

Code of Practice on Assessment and Feedback

Code of Practice number	LT COP 10
Version:	1.1
Superseded Version:	1.0
Date approved by Management Committee	V 1.0 approved 28.01.15
Originator	Academic Registrar
Date for Review:	Jan 2016

Target Audience	
People who need a detailed knowledge of the Code of Practice	Director of Education; Academic Registrar; Directors of Studies; Quality Unit staff
People who need a broad understanding of the Code of Practice	Module Convenors; Academic staff involved in marking assessments; Students
People who need to know that the Code of Practice exists	All academic staff and administrative staff involved with teaching;

Contents

1	Introduction and Context	3
2	Scope	4
3	Roles and Responsibilities	4
4	Principles of Assessment	5
5	Principles of Feedback	6
6	Timing of Assessment	7
7	Submission of Assessed Coursework	7
8	Proofreading of Written Assignments	7
9	Examinations	8
10	Consideration of Mitigating Circumstances	8
11	Marking	10
12	Marking Criteria and Pass Mark	11
13	Compensation	12
14	Reassessment	12
15	Resubmission of a Master's Dissertation	14
16	Feedback on Assessment	14
17	Notification of Final Awards	14
18	Criteria for Distinction and Merit	15
19	Academic appeals	16
20	Retention of Exams Scripts and Coursework	16
21	Boards of Examiners	16
22	External Examiners	17

1 Introduction and Context

- 1.1 This Code of Practice aims to inform staff and students of the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), as well as individuals from outside the organisation, such as external examiners and external reviewers about LSTM's principles and strategy in relation to assessment of students and giving feedback on assessment.
- 1.2 LSTM needs to be able to assure itself that the standards of its awards are consistent with the general expectations for such awards within the higher education sector nationally and internationally, and that actual student achievement is consistent with those standards.
- 1.3 This Code of Practice uses as a reference point the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland*. It is set within the context of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education Chapter B6 (Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning, October 2013).
- 1.4 LSTM employs a variety of assessment methods, and students are provided with feedback on all assessments undertaken in order to develop their skills and improve future performance. Assessment enables the assessor to evaluate the student's knowledge and understanding of what they have been taught or gained through self-directed learning and to grade work accordingly. Staff are also enabled to evaluate the effectiveness of their teaching.
- 1.5 Related documents are:
- Regulations for Postgraduate Taught Programmes
 - Code of Practice on Monitoring Student Progress and the Conduct of Boards of Examiners
 - Code of Practice on External Examining of Taught Programmes
 - Code of Practice on Academic Integrity
 - Code of Practice on the Design, Approval, Monitoring and Review of Taught Programmes
 - Procedure for Double Marking and Moderation of Taught Postgraduate Assessments
 - Procedure for Provision of Feedback to Students
 - Procedure for Dealing with Mitigating Circumstances
 - Procedure for the Conduct of Examinations
 - Procedure for the Verification of Examinations
 - Procedure for Dealing with Academic Appeals (Taught Programmes)
 - Procedure for Dealing with Academic Appeals (Research Programmes)

- Guidelines on the Use of Proofreaders

2 Scope

- 2.1 This Code of Practice applies to all LSTM programmes that lead to an award. It does not apply to short courses where a certificate of attendance only is issued.

3 Roles and Responsibilities

- 3.1 The Director of Education will:
- 3.1.1 Approve requests to amend the published dates of assessments
 - 3.1.2 Authorise extension requests for MSc dissertations
 - 3.1.3 Authorise requests to defer an examination
 - 3.1.4 Arbitrate in cases where moderation has revealed significant differences in marking standards or assign a third marker where two markers are unable to reach an agreement when double marking
 - 3.1.5 Approve requests to offer an alternative type of assessment for a re-sit, provided the assessment tests the same learning outcomes as the original
 - 3.1.6 Decide whether a student has grounds for appeal and if necessary, convene the Academic Appeals Panel
- 3.2 The Board of Examiners will:
- 3.2.1 Make decisions on final awards, including consideration of borderline cases
 - 3.2.2 Make decisions on breaches of academic integrity
 - 3.2.3 Determine which element(s) of a failed module shall be offered for reassessment where there are several assessment components for a module (MSc programmes)
 - 3.2.4 Make decisions on action to be taken based on recommendations from the Mitigating Circumstances Committee
 - 3.2.5 Make decisions on action to be taken based on recommendations from the Academic Appeals Panel
- 3.3 The Academic Registrar will:
- 3.3.1 Advise students on the procedure for making an academic appeal
 - 3.3.2 Act as Secretary to the MSc Board of Examiners, Academic Integrity Panels, Academic Appeals Panels and Mitigating Circumstances Committee and communicate decisions to students
 - 3.3.3 Make arrangements for re-sits and resubmissions and communicate these to the students

