Mitigating Circumstances Policy

- Student Disability Policy

- Information Control Procedures

- Birkbeck University of London: Common Awards Scheme

- UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: External Expertise

- UK Quality Code, Advice and Guidance: Assessment

- Guide to Assessment Submission

- Guidance for Extensions and Extenuating/Mitigating Circumstances

---

[1] https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/advice-and-guidance-assessment.pdf?sfvrsn=ca29c181_5

3.   Forms

The key internal staff 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.

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, these can be both online or paper based.

To facilitate diversity of assessment methods, most modules will be assessed by a mixture of 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

Our Assessment Review Team (ART) is responsible for the oversight of the assessment cycle, including reviewing processes and providing final advice and guidance where assessment issues are not resolved. ART members consist of staff who are involved in the assessment cycle.

4.4   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.

4.5   Assessment Brief

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

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: Extension and Mitigating Circumstances

- Appendix 2: Submission Check List

- Appendix 3: Declaration of authorship

- Appendix 4: Use of external editorial or proof-reading services

4.6   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. This is for internal use and can be made available to academics. Guidance on the Marking Scheme for students should be included within the assessment task.

4.7   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.

5.   Setting the Assessment Task

Bloomsbury Institute set the dates for assessments, as per the Programme/Module Specifications 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. The assessment type used should be in line with the Module Specifications.

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 Setting

Scheduling

The Assessment Team will organise term time examinations and tests, end of year examinations and resit examinations/tests.

Examinations and tests that take place during term will be scheduled in line with the students' timetabled seminar sessions, in the week indicated on the Programme Specification. Where there are room restrictions, tests may be scheduled at a different time or date.

End of year examinations will take place during the assessment weeks indicated on the Academic Calendar.

Resit tests will take place during the resubmission period.

The Assessment Team will work closely with the Timetabling Manager to organise rooms for the examinations and tests.

A final timetable will be created by the Assessment Team, uploaded to the website and sent to Module Leaders. Module Leaders will be responsible to make an announcement of the examination time, date and location on the Canvas page for their module.

Invigilators

Invigilators are responsible for the administration of examinations, ensuring a suitable examination environment is created, and maintaining Academic Integrity.

Invigilators are responsible for completing all the examination front sheets, registers and completing disturbance forms when required.

5.1.2   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

    o 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.

5.1.3   Online Test/ Examination

All online examinations and tests will be conducted in a computer room organised by the Assessment Team, or in a classroom where laptops will be provided. Students are not permitted to use their own laptops or mobile phones for any online assessments.

Building the Online Test/Examination

Online tests and examinations are built by Module Leaders directly within Canvas. All tests must be completed and available no later than two weeks prior to the scheduled test date to allow adequate time for verification of settings and functionality.

Where an assessment is not in multiple-choice format, the Module Leader is required to prepare two distinct versions of the test. This measure ensures that assessments can be conducted within the timeframes specified in the relevant Programme Specifications.

Canvas Log-in

Students are responsible for knowing their Canvas log-in details <u>before attending</u> the test or examination. Failure to do so may result in a delay in the student starting their online assessment; any time lost will not be compensated for at the end of the test.

IT Issues

If there are IT issues during the examination, the invigilators and Assessment Team will attempt to resolve the issue. If it is an issue that cannot be resolved the examination will be stopped and rescheduled.

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.

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 and proofreads 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.

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. First sit and Resit examination papers will be created and uploaded to the shared area on SharePoint for Birkbeck to have access to. Birkbeck will liaise with the relevant members of staff as well as External Examiners for approval. Birkbeck will inform the Assessment Team once the review of the examination papers is completed, and the Assessment team will in turn forward any feedback/comments to the relevant Module Leaders and Course Leaders.

The Assessment team incorporates the final agreed assessment task into the relevant Assessment Brief template, which is then shared with the Module Leader. The Module Leader is responsible for reviewing the Assessment Brief and communicating any proposed changes to the Assessment team before the start of term. **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).

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 review. 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.

Where a permanent amendment to an assessment due date is required, the Module Leader must consult with the Quality Team, as such a change must be formally recorded and reflected in the Programme Specification.

