BISHOP GROSSETESTE UNIVERSITY

Document Administration

Document Title:	Code of Practice for Assessment of Students
Document Category:	Code of Practice
Version Number:	3.1
Status:	Approved
Reason for development:	This Code sets out the procedures to be followed for the process of Assessment of Students at Bishop Grosseteste University and assigns responsibility for carrying out various tasks.
Scope:	This Code applies to staff and students.
Author / developer:	Head of Quality and Regulatory Compliance
Owner	Registrar
Assessment: (where relevant)	☒ Equality Assessment ☐ Information Governance ☐ Legal ☐ Academic Governance
Consultation: (where relevant)	☐ Staff Trade Unions via HR ☒ Students via Bishop Grosseteste University Students' Union ☐ Any relevant external statutory bodies
Authorised by (Board):	Senate
Date first authorised:	8 December 2015
Date current version authorised:	22 July 2019
Date current version effective from:	September 2019
Date next review due to commence:	September 2022
Document location:	University website
Document dissemination / communications plan	University website, SharePoint, Staff Portal, Student Portal.
Document control:	All printed versions of this document are classified as uncontrolled. A controlled version is available from the Staff Portal.
Alternative format:	If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact governance@bishopg.ac.uk

*Please note this document remains valid until formally revoked or replaced by the University.

Version Control Table

Version Number	Date Authorised	Summary of Key Changes
4.0	22 July 2019	Minor changes to update terminology and clarify the moderation processes.

Introduction

1. This Code of Practice sets out the terms under which students of Bishop Grosseteste University undertake assessment of their programme(s) of study. It follows the precepts and guidance contained in the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) *UK Quality Code for Higher Education*, specifically the core practice: The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

2. It should be read with reference to other University Codes of Practice notably: the *Regulations for Undergraduate Awards,*; the *Code of Practice for the Validation of Programmes*; the *Code of Practice for the Periodic Review of Academic Provision*; the *Code of Practice for External Examining*; the *Code of Practice for the Conduct of Boards of Examiners*; the *Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct*; *the Code of Practice for Students with Access Needs; the Code of Practice for Work-based Learning; the Code of Practice for Collaborative Provision; the Regulations for Post Graduate and Professional Graduate Certificate in Education; the Regulations for Taught Masters; the Regulations Governing Research Degrees.* In addition, the *Guidance on Marking and Moderation* should also be considered.

3. The *Code of Practice for the Assessment of Students* is designed to secure academic standards by putting in place arrangements that will ensure that judgements made regarding students' work are reliable, consistent and free from bias and that they accord with clear criteria that are made available to students and to internal and external examiners. It also seeks to ensure that the outcomes of assessment are in keeping with national standards and that the awards made to students reflect the provisions of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and, where relevant, meet the requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs).

4. The *Code* seeks to establish close links between the conduct of assessment and the University's strategy on Learning, Teaching and Assessment. It is important that assessment should be regarded as an integral part of the learning opportunities offered to students and that, in addition to its summative role in establishing the standard of awards, it should also provide students with clear guidance on the progress that they have made and on the areas in which further development of their knowledge and skills is desirable. The *Code* also consider the use of electronic submission and marking.

   In higher education, assessment describes any processes that appraise knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills. There are many different forms of assessment, serving a variety of purposes, which include:

   • promoting student learning by providing the student with feedback, normally to help improve his/her performance
   • evaluating student knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills
   • providing a mark or grade that enables a student's performance to be established, and may also be used to make progress decisions
   • the use of peer assessed activities during formal teaching sessions, which will additionally provide students with a more informed understanding of assessment criteria.
   • enabling the public (including employers) and higher education providers, to know that an individual has attained an appropriate level of achievement that reflects the academic

standards set by the awarding institution and agreed UK norms, including the frameworks for higher education qualifications. This may also include meeting professional requirements.

Approval of Schemes of Assessment

5.   When preparing programmes of study for validation or revalidation, academic staff should pay particular attention to the development of the scheme of assessment in accordance with the *Code of Practice for the Validation of Programmes*. The Academic Enhancement Committee will only approve a programme to go forward for validation where the programme documentation includes a clear and consistent assessment scheme covering all modules and stages. Staff should consider a range of assessment methods to promote effective learning as well as articulating any specific team strategies that might be required, for instance for the management of any group and/or peer assessment of learning if applicable. Information regarding Schemes of Assessment is contained within Appendix 1.