- 3.3.4 Advise the Quality Unit and markers of outcomes of Academic Integrity Panels and Academic Appeals Panels and record penalties in the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE)
- 3.3.5 Draft responses to external examiner reports after discussion with the Director of Studies on behalf of the Director of Education
- 3.4 The Quality Management Committee will approve the appointment of external examiners.
- 3.5 The Quality Unit will:
 - 3.5.1 Keep an accurate record of marks and store assessments in accordance with LSTM policy and in line with data protection regulations
 - 3.5.2 Make arrangements for external examiners' attendance at examination boards, ensuring they have access to relevant assessments and supporting documentation
 - 3.5.3 Communicate provisional assessment results to students
 - 3.5.4 Set a schedule at the start of the academic year for meetings of Boards of Studies and Boards of Examiners and assessment deadline dates and communicate to staff and students
 - 3.5.5 Ensure that the internal verification procedures for assessments are followed
 - 3.5.6 Monitor the consistency of feedback across assignments
- 3.6 Markers will:
 - 3.6.1 Alert the Academic Registrar to suspected breaches of academic integrity and seek advice
 - 3.6.2 Mark assignments in accordance with defined marking criteria
- 3.7 The Director of Studies will:
 - 3.7.1 Make arrangements for Board of Studies and Board of Examiners meetings in line with the schedule set up by the Quality Unit
 - 3.7.2 Assist with investigations into suspected breaches of academic integrity
 - 3.7.3 Authorise requests from individual students for extensions to assessment submission dates
 - 3.7.4 Propose external examiners and confirm reappointment of existing external examiners annually

4 Principles of Assessment

- 4.1 When designing programmes, care should be taken to ensure that methods of assessment are appropriate to the teaching and learning methods and the specified learning outcomes

- 4.2 Assessment policies, practices and procedures should take account of the diversity of the student population and provide every student with an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement
 - 4.3 Assessment methods should facilitate differentiation between levels of achievement
 - 4.4 Assessment strategies for programmes should be clearly indicated in programme specifications, and where relevant, in the appropriate module specifications
 - 4.5 Staff responsible for carrying out assessments should be fully aware of the relevant procedures and students should have clear information on how they will be assessed
 - 4.6 Assessment may be:
 - 4.6.1 Diagnostic – provides an indicator of a learner’s aptitude and preparedness for the programme and identifies gaps in knowledge, understanding or skills
 - 4.6.2 Formative – provides learners with feedback on progress and informs development but does not contribute to the overall assessment for the programme
 - 4.6.3 Summative – provides a measure of achievement by the learner in relation to the intended learning outcomes and contributes to the overall assessment for the programme
 - 4.7 The assessment strategy for a programme should employ a variety of assessment methods and an appropriate mix of formative and summative assessments.
 - 4.8 The amount of assessment should be commensurate with the requirement for a student to demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes (*See Procedure for Provision of Feedback to Students*).
 - 4.9 Reasonable adjustments to assessment for individual students will be made in line with the *Code of Practice on Supporting Students with Disabilities*.
-

5 Principles of Feedback

- 5.1 Markers should provide appropriate, constructive and timely feedback to students on assessed work that promotes learning and facilitates improvement.
- 5.2 Generic criteria for written assignments and examinations and assignment specific rubric-based assignment criteria are shared with students through the VLE.
- 5.3 Feedback should be given on all assignments, whether formative or summative, but may be limited to verbal or group feedback for formative assessments.
- 5.4 Markers should be consistent in the amount and type of feedback given to students for a particular assignment.