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 Course and/or Module Leaders, 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)

- Recruiting and providing relevant training to invigilators

- Arranging invigilators for all examinations and in-class tests

   o **Module Leaders are required to stay in the room for the entire duration of in-class tests and TCAs to support the 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 Setting the examination and in-class test timetable and arranging any computer labs if necessary

   o Deploying arrangements of extended times where relevant

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

   o Arranging External Examiners' moderation (if applicable)

Module Leaders must create and set up any online examination or in-class test on Canvas at least one and a half weeks before the scheduled test date.

6.   Marking the assessment and ensuring standards

To ensure that the standards of assessment are maintained, and the required level of achievement reached with regard 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 submissions, marking should be completed and marks should be released no later than **15 working days** after the original submission deadline. For resubmissions, marking should be completed in **10 working days** and marks released no later than **15 working days**. Accelerated modules delivered in Term 3 will have a **reduced** marking deadline to **10 working days.** The Assessment Team will provide a list of accelerated students in advance.

The marking deadline for resubmission is **10 working days.** The marking deadline will remain the same, irrespective of whether extensions have been granted to students.

The following stages are completed before 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 students 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. There is allowance for a 10% variation from the specified word count before any penalty is applied. For example, it is acceptable to submit between 900 and 1100 words for a 1000-word assignment. Work that exceeds the 10% variation from the specified word count will be penalised.

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

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   Second Marking and Moderation

The processes of second marking and moderation are to ensure consistency in marking practice.

Second marking or moderation may take three forms:

- "blind" marking (where the second marker does not see the marks or comments of the first marker)

- "seen" marking (where the second marker sees both marks and comments awarded by the first marker)

- "check" marking (for subjects where answers may be right or wrong, and where answers can be checked against an answer sheet and ensure no administrative error has been made)

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.

6.3.1 Second Marking

Second marking is defined as the marking of all pieces of submitted work for a particular assessment by an examiner other than the person originally designated to mark the work presented for assessment.

All submissions for principal modules (Dissertations and Final Projects) must be second marked. Where work is second marked, the two markers should attempt to agree a proposed mark to go forward to the relevant sub-board. Where there are differences that cannot be agreed through initial discussion between first and second markers, and the discrepancy of marks is above 5% and/or there is disagreement across classification boundaries, the use of a third marker will be employed. In cases where marks between first and second markers differ within 5% an average of the two marks will be taken.

Moderation is not required for work that has been second marked.

6.3.2 Moderation

Moderation is defined as a process of sample marking of submitted work for a particular assessment by an internal examiner other than the person originally designated to mark the work presented for assessment.

Moderation is carried out through the following steps:

- o The Module Leader collates a sample of assessments for moderation, to include 20% of the module cohort or at least 5 students, whichever is greater.

- o The sample should include: assessments across the range of marks with at least one assessment from each classification band and roughly equal numbers from each band; all fails.

- 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.

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

- A different member of the Marking Team 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.

- 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.

6.3.3   Difference in grades

At any level of study, if grades awarded by the moderator differ by more than 10 marks from those of the first marker, it is recommended that all scripts marked by the first marker are moderated.

Example:

- First marker: any percentage grade from 90%

- Second marker: any percentage grade below 80%

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 Birkbeck, University of London, and their role is to ensure that academic standards for the award, and/or specified modules that they have responsibility for are maintained. Ultimately, they play a crucial part in ensuring the marking standards. External Examiners confirm that the types of assessment are appropriate for the subject, the students, the respective level of study and the expected outcomes.

External examiners should have enough evidence to determine that internal marking, and determination of award and where appropriate classification is of an appropriate standard and is consistent. External examiners should see a sample of examination scripts and other assessed material from the top, the middle and the bottom of the range. External examiners should also see all scripts and other material assessed internally as failures. To carry out these duties effectively external examiners should not be asked to carry out any marking duties.

External examiners should receive evidence of moderation processes in with the sample of assessed work.

External examiners should have sufficient time to scrutinise examination scripts and other assessed work adequately, normally by receiving these at least seven days in advance of an Examination Board meeting.

External examiners should not recommend the amendment of marks for individual students or pieces of work unless they have seen all of the assessed work for the module in question. External examiners can recommend that all marks within a module be "re-scaled" if, as a result of their moderation, they consider that the general standard of marking within the module is too harsh or too lenient.

All the above stages are recorded by Birkbeck.

External Examiners are required to submit an Annual Report by the deadline indicated in their letter of appointment.

The reports are submitted to the Birkbeck Quality Unit which then distributes them. Reports on Bloomsbury Institute programmes are sent to the Head of Quality while External Examiner Reports are circulated to Birkbeck 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. Any relating actions as a result of these activities are monitored by relevant committees.

6.5　Re-sits / Resubmissions

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

- The student has an approved Mitigating Circumstance (MC).

Where a module is an overall fail, the student is required to resubmit any failed item of assessment (0-39).

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　Second Marking

For re-sits/resubmissions for principal modules, (Dissertations and Final Projects) second marking is carried out for all submissions.

6.5.3　Moderation

For re-sits/resubmissions, moderation is only carried out on all 4-39% grades (UG) and 4-49% grades (PG), all initial merit bare pass (undergrad: 40%, postgrad: 50%) grades, and any scripts that have been submitted after MCs at first sit [i.e., the grade will not be capped]. Moderated scripts are recorded on the Moderation Form (**AF3**).

6.5.4　External moderation

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

6.5.5　Resubmission and Capping

Academics **should not manually reduce or cap marks** in Canvas.

Enter the **merit mark** in the **Final Column and** add the following sentence to the feedback:

UG: This is a resubmission; therefore, your mark will be capped at 40%.
PG: This is a resubmission; therefore, your mark will be capped at 50%.

6.6   Canvas grades

6.6.1   Mark Entry

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

- 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: agreed merit grade

6.6.2   Canvas cut-off deadlines

The Assessment team will provide Academics with Canvas cut-off dates. Academic staff and Academic Admin staff will not be able to make any changes to grades on canvas 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 panel and an outcome has been confirmed at this stage, or where the academic misconduct case has been referred to a Panel at Birkbeck and an outcome has been received.

- Outcomes received for MCs. 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

- 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 Sub-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 Late Submission and Capping

Where a submission is late, without approved MCs [see 7.3], the following rules will be applied:

Submission Timing	Birkbeck
Up to 7 days late	Reduced by 10%: **Academics enter the *merit mark* and add notes. (see table below)**
7 – 14 days late	Capped at pass mark: **Academics enter the *merit mark* and add notes. (see table below)**

Academics **should not manually reduce or cap marks** in Canvas.

Enter the **merit mark** in the **Final Column**, and add the following details:

Submission Timing	Notes Column	Feedback
Up to 7 days late	LR – indicate which assessment (e.g. 'AS1:LR', 'AS1r:LR' etc)	Your submission was up to 7 days late; therefore, the board will reduce your mark by 10%.
7 – 14 days late	LP – indicate which assessment. (e.g. 'AS1:LP', 'AS1r:LP' etc)	**UG:** Your submission was over 7 days late; therefore, the board will cap your mark at 40%. **PG:** Your submission was over 7 days late; therefore, the board will cap your mark at 50%.

Viewing the Notes Column in Canvas

- Go to **Gradebook**
- Click on **Settings** (top right corner): ⚙
- Under **View Options** and tick **Notes** (found under Show).
- Click **Apply Settings**

7. Assessment Grading

Marks will be awarded from 0-100%. The following **specialised marks** are used for specific circumstances:

Specialised Marks	
3	MCs Approved
2	Holding Grade for various reasons, e.g. MC applications and suspected AM
1	Academic Misconduct (AM) occurred
0	Non submission

Marking criteria differ between courses, subjects and topics. Please see the programme handbook to find the marking criteria for each course.

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

- If the student has either applied for MCs 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 MCs is added by the Academic Administration team in the Final grade column in Canvas.

- If a MC 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 if an application of MCs has been made.