Publication of Schemes of Assessment

6.   The details of the scheme of assessment must be made available to all students. The assessment scheme must correspond exactly and in all respects to the validated programme documentation. Reference should be made to the *Regulations for the award* where appropriate. Under no circumstances, however, should the *Regulations* be paraphrased.

7.   Schemes of Assessment should include a description of the different types of assessment that are in use and provide an explanation of their primary purpose in measuring academic achievement or transferable skills.

Setting Assignments and Examination Papers

8.   The external examiner system should be used for providing advice and feedback on assessments, and all assignments and examinations which contribute to a final degree classification or to a postgraduate award must be submitted to an external examiner for comment. The deadline for the preparation of assignments and examinations should allow sufficient time for this external review to take place. An exception may be made for small scale exercises and tests even though these may contribute to a final classification. The external examiner should, however, be briefed about the function of such forms of assessment in the overall scheme and has the right to ask for further details including examples of such exercises/tests and/or related student work.

9.   Programme teams should ensure every effort should be made to avoid the close coincidence of submission dates so that students' workload is, so far as possible, distributed evenly. Care is particularly important where two or more subjects contribute to a programme or where students are undertaking work place learning or part time study. Reasonable adjustments are made for students who need special assessment arrangements (for example, those with Specific Learning Differences (SpLD)); see *Code of Practice for Students with Access Needs*.

10.   The details of every assessed assignment (including re-assessment) must be set out in a separate assignment brief. The brief must be issued to students in the approved format no later than the start of the semester in which the assignment is to be submitted or, in the case of non-semesterised modules, at the beginning of the module. The assignment brief must contain the following information:

(i) the code and the title of the module to which the assessment is attached;

(ii) the type/title of the assignment, which should correspond consistently with the assessment type defined in the module specification;

(iii) the weighting accorded to the assignment within the assessment scheme for the module;

(iv) a full description of the task to be undertaken or choice of tasks from which the student must select;

(v) a list of the module learning outcomes that the assignment will assess which should correspond exactly to those in the module specification;

(vi) the criteria by which the assignment will be assessed, the weighting of each assessed component and the methods used to generate evidence. Methods may include the use of video recordings, where appropriate; for example, student performances and oral assessment. Such evidence is used for the purposes of moderation and external examining.

(vii) a mark scheme indicating the level of performance that will be required for the award of a particular range of marks;

(viii) the date and time by which the assignment must be submitted and the arrangements for its submission and confirmation that the assignment is to be marked anonymously or the reason why this is not practicable for the assignment in question;

(ix) the date by which the marked work will be returned, which should normally be within 20 working day of submission, and the arrangements that will be made for its return.

11. Examinations must be held during the designated exam weeks, normally at the end of each semester. The assignment brief must clearly indicate the length of any examination and its weighting within the assessment scheme for the module. Details must also be provided of any special equipment which will be needed for the examination and any material which may be consulted during the examination must be specified.

12. The Programme Leader is responsible for advising the School and Student Administration Manager at the start of each semester of any examinations that will take place during the following assessment period. The School and Student Administration Manager will prepare an examination timetable and make arrangements for the invigilation of the examinations. Students must be advised of the exact time, date and location of the examination, typically four weeks in advance by the School and Student Administration Manager.

13. Following consultation with the External Examiner, the examination papers must be lodged with the School and Student Administration Manager for secure keeping at least four weeks before the examination.

14. After the examination is completed scripts will be returned by the invigilator to the School and Student Administration Manager from whom programme tutors will collect and sign for them for marking.

15. In setting examinations programme teams must ensure that there is no recycling of questions year-on-year, except where the use of multiple choice question papers requires the availability of a bank of questions. Care should be taken to avoid the replication of essay titles in

subsequent written examinations or the setting of examination questions which would allow students to answer on the basis of research conducted for previously submitted assessed work.

16.   All assessment tasks should be reviewed each academic year. Resit assessments should normally consist of new tasks or questions in comparison with those set for 'first attempts'. Resit assignment briefs will normally be made available at the end of the academic semester involved.