6 Timing of Assessment

- 6.1 Students must be notified of the deadlines for all assignments and dates of examinations at the beginning of the programme.
- 6.2 Assignment deadlines and examination dates must not be altered without the approval of the Director of Education although they may be changed for individual students if sufficient grounds are provided (Section 7.2).
- 6.3 For Master's modules, at least one assessment must be scheduled after the end of teaching during the associated assessment period.
- 6.4 Timing of in-course assessments should take account of the students' assessment commitments across the programme.

7 Submission of Assessed Coursework

- 7.1 Students are expected to submit coursework assignments through the VLE unless instructed otherwise, in accordance with published deadlines. The time recorded by the VLE will be taken as the formal time of submission.
- 7.2 A student may request an extension to an assignment deadline. Extension requests should normally be submitted at least seven days before the deadline and must be accompanied by supporting evidence. Extensions will be granted in relation to circumstances that are serious, unavoidable and unforeseeable and that are likely to impact significantly on the student's ability to meet the deadline (e.g. medical problems, close family illness or bereavement). Computer-related problems are not valid grounds for seeking an extension.
- 7.3 Coursework submitted late will incur a daily penalty of 5% of the total marks available for the assignment for up to five working days after the deadline but will not be reduced below the pass mark of 50%. Coursework submitted more than five working days after the deadline will receive a mark of zero. A working day is defined as a day when LSTM is open and staff would normally be available for work. Good Friday and Bank Holiday Mondays will be treated as working days for these purposes.
- 7.4 Extension requests are normally approved by the Director of Studies but extension requests for MSc dissertation submission may only be authorised by the Director of Education or nominated representative.

8 Proofreading of Written Assignments

- 8.1 LSTM defines proofreading as "the correction of errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar and sentence construction, referencing, and idiomatic usage".

- 8.2 A student who employs a proofreader to review an assignment must follow the *Guidelines for the use of proofreaders*. Proofreading may include identifying and alerting the author to passages that lack clarity and may also extend to feedback on structural issues. Proofreading does not include structural editing or revising/rewriting passages, which are the responsibility of the student alone.
- 8.3 If a proofreader has been employed, the student must include a statement at the beginning of the assignment giving the proofreader's name and relevant academic or professional experience.
- 8.4 The contract between a student and a proofreader is a private matter and LSTM takes no responsibility for the quality or cost of a proofreader's work.
-

9 Examinations

- 9.1 Formal examinations are governed by the *Procedure for the Conduct of Examinations*.
- 9.2 Examination papers must be processed with due regard to the security of the process. Students must not have access to areas where the printing of examination papers takes place and papers must be kept securely before the examination takes place. All staff involved with the examinations process will be briefed to ensure that they are aware of the need for confidentiality and security.
- 9.3 A student may request deferral of an examination in relation to circumstances that are serious, unavoidable and unforeseeable and that are likely to impact significantly on performance. Requests for deferrals will normally be considered only up to 24 hours before the examination is scheduled. If a deferral is agreed, the student will be offered a re-sit (to count as a first sit) during the relevant re-assessment period. All requests to defer must be supported by valid evidence, either at the time of the request or as soon as possible afterwards. Failure to provide evidence will result in a mark of zero being awarded for the missed examination and the normal re-sit policy will apply. Requests to defer an examination must be authorised by the Director of Education or nominated representative.
- 9.4 A student who misses an examination and has not requested a deferral may complete a claim for mitigating circumstances in line with the *Procedure for Consideration of Mitigating Circumstances*. However, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee is likely to reject a claim where it considers there was no valid reason for the student being unable to request a deferral in advance.
-

10 Consideration of Mitigating Circumstances

- 10.1 Students may request consideration of mitigating circumstances in relation to circumstances that they believe have impacted significantly on their performance.
-

Independent evidence, such as a medical certificate, must be provided to verify mitigating circumstances.