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

7.1 Passing a module

To pass a module, a student must achieve an overall pass grade. The pass grade for undergraduate students is 40% and for postgraduate students 50%, 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%)

Students need to achieve an overall module pass; therefore if the student achieves a fail grade in one item of assessment, they 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 who fail more than one module at first-sit will also be required to continue studies on a standard undergraduate degree programme.

Students are strongly advised to attempt all items of assessments to avoid the risk of being withdrawn for lack of engagement. 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, Birkbeck 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%**.

When a student takes the resubmission/resit opportunity, the highest grade between their first sit and resubmission 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.

7.2 Assessment or Module Failure

7.2.1 Resubmitting / Re-sitting assessments

If a student fails a module overall and has a failure for an item of assessment (i.e., achieves a percentage grade between 4-39% for UG or 4-49% for PG), the student needs to rework their original submission.

Where a student receives a percentage grade between 0-2% (including any academic misconduct) or an 3% grade for an upheld MC claim the student needs to complete the resubmission task.

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.

For both undergraduate and postgraduate students, one resubmission/re-sit opportunity is permitted. All resubmission/re-sit opportunities will be at the discretion of the board. If the student passes at the second attempt, the mark will be capped, unless the student has approved MCs.

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.

7.2.2 Compensation and Repeating

7.2.2.1 Compensation

Students who fail a module and meet the compensated credit criteria may be offered a compensated credit instead of reassessment.

Where a student has achieved a result of 30-39% (undergraduate, other than the LLB), 35-39% (LLB), 40-49% (postgraduate), the Sub-board of Examiners may, at its discretion, offer a "compensated credit".

Compensated credit cannot be awarded for a core module, therefore only one module at level 6/level 7 may be compensated. There is no compensation available on the Top-up programme.

Where a student has not exhausted the prescribed number of attempts at that module the student can reject the offer of compensated credit and seek to pass the module at the next available opportunity; any offer of compensated credit will lapse once a further assessment is attempted, although Sub-Boards of Examiners may repeat the offer if the student does not subsequently pass the module, at their discretion.

7.2.2.2 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.

If a student re-takes a module, the student must attend and complete all assessments. This applies regardless of the marks the student achieved in any element of assessment at the previous attempt.

Any module taken as a re-take will not be capped at the pass mark, although any reassessment attempt of a retake module will be capped.

7.2.3 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 mitigating circumstances

Occasionally, circumstances beyond students' control may affect their ability to submit work on time. In these cases, it is possible for students to request an extension via the MC process.
There are two types of MC claim that students can request:

- Late submission: for students that have missed the original deadline, but have/can still submit within the two-week late period.

- Non-submission: for students that have missed an examination, or the original assessment deadline, and are unable to submit within the two-week late period.

Students can make a claim for MCs by completing the Mitigating Circumstances Form[2]. The claim must be submitted no earlier than 14 calendar days before the original date of an assessment and no later than 14 calendar days afterwards.

If there is a valid reason for applying outside this window, the student must include this information as a support statement, otherwise the claim will be automatically rejected. Students will be asked to indicate their preferred resolution, depending on the type of MC:

1. No penalty for a submission made during the two-week late submission period. In this instance, the student will submit using the same first-sit assessment brief.

2. Deferral to a later submission beyond the two-week late period. In this instance, the student will submit using a new resubmission assessment brief. The brief and resubmission deadline are both available on Canvas. A holding grade of 3% will be added to reflect the approved deferral.

For more detailed information on extensions and mitigating circumstances please refer to the Guidance for Extensions and Extenuating/Mitigating Circumstances document[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.

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, Birkbeck (and all universities) and professional bodies as a very serious matter. Instances of suspected plagiarism will be investigated by the Module Leader/Module Tutor using the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy [Birkbeck][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.

The Learning Enhancement team 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 visiting our website via https://www.bil.ac.uk/student-services/learning-enhancement/ or emailing lee@bil.ac.uk.

---

[2] https://www.bil.ac.uk/student-services/forms/

[3] https://www.bil.ac.uk/student-services/forms/

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