Arrangements for the Submission of Assessed Work

17.   It is the responsibility of students to submit work in person, or electronically if required/permitted on an individual module/programme at the designated location by the published deadline. The work may be submitted up to five working days in advance (except on programmes where a longer time has been stated). The work must be accompanied by a submission sheet if required, which states the name (or number in the case of anonymously submitted work) of the student, the module code and title, the title of the assignment, which must be the same as that on the assignment brief.

By submitting this work students are agreeing to the following statement:

I declare that the work submitted for assessment contains no section copied in whole or in part from any other source, including work I have submitted previously at BGU or another university, unless it is explicitly identified by means of quotation marks and that I have acknowledged such quotations by providing detailed references in the approved format. I understand that either, or both, unidentified, unreferenced copying or purchased assignments constitute(s) plagiarism which is considered academic misconduct and could result in investigation by the Academic Misconduct Panel. I declare that the work is entirely my own.

17.   Work submitted electronically will be screened to check against other material on the web and other submitted work; work will be stored electronically and may be shared with other institutions for the purposes of plagiarism detection. Work stored in the system used with originality detection software may be held by the University for periods that are longer than the normal lengths of time indicated in the University's Records Retention Schedule, and students will be informed of this requirement as is appropriate.

18   Electronic submission, marking and return via the originality detection software (e.g. Turnitin) to check against other material on the web, other work submitted by students at BGU and students at other institutions, is to be undertaken if required within the programme of study; the assessment component is to be determined by the Programme Leader.

19.   On the submission of the assignment a receipt will be issued to the student showing the students' name or number, the title of the assignment and the date and time of submission. The receipt must be signed by the person accepting the assignment. For electronic submission, students should refer to the 'Turnitin Help Guides' which are available on Blackboard.

Extensions and Late Submission

20.   Students may apply to the Programme Leader (or in his or her absence a member of the programme team to whom this task has been delegated) for an extension, of 14 days. A longer period may be negotiated in the light of professional commitments in the case of

students registered on part-time postgraduate programmes. Such applications must be received before the day of submission. The application must be made on the standard pro forma available on the University's website and must be accompanied by corroborating evidence e.g. doctors note, as required. It is the responsibility of the student to decide whether or not they wish to apply for an extension. Tutors may inform students of their right to make such an application but should not advise them to do so. Tutors are not empowered to give any assurance that an application will be accepted. The Programme Leader should record his or her decision on the standard pro forma and inform the student in writing of the outcome. Students will be contacted by the Student Administration Team to confirm the acceptance of an extension request and the revised date of submission. If the claim is accepted and the work is submitted by the new deadline, it will be marked without penalty. The documentation relating to all such claims will be retained and made available to the Board of Examiners if required. An extension of up to three days may be given if submission via originality detection software is disrupted by technical issues.

21.   Where assessed work, is submitted for submission after the deadline, the late submission shall lead automatically to the imposition of a penalty.

22.   Penalties shall be applied following the marking process.

23.   The University's penalty scheme is as follows:

- up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10 marks* will be deducted from the actual mark achieved by the student for that component of the module;
- penalties will be applied until the pass mark is reached, at which point the University will acknowledge that it is a suitable piece of work of a standard for our degree and a pass will be awarded at the lowest pass mark available;
- for undergraduate programmes where the actual mark achieved by the student for the component of the module falls in the compensatable range of 39%-35%, penalties will be applied until the compensatable mark is reached, a compensatable fail will be awarded at the lowest compensatable mark available;
- work submitted later than 24 hours after the deadline will receive a mark of zero; and
- where work is handed in late BGU reserves the right to provide feedback late by the equivalent period of time.

    * *Mark refers to the actual mark awarded*

For example:

Time of Submission	Marks to be deducted (marks will be deducted from the actual mark achieved by the student for the assessment component)		Mark of Zero Awarded
	0	10	
Prior to Deadline	✓		
Up to 24 hours late		✓	
After 24 hours			✓

Scenarios:

a) If an undergraduate student submits work up to 24 hours after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 marks (a mark of 65, for instance, will be reduced to 55, a mark of 48 would reduce to 40, a mark of 38 would be reduced to 35 etc.);
   If a postgraduate student submits work up to 24 hours after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 marks (a mark of 65, for instance, will be reduced to 55, a mark of 58 would reduce to 50 etc.); or

b) If any student submits work later 24 hours after the deadline, the student's mark will be zero.