- 10.2 Claims will be considered in confidence by the Mitigating Circumstances Committee (MCC). External Examiners will be invited to attend meetings of the MCC but if unable to attend, they will be provided with the minutes. The Board of Examiners will be made aware that a claim has been accepted but there will be no discussion of the circumstances.
- 10.3 A claim for mitigating circumstances will not normally be upheld if an extension to an assignment or deferral of an examination was granted or could have been requested.
- 10.4 For claims that are accepted, the MCC will make a recommendation to the Board of Examiners on the impact of the mitigating circumstances and action to be taken in line with the *LSTM Code of Practice on Monitoring Student Progression and the Conduct of Boards of Examiners*.
 - 10.4.1 If a student has met the criteria for an award, the MCC may recommend to the Board of Examiners that the student be given the choice of accepting the award at the level determined by the marks achieved or of re-sitting the affected assessment(s) with the possibility of improving the mark(s) and thereby the award. A student who chooses not to re-sit shall have the option of the original mark(s) being flagged on the transcript as having been affected by mitigating circumstances
 - 10.4.2 If a student has not met the criteria for an award, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee may recommend that the student be allowed to re-sit the failed assessment(s) as 'first attempts'
 - 10.4.3 Under exceptional circumstances, and if the student has met the criteria for an award, the MCC may recommend to the Board of Examiners that the award is made at Merit (if applicable) or Distinction level without the student achieving the required marks in the affected assessment(s). Under these circumstances, a student will not be given the option of re-sitting the affected assessment(s)
 - 10.4.4 In the case of an assessment that counts for 20% or less of a total module mark, the MCC may recommend that the student be given the choice of the mark being discounted and the mark for the module being calculated on the basis of the other assessment(s) or of re-sitting the affected assessment. The MCC may make this recommendation only if the learning outcomes of the module have been met
- 10.5 A Board of Examiners is not permitted to alter any mark. A student's mark can only be changed if they re-sit or re-submit the assessment. The normal rules relating to reassessment marks shall apply (Section 14).
- 10.6 It will not be possible to consider mitigating circumstances once the Board of Examiners has reached a decision on the final award.

11 Marking

- 11.1 Each assignment which contributes to an award will have one or more internal examiners assigned to it.
- 11.2 Examinations and written assignments are normally marked anonymously. However, the MSc dissertation is not marked anonymously, due to the close involvement of the supervisor in the project.
- 11.3 Markers are responsible for reading and interpreting similarity reports in the VLE and referring any suspected breaches of academic integrity to the Academic Registrar. More information can be found in the *Code of Practice on Academic Integrity*.
- 11.4 When marking assignments, teaching staff are encouraged to use on-line marking and feedback wherever possible.
- 11.5 Research students may assist with marking assignments but in such cases, all assignments must be moderated or double marked by a member of LSTM teaching staff.
- 11.6 Moderation
 - 11.6.1 Moderation is the sampling of assessed work to check whether or not the standards are appropriate and have been applied consistently. Moderators are asked to confirm that appropriateness of the mark awarded by the marker and comment on their perceived quality of the feedback to students. Individual marks may not be changed on the basis of moderating a sample since a student could be advantaged or disadvantaged depending on whether or not their assessment was sampled
 - 11.6.2 Any component of the assessment of a module that contributes 20% or more to the overall module mark must be moderated
 - 11.6.3 Moderation should take place where assessments are marked by a single marker. It can be applied to coursework assignments, entire exam scripts or individual exam questions. It is possible to use moderation if more than one marker is involved provided there is a clear process in place. For example, if an assignment is completed by a large number of students, the marking could be split across two markers. Consistency could then be achieved by each marking half the assignments and moderating the other half
 - 11.6.4 The moderation sample must be at least 25% of the total number of assessments or at least ten scripts, whichever is the larger. If less than ten scripts are available, all should be moderated. The sample must include scripts covering the range of achievement (ie Distinction, Merit, Pass and Fail) and not just focus on borderline assessments or Fails
 - 11.6.5 In a moderated sample, if moderation reveals systematic differences between the marker and the moderator for a significant portion of the sampled work, cases should be referred to the Director of Education. A decision will be

made either to double mark all assessments or to double mark all assessments at a particular borderline

11.6.6 Further information on moderation can be found in the Procedure for Double Marking and Moderation of Taught Postgraduate Assessments

11.7 Double Marking

11.7.1 Double marking involves two markers independently assessing a piece of student work and assigning an agreed mark. The first marker will normally be the person who set the assessment. In cases where several staff are involved in setting the assessment, an Assessment Lead (normally the Module Convenor) will be nominated. The designated Assessment Lead will be responsible for collating marks from all markers

11.7.2 Double marking can be blind (the two markers do not see each other's marks/comments) or non-blind (the second marker has access to the first marker's comments)

11.7.3 All dissertations/major projects, assignments involving more than two markers, presentations or similar assessments must be double marked

11.7.4 Where there a disagreement over a single mark, the two examiners should resolve this between themselves if possible and make a note on the mark sheet as to the justification for the agreed mark. Markers should not just record an average of the two marks. Should it prove impossible for the two markers to agree on a mark, the Director of Education will nominate a third marker

11.7.5 Further information on double marking can be found in the Guidelines for Double Marking/Moderation of Taught Postgraduate Assessments

11.8 Recording of marks

11.8.1 A designated member of staff from the Quality Unit is responsible for recording agreed marks and for informing the students when feedback and marks are available. S/he will also record instances of late submission and apply appropriate penalties

11.8.2 The Academic Registrar will advise the Quality Unit on any penalties to be applied due to academic integrity issues

11.8.3 Marks are provisional until they have been agreed by the final Board of Examiners for the programme

12 Marking Criteria and Pass Mark

12.1 For credit-bearing programmes, a rubric-based approach is taken to marking of all assignments. The rubric sets out criteria for levels of achievement to be met in order to be awarded Pass, Merit (if applicable) or Distinction.

- 12.2 For all programmes the overall pass mark is 50%. In the case of MSc programmes, the pass mark for each module and the dissertation is 50%. Where there is more than one assessment component for a module, it is not necessary to pass every assessment, provided the overall average mark achieved is 50% or over. Assessments may be weighted differently, allowing students to compensate for failure in a particular assignment by gaining a higher mark in a more heavily weighted assignment. Additional requirements, such as criteria for named and unnamed awards, are outlined in the programme specification.
- 12.3 In the case of non-credit-bearing programmes which are assessed, where there is more than one component of assessment within the course, the overall pass mark is 50% and students must normally gain a minimum mark of 40% in each component. Exceptions must be stated in the programme specification.
- 12.4 Students will be given clear information about which learning outcomes are being tested by assignments, the purpose of the assignment, criteria to be used in allocating marks, proportion of the marks allocated to different parts of the assessment (if appropriate), the proportion of the total marks for the module which the assessment represents (if appropriate), and whether or not failure in the assessment may be compensated for by higher marks in other components of the module (if applicable).

13 Compensation

- 13.1 For MSc programmes, where the average of the total marks is 50% or above, students can still qualify for the award of Certificate, Diploma or Master's, without re-sitting, with a mark of 40-49% for one module of 20 credits, or for two 10 credit modules. A student who has failed a module with a mark below the compensation range will qualify for compensation on re-sit, provide the mark for the resit falls in the range of 40-49%. Students with compensatable fails are eligible for the award of Merit or Distinction provided they meet the other award criteria. Compensation marks are raised to 50% for the purposes of calculating the award (see Section 18).

14 Reassessment

- 14.1 For all programmes, students are normally offered one reassessment opportunity for each failed component. Where there are several assessment components for a module (MSc programmes), the Board of Examiners will determine which element(s) of a failed module shall be offered as re-sit(s). The Board of Examiners may extend the dissertation deadline by up to three months for students requiring reassessment in multiple components.
- 14.2 Students may not re-sit or re-submit assessments where they have achieved a mark of 50% or above, or where they have passed the module or course overall (except in the case of mitigating circumstances (see Section 10)).