Work presented 24 hours or more after the deadline for submission cannot be accepted and a mark of zero will be recorded. In such cases a student may ask the Board of Examiners to take into account extenuating circumstances which prevented the student from submitting to the deadline. The claim must be presented on the appropriate pro form available on the website, and be accompanied by corroborating evidence. The claim will be considered by the Board of Examiners and, if it is accepted, the student will be deferred and permitted to submit the assignment with access to the full range of marks. If the claim is not accepted the student will be referred in that assessment component and may resubmit on a maximum of two further occasions. The resubmission will be eligible to receive a mark no higher than the minimum required for a pass. A student submitting work up to 24 hours late, may if there is legitimate grounds, submit a request for extenuating circumstances.

Other Claims Relating to Extenuating Circumstances

24.   A student may ask the Board of Examiners to take into account extenuating circumstances if they are absent from an examination. Such claims must be accompanied by corroborating evidence. If the claim is accepted the student will be deferred and will be given the opportunity to resit the examination as though for the first time. Extenuating circumstances may also be brought to the attention of the Board of Examiners where a student believes that the quality of work in an assignment or examination has been adversely affected.

Arrangements for the Retrieval of Failure and Completion of Deferred Modules

25.   All work undertaken in order to retrieve failure or to complete the requirements for modules in which a student has been deferred must be undertaken after the confirmation of the outcome by the Board of Examiners. A date for the submission of assignments and for any formal examinations will be set by the Board and the outcomes will be considered by a Retrieval Board before the commencement of the relevant academic session. An exception may be made in the case of a student who fails to complete a placement satisfactorily. In such cases, a sub-committee of the Board of Examiners may decide that the placement may be extended or retaken in its entirety during the same academic session. However, the sub-committee should take care to satisfy itself that these arrangements will not be such as to affect adversely the student's performance in other elements of the programme. The student should always be offered the option of deferring the completion of the placement until after the end of the current session.

There is an opportunity for final year students to be offered in-programme retrieval following Semester 1 Module Boards. Any other possibilities for in-programme retrieval will normally be specific to particular programmes of study. The relevant *regulations for the award* will specify any such opportunities related to particular programmes.

Arrangements for Marking and Returning Assignments

26.   Markers should make every effort to retrieve assignments and examination scripts promptly. Assignments must be marked in accordance with the published criteria. It is the responsibility of the module tutor to ensure that these are available to all internal markers.

27.   Appropriate feedback should be given on the standard proforma adopted for the programme and prepared electronically. The feedback should be linked to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria. It should be designed to promote the student's learning by giving a clear indication of areas of strength as well as advice on how further improvement might be secured. If any targets have been previously identified to the student then feedback should be aligned to those targets as appropriate.

28.   Marked assignments should be returned to students by the date indicated on the assignment brief, which should not normally be more than 20 working days + 72 hours after the deadline. A longer period may sometimes be appropriate e.g. in the case of part-time postgraduate in-service programmes to enable the work to be returned in person to the student or if technical issues have occurred when assignments have been submitted via originality detection software; exceptionally, where it is not possible to adhere to the published timetable, students must be informed of the delay and a new date should be set. Students must be given clear information of the arrangements that will be made for the collection of their work. If the date of return falls after the end of the academic year then hard copy final year work may be collected at graduation. Pre-final year work will be available for collection at the start of the next academic year.

29.   Marks are communicated to students by, or via, Student Administration, Students must be advised that all marks are provisional until confirmed by the Board of Examiners. A sample of work for scrutiny by external examiners and for future reviews will be copied and may in the case of reviews be retained by the University for periods that are longer than the normal lengths of time indicated in the University's Records Retention Schedule. Students will be informed of this requirement as is appropriate. In all cases, students must be informed that any original assignments returned to them must be made available if required for consideration by the external examiner or other purposes (period of retention to be 12 months following completion of assignment)

30.   The University does not normally hold meetings of Boards of Examiners at the end of the first semester and marks for both semesters are confirmed at the end of each academic session. Student should be informed of their overall mark for each module after the final assessment of that module.

Examination Scripts

31.   Examination scripts will be returned to students after their results are announced. Samples will be copied and kept for External Examiners and review purposes in the same way as for assignments. Feedback will be provided in the same way as for assignments.

Confidentiality

32.   Module marks obtained by individual students are regarded as confidential and should not be displayed on notice boards or published in any way.

33. Assessment results must not be communicated by telephone. E-mail may be used, where the student has e-mailed from their University email address requesting their results. For work submitted by the originality detection software, marks will be communicated via "Grade Centre" on Blackboard.

Marking and Moderation

34. Marking must be undertaken in accordance with the detailed written criteria outlined in the assignment brief.

35. The University policy is that all assignments are marked anonymously wherever possible and in accordance with the Code of Practice for Anonymous Marking. Exceptions include those assessment items that involve face to face assessment such as presentations, exhibitions, and performances and those assessments such as dissertations which have involved individual supervision. Instructions on how to title assignments are available on the VLE.

36. Programme Leaders are responsible for overseeing the implementation of this *Code of Practice*. They must take adequate steps to satisfy themselves that assignments and examination questions are relevant and appropriate and that the outcomes of assessment, which should be available to all internal and external examiners (and, where appropriate, to placement mentors), are consistent and reliable. Particular care should be taken in the case of newly appointed staff with limited experience of higher education whose assessment practice and outcomes should be moderated by an experienced marker.

37. Second marking and moderation should be undertaken in accordance with the provisions set out in paragraph 34 below. Evidence must exist and be retained for review purposes which demonstrates that an appropriate scrutiny of marking standards has taken place using the moderation sheet.

38. Moderation is the process whereby the standard of assessment task, the application of assessment criteria, the effectiveness of the task in testing the learning outcomes, and the quality and appropriateness of the feedback are assured. Moderation does not change the mark of individual students. Detailed instructions on moderation can be found in *Guidance on Marking and Moderation.* The following guidelines and summary table set out the minimum requirement for moderation:

    (i) on undergraduate programmes, assessments which do not contribute to the final degree classification will be subject to moderation involving a sample of 10%, at least six pieces including a sample of all classifications and most borderline marks.

    (ii) assessments in stages which contribute to the final degree classification of an undergraduate programme, or Level 7 modules of 30 credits or fewer, will normally be subject to a moderation exercise of a sample of all award classifications.

    (iii) the assessment of a sample of student performances and presentations will be moderated in the same proportions as written assignments. In addition, appropriate evidence, including the use of video recordings, will be used as part of the moderation and external examining processes.

    (iv) the outcome of all school placements will be moderated.

    The sample should be moderated by tutors not restricted to those who delivered the module.

Double or second marking enables a second perspective and commentary on assessments. Unlike moderation, this process may involve individual grades being modified. Detailed instructions on double or second marking can be found in *Guidance on Marking and Moderation*. The following guidelines set out the minimum requirements for second marking.

(v)   any single assignment at Levels 4, 5 or 6 contributing more than 30 credits will be subject to open second marking.

(vi)   any single assignment at Level 7 contributing more than 30 credits will be subject to blind second marking.

Level of Study	Module Credit Value	Moderation*	Open Second Marking**	Blind Second Marking**	Moderation Sample***
L4	all	✓			10% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and most borderlines)
L5	30 credits or fewer	✓			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
	more than 30 credits		✓		all assignments
L6	30 credits or fewer	✓			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
	more than 30 credits		✓		all assignments
L7	30 credits or fewer	✓			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
	more than 30 credits			✓	all assignments

***Moderation**

Providing the moderator is within 2-3 marks of the original marker for each piece of work, no changes will be made to the original marks. In the event of an agreement not being reached a scaling of up to +5 or -5 across the whole set of marks may be recommended in accordance with the Guidance on Marking and Moderation.

**Open/Blind Second Marking

Once second marking has been completed, the marks should be compared with the first marker and the above apply if there is not agreement, within 2-3% of the first marker.

***Moderation Sample

Where the number of pieces of work totals less than 6, it is expected that all pieces of work would be moderated.

Staff Development

39.   All newly appointed staff and visiting tutors must be provided with information and training on the University's assessment practices to ensure competence. Programme Leaders should pay particular attention to the assessment practice and the reliability of the outcomes in these cases. Sampling of the marking standards of new staff must, therefore, be undertaken regularly.