- 14.3 Reassessments for MSc taught modules will normally be held in the assessment period after the submission of the dissertation and before the final Board of Examiners. In the exceptional circumstance that reassessment of a component is essential at an earlier date in order to appropriately prepare a student for a later assessment (e.g. the dissertation research proposal), this must be agreed at the time of approving the module and the arrangements for reassessment must be made clear to the students.
- 14.4 In the case of MSc programmes, students may proceed with a dissertation if they have failed taught modules, but may be prevented from doing so if failure to complete key modules would mean that undertaking the dissertation project would put themselves and/or others at risk.
- 14.5 In the case of MSc programmes, if a student fails a module or dissertation at the second attempt, they may be eligible for an alternative award, provided they have accumulated sufficient credit. Depending on which modules have been taken, the exit award may be named or unnamed. Criteria for awarding alternative named awards are stated in the programme specifications.
- 14.6 A failed dissertation may be submitted on one further occasion only within one year of the original date of submission.
- 14.7 Reassessment for Professional Diplomas and short courses will either take place within three months of the date of the original assessment, or, for programmes with multiple entry dates in a single year, at the time that assessment of the next cohort of students is taking place.
- 14.8 Reassessments should be of the same type as the original assessment, but not the same task. Where it is not possible to offer the same type of assessment, it is possible to offer an alternative, with the approval of the Director of Education, provided the reassessment task tests the same learning outcomes as the original assessment.
- 14.9 Marks for re-sits and resubmissions will be capped at 50% for the purpose of calculating final awards, but the actual mark achieved will be recorded on the transcript (flagged as a second attempt). Students who re-sit or re-submit will be eligible for a Distinction or Merit (Merit awarded for MSc and DTM&H programmes only), provided they meet the criteria outlined in section 18.
- 14.10 The mark for the re-sit is the one which will count, even if lower than the original.
- 14.11 Students who register on a Master's or Postgraduate Diploma but who exit with a lower award because of failure in assessment will be eligible for a Merit or Distinction for the lower award provided they meet the criteria outlined in Section 18.
- 14.12 Students who register on a Master's or Postgraduate Diploma but who withdraw at Certificate or Diploma level with good reason will be eligible for a Merit or Distinction provided they meet the criteria outlined in Section 18.

- 14.13 Students should make a reasonable attempt at assessments. The Board of Examiners reserves the right to deny a student the opportunity to re-sit the failed component if the student has failed to give a good reason for being absent from an assessment or is deemed to have not made a reasonable attempt to complete it.
-

15 Resubmission of a Master's Dissertation

- 15.1 A failed Master's dissertation may be submitted on one further occasion only (see 14.6 above), within one year of the first submission. A decision will be made by the markers, through the marking rubric, as to whether the dissertation is 'redeemable'. If the dissertation is considered 'redeemable', the student will be given the opportunity of re-submitting on the same topic with minor modifications. Students whose dissertation is not considered 'redeemable' will register for a Semester's supervision, paying the relevant fee. Students who are required to re-write the dissertation on a new topic will undertake either a desk-based or lab-based project in LSTM. Resubmission, re-examination and where relevant, bench fees will apply.
-

16 Feedback on Assessment

- 16.1 LSTM staff aim to give students feedback and a mark for assessments within three weeks of submission.
- 16.2 Feedback on assignments will be either sent to individual students by the LSTM Quality Unit or through the VLE.
- 16.3 Students will be given generic feedback on examinations via the VLE or at a group meeting. Examination scripts may be annotated but should not be returned to the student. However, comments may be shared with individual students who request a face-to-face meeting with the marker.
- 16.4 Further information can be found in the Procedure for the Provision of Feedback to Students.
-

17 Notification of Final Awards

- 17.1 Following the final Board of Examiners' meeting for the programme, students will be informed of results as soon as possible thereafter.
- 17.2 No marks will be disclosed or discussed with other students or third parties. Results will not be communicated by telephone.
-

- 17.3 Certificates and transcripts for MSc programmes will be issued at the graduation ceremony in December, or, for students graduating in absentia, are posted to the student in January.
- 17.4 For all other programmes, certificates and transcripts will be issued shortly after completion of the programme.

18 Criteria for Distinction and Merit

- 18.1 The framework for Master's regulations is detailed in the *Regulations for Postgraduate Taught Programmes*.
- 18.1.1 For a Master's degree with **Distinction**, a student must achieve:
- A Distinction grade for the dissertation and;
 - An overall average of at least 70% in 120 credits of taught modules
- 18.1.2 For a Postgraduate Diploma with **Distinction**, a student must achieve:
- An overall average mark of at least 70% in 120 credits of taught modules; or
 - An overall average mark of at least 70% in 60 credits of taught modules and a Distinction grade for the dissertation
- 18.1.3 For a Postgraduate Certificate with **Distinction**, a student must achieve:
- An overall average mark of at least 70% in 60 credits of taught modules
- 18.1.4 For a Postgraduate Award with **Distinction**, a student must achieve:
- An overall average mark of at least 70% in 30 credits of taught modules
- 18.1.5 For a Master's degree with **Merit**, a student must achieve:
- A Merit grade for the dissertation and;
 - An overall average mark of at least 60% in 120 credits of taught modules
- 18.1.6 For a Postgraduate Diploma with **Merit**, a student must achieve:
- An overall average mark of at least 60% in 120 credits of taught modules; or
 - An overall average mark of at least 60% in 60 credits of taught modules and a Distinction grade for the dissertation
- 18.1.7 For a Postgraduate Certificate with **Merit**, a student must achieve:
- An overall average mark of at least 60% in 60 credits of taught modules
- 18.1.8 For a Postgraduate Award with Merit, a student must achieve:
- An overall average mark of at least 60%
- 18.2 Average marks falling up to 2% below any grade boundary for a credit-bearing programme are deemed to be borderline cases. In these cases the award is determined by consideration of the profile of marks across all taught credits. To be

awarded the higher grade, at least 50% of the taught credits and the dissertation (if applicable) must be at the higher grade.

- 18.3 For non-credit-bearing programmes, candidates who achieve an overall average of at least 70% will be awarded a **Distinction**. For the Diploma in Tropical Medicine & Hygiene only, students who achieve an overall average of at least 60% will be awarded a **Merit**.

19 Academic appeals

- 19.1 Students may appeal against an academic decision that has been made in respect of student progression, assessment or award. Students wishing to submit an academic appeal, either against an assessment mark or a mark for a final award, should refer to the *Procedure for Academic Appeals (Taught Programmes)*, or the *Procedure for Academic Appeals (Research degrees)*

20 Retention of Exams Scripts and Coursework

- 20.1 In line with data protection legislation, LSTM Quality Unit retains all work undertaken under exam conditions and which contributes to a final award, and all other assessed coursework, for a period of one year from the date on which the final award was determined by the Board of Examiners.

21 Boards of Examiners

- 21.1 All LSTM courses have Boards of Examiners who are responsible for the assessment of candidates and the determination of results of examinations.
- 21.2 The Board of Examiners consists of the Director of Studies, the External Examiner(s) and members of staff who have a major contribution to the teaching and assessment of the programme. The Master's Board of Examiners will be chaired by the Director of LSTM.
- 21.3 The Terms of Reference are as follows:
- To monitor methods of assessment against set learning outcomes and programme requirements
 - To ensure standards of assessment are maintained
 - To assess students' performance in accordance with regulations
 - To reach overall decisions concerning awards
 - To make recommendations to the Board of Studies on the conduct and standards of all assessment procedures

- To make decisions based on courses of action to be taken based on the recommendations of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee
- To make decisions and take action on breaches of academic integrity.

21.4 Further information on the conduct of Boards of Examiners can be found in the Code of Practice on Monitoring Student Progress and the Conduct of Boards of Examiners.

22 External Examiners

22.1 External examiners are appointed for all LSTM courses which result in an award being made. Their role is to monitor standards of awards, to ensure that the assessment process is fair, and appropriate for the award, and comparable in standard with those for similar subjects and awards in other HE institutions. They need to be in a position to participate in assessment processes, to adjudicate on difficult cases and to comment and give advice on programme content, balance and structure and assessment processes.

22.2 Further information on external examining can be found in the *Code of Practice on External Examining of Taught Programmes*.

23 Review of Assessment Strategies

23.1 The assessment strategies of all modules and programmes must be reviewed annually and all changes in assessment must be approved in accordance with the *Code of Practice on Programme Design, Approval, Monitoring and Review*.

Annex of Modifications		
Version	Date of issue	Details of modification from previous version
1.1	30.01.15	Minor edits following review by Management Committee 28.01.15
1.2	15.07.15	Additional responsibilities regarding academic appeals added to Section 3 and Section 19 added