40.   Academic staff must be supported by Programme Leaders and Heads of School to participate in appropriate staff development activities relating both to existing, new and innovative assessment and marking practices.

41.   All sections of the *Code* apply to programmes delivered by collaborative partners, whether the marking is done by BGU staff or staff at the collaborative partner (as specified in the relevant Memorandum of Cooperation).

Appendix 1

Schemes of Assessment

1.   The scheme of assessment must specify the elements of assessment that students are required to complete in each module and the weighting that is accorded to each element.

2.   The scheme of assessment must clearly state the volume of assessed work that a student is required to undertake e.g. by stating the length of written assignments and the duration of presentations or examinations. Care should be taken to ensure that the overall assessment load is appropriate, especially in joint schemes which involve the study of more than one subject, and that there is a consistent relationship within the programme between the volume of assessment required and the credit value and level of the module. There should also be reasonable consistency between different BGU programmes as regards the volumes of work required when comparing work related to similar types of assessments. Programme teams shall normally conform to any School and/or University level guidance on this subject; Validation and Review panels should seek clarification regarding the reasons for any significant deviation from such guidelines before giving their approval to the scheme of assessment.

3.   The nature of the assessment must be clearly suited to establishing the extent to which the learning outcomes for each module have been met. The overall scheme of assessment must include a rationale showing how the scheme is matched to the learning outcomes for the programme.

4.   The scheme of assessment must take account of the provisions of the relevant subject benchmark statements (if any) or benchmark statements for closely related subjects and, where appropriate, the requirements for accreditation by professional bodies.

5.   The scheme of assessment must be compatible in all respects with the *regulations for that award.*

Monitoring of Schemes of Assessment

6.   Programme teams should keep under review the effectiveness and appropriateness of the scheme of assessment. In particular, they should seek to determine how far it is proving successful in establishing the extent to which students have met the learning outcomes and in discriminating between different levels of performance. Teams should consider the evidence provided by the record of student performance as well as feedback from staff, students and the external examiner. The outcome of this consideration should normally be included as part of the Annual Monitoring Process and, where appropriate, in the response to the External Examiner's report. Where the need for revision is indicated, the necessary action should be pursued promptly through the established procedures for approving changes to validated programmes. Such changes would normally be introduced for new cohorts only.

7.   A full consideration of the operation of the scheme of assessment and any changes that have been made to it should be included in the annual monitoring report. This report might be expected to include a consideration of

   (i)   the extent to which there is comparability across the programme between assessment load and credit value, and consistency between the programme and other programmes of the University in this respect;

   (ii)   the correspondence between learning outcomes and assessment methods;

(iii) the range of assessment methods that students experience, any issues arising from the adoption of innovative modes of assessment, and how any such issues are managed (e.g. articulating any specific team strategies that have been required, for instance for the management of any group and/or peer assessment of learning if applicable);

(iv) the possibility of assessment overload or underload;

(v) the extent to which students are able to assimilate and reflect on their learning;

(vi) the distribution of assessment tasks across semesters;

(vii) experience of using assessment methods that take account of individual learning needs.

Appendix 2

Grade Descriptors for all Undergraduate Provision

These descriptors are inter-related: with regard to marks of 40% and above there is an assumption that in awarding marks in one band work will have met the requirements of the band; with regard to marks of 39% and below there is an assumption that in awarding marks in one band work will **not** have met the requirements of the previous higher band. When marking an individual piece of work there is an expectation that it will clearly demonstrate **most** of the criteria within each band for the mark allocated:

Mark range	Criteria
90-100%	- Responds to **all** of the assessment criteria for the task - Displays exceptional degree of originality - Exceptional analytical, problem-solving and/or creative skills - No fault can be found with the work other than very minor errors, for example minor typographical issues
80-89%	- Responds to **all** of the assessment criteria for the task - Work of outstanding quality, evidenced by an ability to engage critically and analytically with source material - Likely to exhibit independent lines of argument - Highly original and/or creative responses - Extremely wide range of relevant sources used where appropriate
70-79%	- Responds to **all** of the assessment criteria for the task - An extremely well developed response showing clear knowledge and the ability to interpret and/or apply that knowledge - An authoritative grasp of the subject, significant originality and insight, - Significant evidence of ability to sustain an argument, to think analytically, critically and/or creatively and to synthesise material - Evidence of extensive study, appropriate to task
60-69%	- Responds to **most** of the assessment criteria for the task - A detailed response demonstrating a thorough grasp of theory, understanding of concepts, principles, methodology and content - Clear evidence of insight and critical judgement in selecting, ordering and analysing content - Demonstrates ability to synthesise material, to construct responses and demonstrate creative skills which reveal insight and may offer some originality - Draws on an appropriate range of properly referenced sources
50-59%	- Responds to **most** of the assessment criteria for the task - An effective response demonstrating evidence of a clear grasp of relevant material, principles and key concepts - An ability to construct and organise arguments - Some degree of critical analysis, insight and creativity

	• Demonstrating some conceptual ability, critical analysis and a degree of insight • Accurate, clearly written/presented
40-49%	• Responds to **some** of the assessment criteria for the task • A response demonstrating an understanding of basic points and principles sufficient to show that some of learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved at a basic level • Suitably organised work demonstrating a reasonable level of understanding • Covers the basic subject matter and is appropriately presented but is rather too derivative and insufficiently analytical • Demonstrates limited conceptual ability, levels of evaluation and demonstration of creative skills • Demonstrates adherence to the referencing conventions appropriate to the subject and/or task
30-39%	• Overall **insufficient** response to the assessment criteria • A weak response, which, while addressing some elements of the task, contains significant gaps and inaccuracies • Indicates an answer that shows only weakly developed elements of understanding and/or other skills appropriate to the task • May contain weaknesses in presentation that constitute a significant obstacle in communicating meaning to the assessor
20-29%	• Overall **insufficient** response to the assessment criteria • A poor response, which falls substantially short of achieving the learning outcomes • Demonstrates little knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Little evidence of argument and/or coherent use of material
10-19%	• Overall **insufficient** response to the assessment criteria • A very poor response demonstrating few relevant facts • Displays only isolated or no knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Little adherence to the task
0-9%	• Overall **insufficient** response to the assessment criteria • Displays virtually no knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Work is inappropriate to assessment task given

Appendix 3

Generic postgraduate taught mark descriptors at BGU

Modules are marked on a range of 0-100%. Mark descriptors are given in the table below.
A mark below 50% indicates a Fail grade (the shaded boxes).

Mark Range	Criteria
90-100%	• Demonstrates an exceptional ability and insight, indicating the highest level of technical competence. • The work has the potential to influence the forefront of the subject, and may be of publishable/exhibitable quality. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at the highest possible standard.
80-89%	• Demonstrates an outstanding ability and insight based on authoritative subject knowledge and a very high level of technical competence. • The work is considered to be close to the forefront of the subject, and may be close to publishable/exhibitable quality. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a very high level.
70-79%	• Demonstrates an authoritative, current subject knowledge and a high level of technical competence. • The work is accurate and extensively supported by appropriate evidence. It may show some originality. Clear evidence of capacity to reflect critically and deal with ambiguity in the data. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a high level.
60-69%	• Demonstrates a sound, current subject knowledge. No significant errors in the application of concepts or appropriate techniques. May contain some minor flaws. • The work is well developed and coherent; may show some originality. Clear evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a good level.
50-59%	• Demonstrates satisfactory subject knowledge. Some evident weaknesses; possibly shown by conceptual gaps, or limited use of appropriate techniques. • The work is generally sound but tends toward the factual or derivative. Limited evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • Relevant generic skills are generally at a satisfactory level.
40-49%	• Demonstrates limited core subject knowledge. Some important weaknesses; possibly shown by factual errors, conceptual gaps, or limited use of appropriate techniques. • The work lacks sound development. Little evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.

30-39%	• Demonstrates inadequate subject knowledge. • The work lacks coherence and evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
20-29%	• Demonstrates seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject. • The work contains minimal evidence of awareness of relevant issues or theory. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
10-19%	• The work is almost entirely lacking in evidence of knowledge of the subject. • No evidence of awareness of relevant issues or theory. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
0-9%	• The work presents information that is irrelevant and unconnected to the task. • No evident awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques.