



## Cambridge Muslim College Assessment Policy

Committee: Faculty Board/ Examination Board  
Next Review Date: April 2025

### Table of Contents

<b>1. PURPOSE</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. SCOPE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. RESPONSIBILITY</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. REFERENCES</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. ASSESSMENT, ITS METHODS AND TYPES</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>11. COMPENSATION</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>12. RESITS</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>13. REPEAT AND RETAKE</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>7. ASSIGNMENT AND EXAM PROCEDURES – STAFF RELATED</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1- ASSIGNMENT / EXAM PROCEDURE</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2- INVIGILATION GUIDELINES</b>	<b>20</b>

**APPENDIX 3 .....24**

**APPENDIX 4- MARKING CRITERIA .....27**

**APPENDIX 5- ASSESSMENT AND QAA QUALITY CODE .....36**

## **1. Purpose**

This document sets out the policy, principles, regulations and all associated procedures in relation to student assessment, with the aim of ensuring consistent and fair treatment for all.

## 2. Scope

This policy applies to all summative assessment on all taught programmes and OU validated provisions in the College.

## 3. Responsibility

- 3.1. The Quality Assurance Manager is responsible for reviewing and updating this policy in liaison with Faculty Board.
- 3.2. Responsibility for the implementing this policy lies with the Academic Director, Module Convenors, the Chair of Examination Board and the Registrar.
- 3.3. It is the responsibility of the Equality and Diversity Officer/ Students to ensure that arrangements are made for students with long- or short-term medical conditions, specific learning difficulties or disabilities, subject to the overall requirement that academic standards must be maintained.

## 4. References

- Assignment and Exam Procedures (Appendix 1)
- Invigilation Guidelines (Appendix 2)
- Examination Report Form for Invigilators (Appendix 3)
- Marking Criteria (Appendix 4)
- [Assessment Guideline and Principles](#)
- [QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance- Assessment](#) (Appendix 5)
- [Teaching and Learning Strategy](#)
- [Moderation Policy](#)
- [Terms of Reference for the Examination Board](#)
- [Academic Misconduct Policy](#)
- [Extenuating Circumstances Policy](#)
- [Disability and Equal Opportunities Policy](#)
- [Academic Appeals Policy](#)
- [Data Retention Policy](#)
- [Admissions Policy](#)

## 4. Assessment, its methods and types

4.1. The definition of assessment as per the Quality Code of Higher Education is as following: “Assessment is a fundamental aspect of the student learning experience. Engagement in assessment activities and interaction with staff and peers enable learning, both as part of the task and through review of their performance. It is a vehicle for obtaining feedback. Ultimately, it determines whether each student has achieved their course’s learning outcomes and allows the awarding body to ensure that appropriate standards are being applied rigorously. Deliberate, systematic quality assurance ensures that assessment processes, standards and any other criteria are applied consistently and equitably, with reliability, validity and fairness”.

4.2. Most assessment is likely to fall into one or more of the following categories:

- a. Formative assessment: Assessment with a developmental purpose, designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and how it can be improved and/or maintained. It does not count towards the students’ final grades.
- b. Summative assessment: Assessment which provides a measure of a learner ‘s achievement in relation to the intended learning outcomes of a programme of study. It counts towards the students’ final grades.

4.3. For each taught programme, it is expected that a variety of assessment methods will be used to encourage and support effective student learning.

4.4. The details of assessments, including examinations, (e.g., type, scheduling, word length, weighting, relation to learning outcomes and due date) are set out in the Programme and Module Specifications. These must be shared with students at the start of the academic year. It is the responsibility of students to read these Specifications.

4.5. Designing the assessment follow the guideline of “[Assessment Guideline and Principles](#)”.

## 5. Assessment Questions

5.1. Module Convenors are responsible for setting the assessment questions.

5.2. The Programme Lead and the QA Manager to review assignment question papers, including examination, for accuracy and appropriateness, before being reviewed and approved externally by the External Examiner.

5.3. Assessment questions should be shared with students 4-5 weeks before the submission deadline.

- 5.4. Arrangements are made to ensure the secure printing of examination papers and the security of papers while in transit (for example to and from internal staff and External Examiners). i.e. Assignment and examinations questions are password protected when shared with External Examiners.

## 6. Assessment Submission

- 6.1. The College's submission policy is that all assessments, excluding examinations, must be submitted online through students' accounts on the VLE, i.e., Moodle by the scheduled deadline. Any assessment submitted as part of a summative assessment cannot be amended after submission or resubmitted.
- 6.2. If College system is not accessible on the due date/time, the due date for an assessment will be extended by 24 hours. Students should not use alternative methods to submit their work.
- 6.3. In the event of a technical problem preventing a student from submitting an assessment, the responsibility is on the student to seek support and guidance and submit as soon as practically possible.
- 6.4. It is the responsibility of the student to know their submission deadlines.
  - a. Misreading the timetable will not be accepted as a satisfactory explanation for absence from an examination.
  - b. Special timetabling arrangements cannot be made to accommodate a student's personal preferences, unless these are associated with reasonable adjustments identified at the start of the year as part of a disability provision.
- 6.5. Student who has Extenuating Circumstances which prevent them from submitting their assessment on time should request an extension to assignment deadlines following the College [Extenuating Circumstances Policy](#). Any requests that don't follow the process in the policy cannot be considered.

## 7. Late Submission & Request an extension

- 7.1. Late Submission will be accepted within six working days from the deadline of an assessment. Any submission that is late by seven or more working days will not be accepted and a non-submission will be recorded.
- 7.2. There is a standard penalty for all work that is submitted late. A late submission will be marked but with a **10% reduction** for each working day late down to the 40% pass mark and no further. The penalty applies as soon as an assignment is late; thus, a 10% deduction would be issued if an assignment is submitted immediately after the deadline, and the work would continue to attract further penalties for each subsequent 24 hours the work was late down to the 40% pass mark. For more details, please see the [OU Regulation for Validated Awards](#).
- 7.3. Where a student, with no approved extenuating circumstances, has failed to submit an assessment or has failed to attend an examination, a mark of zero ('0') will be awarded.

- 7.4. If a student is unable to be assessed by the methods specified in the assessment regulations, the College will try to accommodate that student by making special arrangements as per [Disability and Equal Opportunities policy](#).
- 7.5. The College should provide any necessary support and training to members of academic and administrative staff to ensure that they fully understand the assessment criteria, regulations and process.

## 8. Assessment Marking and External Examiner

- 8.1. Marking of all summative assessments must be done in accordance with the College’s marking criteria (Appendix 1).
- 8.2. Internal and External Moderation/review processes should take places for all summative assessments, including exams and dissertations, as per the [Marking and Moderation Policy](#).
- 8.3. Internal Moderation process is done by “Second Markers”, who are usually lecturers teach in the College on any of its programmes. External Moderation is done by the “External Examiner” who is appointed by the Open University.
- 8.4. Marked and annotated assignments should be returned to students in a timely manner. The maximum turn-around time to mark assessments and examinations, including internal moderation, is two weeks only.
- 8.5. All undergraduate summative assessment will be marked on a percentage scale of 0-100.

% Scale Score	Performance Standard
70+	Excellent pass
60-69	Very Good pass
50-59	Good Pass
40-49	Pass
0-39	Fail

- 8.6. All postgraduate summative assessment will be marked on a percentage scale of 0-100. Taught postgraduate awards may include merit and/or distinction classification.

% Scale Score	Performance Standard
70+	Distinction
60-69	Merit
50-59	Pass
0-49	Fail

- 8.7. All assessment marks are provisional until they are approved by Examination Boards in summer.

## 9. Feedback on Assessment

- 9.1. Students expect to receive good feedback for their submitted summative assessments.
- 9.2. Good quality feedback on summative assessments includes a narrative commentary that is qualitative, which should enable students to understand the mark they have been awarded and what they should do to improve performance in future assessments. The feedback should help students to reflect on their learning. It should be honest, comprehensive, clear, and constructive. Moder details on this can be found in the "[Assessment Guideline and Principles](#)".

## 10. Assessment Regulations and Examination Board

- 10.1. External Examiners are associated with all summative assessment that contributes towards the award, and to be involved whenever there is progression from one level to the next. Their particular role is to ensure that justice is done to the individual student and that the standard of the OU's validated awards is maintained. The External Examiner role is central to the academic standard and quality of a programme, and without one this programme would not be allowed to run.
- 10.2. To obtain an award, students are required to complete all parts of the programme's assessment and comply with all programme regulations as noted in the related programme specifications. The minimum aggregate pass mark for the BA (Hons) programme and Cert HE- level 4 is **40%**, and for PgCert HE is **50%**. These minima apply to assessments, modules, stages and qualifications.
- 10.3. Each of the stages of the BA (Hons) programme consist of a total of 120 credits. In order to complete and pass a stage of the programme, a student must acquire the total credit set out in the Programme Specification at the approved qualification level for the award or have been exempted through the implementation of the processes covering extenuating circumstances. The credit value of each module contributing to a stage determines its weighting in the aggregation of credit for a stage.
- 10.4. The Examination Board has discretion in reaching decisions on the formal assessments and awards to be recommended for individual candidates. They are responsible for interpreting the Regulations for Validated Awards of The Open University and good practice in higher education. Their academic judgements cannot be questioned or overturned. Any marks given by College teaching staff are preliminary and are not definite until confirmed by the Examination Board.

- 10.5. Pathways through the BA (Hons) programme require students to complete pre-requisite modules, as set out in the Programme Specification (for example, passing Islamic Law 1 is a pre-requisite to embarking on Islamic Law 2).
- 10.6. Exceptionally, viva voce examinations may be required by the Examination Board (with the approval of External Examiners), to confirm the progression/result status of a student, to determine the result status of borderline cases, when there is conflicting evidence from the various assessment components, or as an alternative or additional assessment in cases where poor performance in assessment is the result of exceptional circumstances verified through due processes.
- 10.7. Where the result of the assessment calculation creates a mark of 0.5% or greater this will be rounded up to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.5% is rounded to 70; 59.5% to 60%; and so on). Where the calculation creates a mark below 0.5% this will be rounded down to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.4% is rounded to 69%; 59.4% to 59%; and so on). For the purposes of rounding up or down, only the first decimal place is used.

## 11. Compensation

- 11.1. Compensation is the award of credit by the Examination Board for a failed module(s) on account of good performance in other modules at the same credit level where the learning outcomes have been met. Compensation follows the conditions under paragraph 17.4 of the [OU Regulations for Validated Awards](#).
- 11.2. Internal compensation:
  - a. In case of failing one component/coursework of a module while the total mark of this module is a passing mark of 40%, it is at the discretion of the Examination Board to accept the failing mark for this component and compensate it to 40%. The Examination Board should make sure that the learning outcome of this specific coursework has been achieved.
  - b. Internal compensation is only possible if a minimum mark of no more than 5 percentage points below the module pass mark has been achieved in the module to be compensated.

## 12. Resits

- 12.1. A student may resit the failed assessment components of a module only once. Where there are extenuating circumstances, the Board of Examiners has discretion to decide whether a further assessment opportunity shall be permitted, as approved in the validation process and programme specification.

- 12.2. A student who does not complete the resit by the date specified shall not progress the programme, except in cases where the process for allowing extenuating circumstances has been followed.
- 12.3. Resits can only take place after the meeting of the Board of Examiners or following agreement by the Chair and the External Examiner of the Board.
- 12.4. A student who successfully completes any required resits within a module shall be awarded the credit for the module and the result for the individual assessment component capped at the minimum pass mark for the module.
- 12.5. A student shall not be permitted to be reassessed by resit in any module that has received a pass mark, or in a component that has received a mark of 40% or above at UG level, or 50% at PG level.
- 12.6. The resit will normally be carried out by the same combination of written examination, coursework, etc. as in the first attempt.
- 12.7. If, having exhausted all permitted resit and compensation opportunities, a student is still unable to pass, the Examination Board may, at its discretion, permit one of the approved repeat options.

### **13. Repeat and Retake**

- 13.1. Where a student fails a module, they may have a second attempt at an assessment component.
  - a. A Retake is a further opportunity to pass an examination/assignment and be awarded the associated marks and credits.
  - b. Retakes are arranged for failed examinations only and are not available if a student simply wants to try to increase their grade.
  - c. A new examination paper will be provided by the relevant Lecturer.
  - d. Retake opportunities are arranged during the summer vacation and conducted under examination conditions.
  - e. The maximum period within which a student will be expected to complete the programme, including the time period for any retake assessments, is specified in the Period of Registration policy.
  - f. Retake provision is subject to all the following conditions:
    - A student may retake the failed assessment components of a module only once.
    - A student who does not complete the retake by the date specified shall not progress on the programme, except in cases where the process for allowing extenuating circumstances has been followed.

- Retakes can only take place after the meeting of the Examination Board or following agreement by the Chair and the External Examiner of the Board via Chair's action.
  - A student who successfully completes any required retakes shall be awarded the credit for the module and the result capped at the minimum pass mark for the module (except for students completing retakes due to extenuating circumstances, whose results will not be capped).
- g. Full details of Repeat options can be found under Paragraph 17.5 in the OU Regulations for Validated Awards.
- 13.2. For the BA (Hons) programme, where retake, compensation and repeat opportunities have been exhausted, the Examination Board may recommend a student for an exit award.

## 14. Progress and Award

14.1. Honours degrees are classified as follows:

First class	Aggregate mark of 70% or above
Upper Second class	Aggregate mark between 60% and 69%
Lower Second class	Aggregate mark between 50% and 59%
Third class	Aggregate mark between 40% and 49%

14.2. Classification of awards other than the Honours degrees are as following:

For the award of Distinction, the overall aggregate mark will be 70% or above.

For the award of Merit, the overall aggregate mark will be 60% - 69%.

14.3. Calculation of a CertHE will be based on the average mark across all modules within Stage 1 (usually Credit Level 4).

14.4. Where the final result of the classification calculation creates a mark of 0.5% or greater this will be rounded up to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.5% is rounded to 70; 59.5% to 60%; and so on). Where the calculation creates a mark below 0.5% this will be rounded down to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.4% is rounded to 69%; 59.4% to 59%; and so on). For the purposes of rounding up or down, only the first decimal place is used.

14.5. Classification of the BA (Hons) degree is based on the average mark across all modules within Stage 3 (Credit Level 6) and Stage 2 (Credit Level 5) at a ratio of 2:1 respectively.

## 15. Non-completion

15.1. Non-completion is the failure to complete a degree on which a student is enrolled.

- a. The decision for non-completion may be taken by the student, or the College, or both, and may be due to health or family reasons; inability to pay tuition fees or to achieve the academic standards required; poor attendance, and/or attitude; no longer wishing to

continue; failure to meet assessment deadlines or to sit examinations; reasons of conduct, behaviour or violation of the [College's policies](#).

- b. Before withdrawal takes place, students will have the opportunity to appeal this decision, following the [Academic Appeals Policy](#).
- c. Except in exceptional circumstances, refunds for tuition fees are not offered by the College for withdrawal or removal from an award.

## 16. Aegrotat award

- 16.1. Should a student be prevented by illness, or other circumstances, from completing the final assessed component of the programme, the Examination Board, having considered the relevant evidence (including medical certification) may recommend that an Aegrotat award be made.
  - d. Such exceptions are limited to students who are permanently unable to continue their studies and are registered for the final module that would complete a qualification and have been assessed on at least part of the module.
  - b. The board must be satisfied that the student's prior performance shows beyond reasonable doubt that they would have passed but for the illness, or other circumstances.
  - c. Before a recommendation of an Aegrotat is submitted to The Open University, the student must have signified willingness to accept the award and understand that this implies waiving the right to be reassessed.
  - d. Posthumous awards are permitted for all programmes. The classification for such awards is based on past performance and is recommended to the Open University Ratification Panel for approval.
- 16.2. Students wishing to challenge an assessment decision must follow procedures set out in the [Academic Appeals and Complaints Policy](#).
- 16.3. Assessed materials are retained by the College in line with the Data Retention Policy.
- 16.4. Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) is the identification, assessment and formal acknowledgement of learning and achievement that occurred at some time in the past which is considered when admitting a student to a course of study.
- 16.5. Forms of Recognition of Prior Learning for the BA in Islamic Studies can be found under the [Admissions Policy](#).

## 7. Assignment and Exam Procedures – Staff related

Procedures followed for assignments and exams can be found in Appendix 1.

### REVISION HISTORY

Revision #	Effective Date	Description of Change
00	31 Mar 2017	New Document
01	06 June 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Formatting change</li> <li>2. Policy number assignment</li> <li>3. Change of responsibilities</li> <li>4. Re-structure of 'Principles' section</li> </ol>
02	28 November 2018	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The BA Manager seeks advice of the Faculty Board and not the Academic Advisory Board.</li> <li>2. Examinations will be scheduled by the BA Manager.</li> </ol>
03	25 September 2019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete sending summary of results to the students by email</li> <li>2. Update Invigilation Guidance</li> </ol>
04	10 January 2020	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Updated information on recognition of prior learning to reference only three sources as evidenced in the Admission Policy.</li> <li>2. Added Admission Policy as a reference.</li> </ol>
05	March 2021	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update the References of QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education</li> </ol>
06	October 2021	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add the internal compensation in case of failing one element of a module while passing the module as a whole</li> </ol>
07	November	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exceeding word limits specified in the assignments questions will face a penalty of reducing 10% of the mark for every 10% extra words</li> </ol>
08	Feb 2022	<p>As a response to Admin Audit Feedback the following has been updated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include Programme Officer in the Responsibility to eliminate Single Point of Failure in the process</li> <li>2. Change College Coordinator (BA) to BA Programme Officer to reflect the new changes in the Organisational Chart</li> <li>3. Under section 6:</li> </ol>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Include reviewing all assignments' questions by the External Examiner not just the Exam questions</li> <li>-Clarify that assignments and exam questions are password protected when shared with the External Examiner</li> <li>-Ensure that students are aware that their assignments' marks that they receive during the year are provisions</li> </ul> <p>4. Classification of the BA degree is based on the average mark across all modules within Stage 3 (Credit Level 6) and Stage 2 (Credit Level 5) at a ratio of 2:1 respectively</p> <p>5. Under section 7:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Separate procedures for both assessment and exams to ensure that procedures are clear</li> <li>-Explain the roles of both Invigilators in more details</li> <li>-Update Invigilator' responsibilities to ensure that two Invigilators are available in case student needs toilet break or found in possession of notes</li> <li>-A Safe Register is created to sign in and out Exam papers and scripts from the secured Safe</li> <li>-Invigilators to check ID of students</li> <li>-Ensure that Transcripts that provides awards, including exit awards, are not shared with students until after the ratification of the MRAQCP</li> </ul> <p>6. Under Appendix 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that Chief Invigilator is available during exams to follow up on implementing the Exam's Regulations</li> <li>-Check students' ID before admitting to exams</li> <li>-Update form in Appendix 2 to include BA Officer as well.</li> </ul>
09	June 2022	<p>The policy has been updated as a response to the IR conditions as following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Language has been changed to present tense instead of will, must</li> <li>2. Modify the paragraphs copied from the OU Regulations and linking it to the source.</li> <li>3. Make it clear that "procedure" under 7 is related to Staff and not students.</li> </ol>
10	Jan 2023	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update the policy to reflect the responsibility of both the Academic Director and the BA Manager/ Officer for the Assessment policy</li> <li>2. Update the Marking Criteria in the Appendix 3</li> <li>3. Remove the previous 10% penalty of exceeding word limits. It is now part of the Marking Criteria_ Appendix 3.</li> <li>4. Word count includes the main text of the assignment and the footnote. Bibliography and Appendixes don't count. (Paragraph 6.6)</li> </ol>
11	Dec 2024 <i>Z. Alkhatib</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Include all taught programmes.</li> <li>2. Remove Procedures to Appendix.</li> <li>3. Update Procedures to ensure that responsibilities are clear.</li> <li>4. Update Procedures to match the new updated Org chart.</li> <li>5. Include the information on resit option as per the OU Regulations.</li> </ol>

		6. Re-arrange sessions to improve the accessibility of this policy.
--	--	---

## Appendix 1- Assignment / Exam Procedure



**Effective Date: April 2024**

**Review Date: April 2025**

### Responsibilities

Role	Responsibility	Accountability
Programme Lead	Check assignment and exam questions against learning outcome	Academic Director
Quality Assurance Manager	Check assignment and exam questions for language, formats, and QA Code and OU Regulations	Registrar/ Academic Director
Quality Assurance Manager	Approve questions from the EE	Registrar
Programme Officer	Student submission	Registrar
Programme Officer	Marking and moderation process	Academic Director
Programme Lead	Written Feedback- in line with marking criteria	Academic Director
Programme Officer	Late submission penalty	Chair of Examination Board

Student Experience Officer/ Chief Invigilator	Operation of Exam	Registrar
Programme Officer/ QA Manager	Exam Board documents	Chair of Exam Board

## **Processes**

This document explains the processes for administrating both assignments and exams for all taught programmes at Cambridge Muslim College.

### **1. Assignment Procedure**

Assignment questions are written by the lecturer/ module convenor 6 weeks before assignment due date. Questions should be reviewed by the Programme Lead & Quality Assurance (QA) Manager. Programme Lead is responsible to ensure that questions are in line with learning outcome. QA Manager is responsible for ensuring that questions are in line with the Quality Code of HE.



The QA Manager share questions securely (password protected) with the External Examiner for their approval.



The Programme Officer shares the approved questions formally with the students through the VLE. System, i.e. Moodle, 4-5 weeks before the assignment deadline



The students to be given access to the VLE, i.e. Moodle; to submit their assignments, anonymously, by the published deadline



After the submission deadline, the Programme Officer grants access to the first and second markers to mark the assignment/ exam papers, anonymously, through the online assignment system; i.e. Moodle, by following the Moderation policy



The module convenor/ First marker is responsible for delivering the marking and moderation sheet back to the Programme Officer at the end of the marking process.



The Programme Officer to check that the written feedback is inline with the marking criteria. They may raise any concerns with the programme lead and the QA Manager.



The Student Experience Officer to keep records of Extenuating Circumstances (EC) forms in Student's records.



The Programme Officer to liaise with the Student Experience Officer to keep track of late submissions and approved EC forms.



Students to access their provisional marks and feedback of the course convenor within 2 weeks of the deadline.



The provisional marks are exported from the online system and copied into the Examination Board documents after implementing any late submission penalty

### **Exam Procedure**

Exam questions are written by the lecturer/ module convenor 5 weeks before exam due date. Questions should be reviewed by the Programme Lead & Quality Assurance (QA) Manager. Programme Lead is responsible to ensure that questions are in line with learning outcome. QA Manager is responsible to ensure that questions are in line with the Quality Code of HE.



The QA Manager share questions securely (password protected) with the External Examiner for their approval.



The Programme Officer schedules examinations on the student calendar at least two weeks before the exams. Exam timetable should be approved in the previous Faculty Board meeting.



The Programme Officer prints the required number of examination papers in coordination with the QA Manager. The printing out process will be a password protected with limited access to Programme Officer and QA Manager only.



The Programme Officer places the examination papers in an A4 envelope, along with a blank Invigilator's Report Form. The QA Manager can replace the Officer in this process.



The Programme Officer seal the envelope and place it in the "Safe" for the day of the exam. The QA Manager may replace the Officer in this process, if needed.



The Programme Officer to update the "Safe Register" and log in/ out exam papers from the "Safe". The Chief Invigilator to update the "Safe Register" when taking the exam papers out of the "Safe", if needed.



Two invigilators will administer the examination process, with a ratio of 1 main Invigilator (Invigilator 1) per 20 students.



The Chief Invigilator is responsible for ensuring the number of invigilators (who are sourced from College staff) in each examination room is at a ratio of one invigilator per 20 students maximum



The Chief Invigilator is responsible for booking examination rooms for all exams on all programmes and circulate this information to all students and staff.



Invigilator 1 (Main)	Invigilator 2 (Chief Invigilator)
Checking the ID of the students	
At the beginning of the exam: -Check if the envelope has been tampered with -Inform the Chief Invigilator/ QA Manager immediately if any tampering has taken place -Check the information on the envelope for the correct examination papers and number -Open the envelope in front of the examinees	Retrieves the envelop of exam papers from the Safe
Distribute examination papers	Invigilate in the first 30 minutes of exam, then leave exam room
Invigilate for the all the exam period	Be available during exam period to stay with student who: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. needs toilet break</li> <li>2. if a student found in possession of notes</li> </ol>
To complete Invigilation Report	To check and sign the Invigilation Report
Place all scripts in envelope marked “complete” and deliver it to the “Chief Invigilator”	Place completed scripts in the Safe, in coordination with key folder of the Safe



The Programme Officer to scan exam scripts and upload them to the VLE so the marking process can start. Access should be given to the markers as per their previously agreed marking duties.



The module convenor/ First marker is responsible for delivering the marking and moderation sheet back to the Programme Officer at the end of the marking process.



The Programme Officer to produce Exam Board documents from the VLE and to ensure they are double-checked by QA Manager.



The Student Experience Officer to keep records of Extenuating Circumstances (EC) forms in Student’s records.



The Programme Officer to liaise with the Student Experience Officer to keep track of late submissions and approved EC forms.



If a student missed an exam due to Extenuating Circumstances, Student Experience Officer to re-schedule the exam and inform the Programme Officer.



Programme Officer to liaise with the “module convenor”, programme lead and QA Manager to produce another set of exam questions and follow the process of approving them as per the first step in this process.



The Programme Officer prepares students’ Transcripts at the end of each academic year as per the OU template.

If “awards”, including exit awards, are to be provided, transcripts should not be sent to students until the OU has ratified the Awards and Exit Awards.

### **Resits and Retake Processes**

If a student failed an assignment or exam, they may do resits as per the assessment policy.

### **Preparing Exam Board Documents Procedure**

The main responsibility of preparing exam board documents lays with the Programme Officer & Chair of Exam Board (QA Manager) as following:

- The Programme Officer to download assignment marks from the VLE system, i.e. Moodle.
- The Programme Officer to apply any penalty to the marks as needed, i.e. late submission penalty, following the assessment policy.
- The Programme Officer to copy the final marks of both assignments and exams to the exam board documents.
- The Chair of Exam Board to double-check the marks from the VLE system, the moderations sheets and on the exam board documents.
- The Programme Officer to prepare students’ Transcripts at the end of each academic year.
- The Chair of Exam Board to double check Transcripts to minimize any admin error.

- The Programme Officer to send Transcripts to students after the approval of Exam Board. If awards, including exit awards, are to be provided, transcripts should not be sent to the students until OU has ratified the Awards and Exit Awards after the Examination Board.

## Appendix 2- Invigilation Guidelines



### Information for Invigilators

All students are required to sit end of term examinations as part of the programme assessment process.

Examinations will be held in accordance with the College calendar which will be available at least 2 weeks before the commencement of the examination period and will include the date and time of each examination.

Examinations are held from Monday to Friday and spread over one or two weeks.

Most modules are assessed using the written examination format. This is usually a 2-3 hours paper, with a choice of questions.

There shall be a prescribed number of invigilators in each examination room, at a ratio of one invigilator per 20 students maximum. However, two invigilators are required to be available during exam times as per 7.2.11

Invigilators are sourced from College staff. Invigilators will be informed of the sessions assigned to them shortly before the examination period.

The Student Services Officer acts as Chief Invigilator, taking overall responsibility for ensuring that fellow invigilators implement the regulations that govern the conduct of invigilated examinations. They are required to be available during exams and may act as Invigilator 2

Invigilators are responsible for ensuring that examinations are conducted in such a manner that there can be no suggestion of improper conduct, unfairness, advantage or disadvantage to any student.

**Please read these guidelines carefully  
and ensure that you are fully aware of your responsibilities**

## **Preparation**

Invigilator 2 to collect examination question papers and writing paper from the Safe at least 20 minutes prior to the start of the examination and report to the examination room at least 15 minutes before the examination is due to commence.

Invigilator 1 to place an examination paper and 5 sheets of lined writing paper, on each desk. If more than one examination is taking place in the same room, refer to the seating plan posted outside the examination room and ensure that the correct examination paper is on each desk.

Admit students into the examination room 5-10 minutes before an examination is due to start. Students ID to be checked before admitting them to examination room

Remind students that, once admitted to the room, examination conditions apply so no talking is permitted.

Students are not permitted to wear coats, scarves, or outdoor wear during examinations. Ensure that students remove any clothing of this type. This, together with any bags or rucksacks, should be placed in the area reserved for storage of personal items before the exam begins.

Students should sit at a desk allocated for the examination question paper they are sitting in accordance with the seating plans posted outside the examination room.

Remind students that items such as keys, purses and mobile telephones should be placed in the clear plastic bags provided on each desk and placed under their chair. Mobile telephones must be turned off and no items should be touched during the examination.

Do not allow any food and drink in the examination room, with the exception of water which should be in a clear plastic bottle.

Students must bring their own pens, pencils, rulers and any other required equipment to each examination. These should be kept in a clear plastic pencil case. Cases and other containers are not permitted on examination desks.

Remind students to enter their student number, not their name, on the examination answer paper.

Announce at the beginning of each examination that it is an offence for students to be in possession of any notes, documents or unauthorised material or to have any information written on their body or clothing. Ask anyone with such material to raise their hand.

Collect the material and give the opportunity for information on the body or clothing to be removed.

After this point, if any student is discovered with such material or with any information written on any part of their body or clothing in the examination room it will automatically be assumed that cheating has taken place. You should immediately alert the Registrar/Quality Assurance Manager in such cases and provide a report.

### **Starting the Examination**

Students must not open examination question papers or start writing until instructed to do so.

Tell the students the duration of the examination paper and that you will be announcing when there are 30 minutes left and when there are 5 minutes left before the examination finish time.

As near as possible to the published start time of the examination, ask the students to begin writing.

Write the examination name and start time clearly and in large letters on the whiteboard. Calculate the finish time and write this also on the whiteboard.

Students who arrive late may be admitted to an examination room during the first 30 minutes of an examination. No additional time will be given.

### **During the Examination**

You are responsible for the proper conduct of examinations. Students are required to comply with all instructions issued by you.

Do not allow talking or communicating in any other way between students in the examination room. Failure to observe this requirement is a disciplinary offence.

If a student wishes to speak to you, he/she should raise a hand and stay seated.

Any student wishing to leave the examination room temporarily should raise their hand to request your permission. Escort the student out of the room. Invigilator 2 to accompany students outside examination room. Any student who leaves the room without your permission will be deemed to have withdrawn from the examination and will not be allowed to return. Provide a report to Registrar/Quality Assurance Manager in such cases.

Reprimand any student who causes a disturbance in an examination room. If the conduct persists you may request the student to withdraw from the examination room. Alert the Registrar/Quality Assurance Manager and write a report in such cases.

If a mobile telephone or other electronic device is found on a student during the course of an examination, it will be regarded as a disciplinary offence. Alert the Registrar/Quality Assurance Manager and write a report in such cases.

Students wishing to leave an examination early must inform you and must remain in their seat until their examination script has been collected. They must leave the examination room quietly with minimum disturbance both inside and immediately outside the examination room.

Students are not permitted to leave an examination during the first 30 minutes or the last 5 minutes. If papers of mixed duration are being taken, students are only permitted to leave at your discretion.

In the event of a fire alarm during an examination, instruct the students to stop what they are doing, leave all materials on their desk and make their way to the nearest fire exit. Remind students that they must not communicate with each other and ensure that examination conditions are maintained.

Let the students know when there are 30 minutes left and when there are 5 minutes left before the finish time.

### **Ending the Examination**

When the finish time is reached, instruct students to stop writing. Be firm and insist that all students put down their pens immediately.

Students must remain seated at their desks until you have collected all examination scripts, then instruct them to leave quietly. No talking is allowed until students are outside the examination room.

Students may not remove any examination question paper from the examination room.

Clear the room of examination materials and shred all question papers and student notes.

Hand the scripts to Invigilator 2.

Complete a report form on the conduct of each examination for the Registrar/Quality Assurance Manager.

### Appendix 3



#### Cambridge Muslim College

#### Examination Report Form for Invigilators

Invigilators are required to complete a report form after each examination as part of the monitoring and quality process.

Please fill in this form as soon as possible after the end of each examination and hand it to the Programme Officer/ Manager, together with all scripts and question papers.

#### General Information

Examination title:	
--------------------	--

Module:	
Date of examination:	
Timetabled start time of examination:	
Actual start time:	
Timetabled finish time of examination:	
Actual finish time:	
Number of candidates:	
Name of invigilator 1:	
Name(s) of invigilator 2:	

**Observations and Comments**

Please comment on anything unusual that took place during the set-up, start, duration or end of the examination. This should include the names and arrival times of any students who arrived late.

The following are disciplinary offences and should be fully and immediately reported:

- if a mobile telephone or other electronic device was found on a student during the course of an examination
- if any notes, documents or unauthorised material was found on a student, including any information written on their body or clothing
- details of any student who caused a disturbance in an examination room (including talking or communicating in any way with other students)
- details of any student who left the room without your permission

**Compliance with Examination Regulations**

Please confirm that the following regulations were complied with:

- Remind students that, once admitted to the room, examination conditions apply so no talking is permitted
- Remind students that items such as keys, purses and mobile telephones should be placed in the clear plastic bags provided on each desk and placed under their chair. Mobile telephones must be turned off and no items should be touched during the examination.
- Announce at the beginning of each examination that it is an offence for students to be in possession of any notes, documents or unauthorised material or to have any information written on their body or clothing.
- Do not allow talking or communicating in any other way between students in the examination room.
- When the finish time is reached, instruct students to stop writing. Be firm and insist that all students put down their pens immediately.

**Declaration:**

I am satisfied that the examination was conducted in such a manner that there can be no suggestion of improper conduct, unfairness, advantage or disadvantage to any student.

<b>Name of invigilator 1 (printed)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

<b>Name of invigilator 2 (printed)</b>	
<b>Signature</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

Form 200.008.01

## Appendix 4- Marking Criteria



### Cambridge Muslim College Marking Criteria

#### 1. Introduction

Marking Criteria is the formal record of the specific assessment standards for a programme to which they apply. They set out how examined work will be marked and how the resulting marks will be used to arrive at a final result and classification of an award.

The following scale will be used for marking individual coursework:

70–100	Excellent Pass (1)
60–69	Very Good Pass (2:1)
50–59	Good Pass (2:2)
40–49	Pass (3)
0–39	Fail

The award of a mark within a particular scale indicates work displaying the following characteristics:

#### ***Excellent Pass***

Overall excellent to superior work that shows a deep understanding of the relevant issues and literature. Distinction-level work very clearly and consistently demonstrates such scholarly virtues as independence of thought, critical acumen, and clarity of expression.

#### ***Very Good Pass***

Overall good to very good work that shows significant understanding of the relevant issues and literature. Merit level work displays some evidence of such scholarly virtues as independence of thought, critical acumen, and clarity of expression.

#### ***Good***

Displays good understanding of the relevant issues and literature, but without consistent evidence of such scholarly virtues as independence of thought, critical acumen, or clarity of expression.

***Pass***

Competent work showing a grasp of relevant issues and literature alongside some limitations to argumentative structure and exposition, and some inconsistencies, imbalances or limitations of treatment.

***Fail***

Failing work may display a poor grasp of relevant issues or literature; inadequate use of illustration, poor argument or organisation of material; or lack of clarity; or problems relating to scholarly presentation.

## 2. Qualitative Criteria for Different Types of Assessments

### 2.1. Criteria for written work (including essays, timed exam essays, and dissertations)

Markers will attend to the following criteria in marking submitted essays and timed essays, as appropriate to the piece of work being assessed.

**Engagement**

- incisiveness of engagement with the question
- range of issues addressed
- depth and sophistication of comprehension of issues and implications of the question
- relevant engagement with primary and secondary literature
- directness of answer to the question

**Argument**

- coherence and rigour of argument
- analytical clarity and power
- intellectual penetration and sophistication of ideas
- originality of argument

**Information**

- relevant deployment of information
- depth, precision and detail of evidence cited
- range of material deployed
- accuracy of facts

**Presentation & Organisation**

- clarity and coherence of structure
- clarity, fluency and elegance of prose
- correctness of grammar, spelling, transliteration, and punctuation
- scholarly presentation

### 2.2. Criteria for translations & gobbets

Markers will attend to the following criteria in marking responses to translations and gobbets, as appropriate to the piece of work being assessed:

**Immediate context of the extract**

- relation of the extract to the wider text from which it is drawn
- representativeness/distinctiveness of the extract within the wider text
- precise meaning or significance of terminology or points of detail

- identification of key ideas, individuals, or events
- **Clarification of the extract**
- author, authority, and purpose
- audience
- conditions of creation, transmission, reception, and preservation
- genre
- language and style
- **Wider context of the extract**
- relationship between the extract and other set texts or texts
- relevance of the extract to wider theological or historical developments
- relevance of the extract to modern debates
- **Organisation and presentation of answer**
- clarity and coherence of structure
- clarity, fluency and elegance of prose
- correctness of grammar, spelling, transliteration, and punctuation

### 2.3. Criteria for oral presentations

Markers will attend to the following criteria in marking oral presentations, as appropriate to the presentation being assessed:

#### **Information**

- demonstrated depth and breadth in knowledge of the subject
- situates the information presented within broader subject matter or modern debates
- relevant deployment of information and knowledge acquired
- evidence of skills relevant to learning outcomes

#### **Argument**

- clear response to the question or task assigned
- clarity and coherence of argument and reasoning throughout the presentation
- demonstrates critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

#### **Presentation Skills**

- clarity of structure and organisation
- suitably tailored to the audience
- clarity of delivery: audible, paced, well timed
- effective use of audio-visual media (where relevant)

## 3. Assessment Scores

### 3.1. Essays, dissertations, and gobbets

The following detailed descriptors will be used to determine the assignment of marks for essays, dissertations, and gobbets within the grade boundaries. Written work is taken to meet the criteria set out below if for the most part it satisfies the relevant descriptions. These descriptions are to be interpreted in light of what would be expected at the level of an undergraduate degree rather than in absolute terms.

#### **Excellent pass (70–100) quality work will normally demonstrate:**

- Excellent argumentative structure, coherence and clarity

- Excellent knowledge of relevant primary and/or secondary literature.
  - Excellent knowledge of and ability to apply relevant core concepts and methods of inquiry
  - Excellent evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality
- When most of these qualities are evident, the mark should be 70–80. When all of these qualities are evident throughout, the mark should be 80 or above. Where these qualities are evident throughout and the script displays original thought of publishable standard, the mark should be 90 or above.

**Very good pass quality work in the upper range (67–69) will normally demonstrate:**

- Very clear argumentative structure, coherence and clarity
- Very good knowledge of relevant primary and/or secondary literature
- Very good knowledge of and ability to apply relevant core concepts and methods of inquiry
- Very clear evidence of application of critical evaluation and judgement.

**Good pass quality work in the lower range (60–66) will normally demonstrate:**

- Clear argumentative structure, coherence and clarity
- Good knowledge of relevant primary and/or secondary literature
- Good knowledge of and ability to apply relevant core concepts and methods of inquiry
- Clear evidence of application of critical evaluation and judgement.

**Pass quality work in the upper range (50–59) will normally demonstrate:**

- Competent argumentative structure, coherence and clarity
- Competent knowledge of relevant primary and/or secondary literature
- Competent knowledge of and ability to apply relevant core concepts and methods of inquiry
- Some evidence of application of critical evaluation and judgement.

**Pass quality work in the lower range (40–49) will normally demonstrate:**

- Limited argumentative structure, coherence or clarity
- Limited knowledge of relevant primary or secondary literature
- Limited knowledge of or ability to apply relevant core concepts or methods of inquiry
- Limited evidence of application of critical evaluation or judgement.

**Failing work may:**

- Lack clarity of focus and argumentative coherence
- Show little evidence of knowledge of relevant primary and/or secondary literature
- Give little evidence of knowledge and application of core concepts and methods of inquiry
- Make little attempt to apply critical evaluation and judgement

### 3.2. Oral presentations

The following descriptors will be used to determine the assignment of marks for oral presentations within the grade boundaries. An oral presentation is taken to meet the criteria set out below if for the most part it satisfies the relevant descriptions. These descriptions are to be interpreted in light of what would be expected at the level of an undergraduate degree rather than in absolute terms.

**Excellent pass (70–100) quality work will normally demonstrate:**

- Excellent presentation, clearly structured and delivered
- Excellent knowledge of the subject, demonstrating depth, breadth, and relevance to debates
- Excellent argument with a very clear response to the question or task assigned
- Excellent evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

When most of these qualities are evident, the mark should be 70–80. When all of these qualities are evident throughout, the mark should be 80 or above. Where these qualities are evident throughout and the script displays original thought of publishable standard, the mark should be 90 or above.

**Very good pass quality work in the upper range (67–69) will normally demonstrate:**

- Very good presentation, clearly structured and delivered
- Very good knowledge of the subject, demonstrating depth, breadth, and relevance to debates
- Very clear argument with a clear response to the question or task assigned
- Very clear evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

**Very good pass quality work in the lower range (60–66) will normally demonstrate:**

- Good presentation, clearly structured and delivered
- Good knowledge of the subject, demonstrating depth, breadth, and relevance to debates
- Clear argument with a good response to the question or task assigned
- Clear evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

**Pass quality work in the upper range (50–59) will normally demonstrate:**

- Competent presentation, clearly structured and delivered
- Competent knowledge of the subject, demonstrating depth, breadth, and relevance to debates
- Acceptable argument providing a response to the question or task assigned
- Some evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

**Pass quality work in the lower range (40–49) will normally demonstrate:**

- Limited presentation, clearly structured and delivered
- Limited knowledge of the subject, demonstrating depth, breadth, and relevance to debates
- Weak argument
- Provides only a partial response to the question or task assigned
- Limited evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

**Failing work may:**

- Limited presentation, clearly structured and delivered
- Little or no knowledge of the subject, not demonstrating depth, breadth, and relevance to debates
- Make little attempt to present an argument
- Does not respond to the question or task assigned
- Little evidence of critical evaluation, judgement, and originality

### 3.3. Essays in timed written examinations

The following detailed descriptors will be used for marking essay work in timed written examinations within the grade boundaries. The conventions use positive criteria (marked by “+”) and negative criteria (marked by “-”) in order to assign marks. Written work is taken to meet the criteria set out below if for the most part it satisfies the relevant descriptions. These descriptions are to be interpreted in light of what would be expected at the level of an undergraduate degree rather than in absolute terms.

**Excellent (70–100)**

*Upper: 84+*

- + Exceptional answer displaying originality
- + Outstanding analytical and argumentative skills

- + Superior command of the facts and arguments relevant to the question
- + Excellent organisation
- + Lucid and precise expression

*Middle: 76–81*

- + Excellent answer offering high-level analysis
- + Independent and rigorous argument
- + Skilled handling of the facts and arguments relevant to the question
- + Transparent organisation
- + Lucid and precise expression

*Lower: 70–75*

- + Strong answer displaying a high standard of analysis and argument
- + A thorough command of the facts and/or arguments relevant to the question
- + Transparent organisation and clear language.

**Very good (60-69)**

*Upper: 65–69*

- + Effective analysis and argumentation
- + thorough command of evidence
- + clarity of expression
- + transparent organisation of material
- Occasional imprecision in argumentation or expression - lack of depth; or minor omissions; or lapses in focus.

*Lower: 60–64*

- + Well-structured answer offering a generally accurate analysis of central arguments and themes
- + A well-reasoned conclusion.
- Occasional lapses in argumentation
- Writing may be somewhat pedestrian or unclear or imprecise
- Some omissions or infelicity in organisation of material

**Pass (50–59)**

*Upper: 55–59*

- + Adequate, if somewhat basic, analysis and understanding of key concepts and arguments
- Significantly lacking in scope, depth or precision
- Flat or pedestrian representation of thoughts and arguments
- Important inaccuracies or omissions
- Some lapses in argumentation

*Lower: 50–54*

- + Answer showing a basic grasp of relevant material and arguments
- + A fair attempt to arrive at a reasoned conclusion
- Serious inaccuracies or omissions
- Significant lapses in argumentation (e.g. nonsequiturs, misuse of concepts or evidence) - Failure to digest material - Minor irrelevance.

**Pass (40-49)**

*Upper: 45–49*

- + Limited answer to the question; constructs a rudimentary argument; some evidence of relevant study.

- Superficial or incomplete treatment
- Some gaps or mistakes in understanding of key concepts and arguments
- Poor focus and organisation
- Some irrelevance

*Lower: 40–44*

- + Significant elements of a basic and relevant answer
- Muddled argumentation
- Very superficial discussion with poor focus
- Significant misunderstanding of key concepts and arguments
- Considerable irrelevance
- Seriously incomplete answer

**Fail (30–39)**

- + Limited attempt to address question showing a rudimentary grasp of some relevant information
- Very incomplete, brief, or poorly organised answer
- Fundamental misunderstanding of key arguments or ideas
- Large portions of discussion irrelevant or tangential

**Fail (0–29)**

*Upper: 15–29*

- + Some slight evidence of a proper attempt to answer question
- + Glimpse of relevant material

- Extremely limited and inadequate answer, for instance in note form - Discussion mostly irrelevant

*Lower 0–14:*

- Completely or almost completely irrelevant or ignorant answer
- Nothing or almost nothing written

#### **4. PENALTIES**

While penalties are proposed by the markers/assessors during the marking and moderation process, all cases should be flagged and approved by the Examination Board during the pre-Exam Board meeting. Late submission penalties are applied at the end of the marking and moderation process and flagged to the Examination Board during the pre-Exam Board meeting.

##### **4.1. Penalties for short-weight and departure from rubric (to be applied by the markers)**

A mark of zero shall be awarded for any question, part or parts of questions, that have not been answered by a candidate, but which should have been answered. Where answers are of insufficient length, the answer will receive a mark on its merits, taking account of its brevity and thus of inadequate range and coverage. A zero or low mark for a question or part of a question will naturally pull down the average for the whole script but never by more than that which is equivalent to the proportion of the answer that is missing. Short-weight scripts will be flagged for the attention of the Examination Board, which will consider all such cases to ensure consistency of treatment.

Where a candidate has failed to answer a compulsory question or failed to answer the required number of questions in different sections, the complete script will be marked as it stands and the issue flagged for the attention of the Examination Board, which will consider all such cases and will apply penalties consistently. Where it is unambiguously clear that a rubric has not been obeyed, the Examination Board may lower the overall mark for the script by up to 5 marks. This penalty for departure from the rubric may be applied to scripts which are also short weight. For example, if a script contains answers to only two questions, both from section A, where the rubric of the paper demanded three questions to be answered including at least one from each of sections A and B, two penalties may be applied. A zero mark will be awarded for the third question, which will naturally pull down the overall (average) mark for the script; this in turn may be reduced by a penalty of 5 marks because of the failure to comply with the rubric requirement of at least one answer from section B.

**4.2. Penalties for over-length work and departure from approved or prescribed titles or subject-matter (to be applied by the markers)**

*For over-length submitted essays and dissertations*

The markers/assessors may apply penalties to work that exceeds the word limit stipulated in the Module Specifications. It is important to note that **word count** includes the main text of the assignment and the footnote. Bibliography and Appendixes doesn't count.

In these cases, the following tariff of marks may be deducted for over-length work:

<b>Percentage by which the maximum word limit is exceeded</b>	<b>Penalty</b>
Up to 5% over word limit	-2 marks
More than 5% and up to 10% over	-4 marks
More than 10% and up to 15% over	-6 marks
More than 15% and up to 20% over	-8 marks
More than 20% and up to 25% over	-10 marks
More than 25% and up to 30% over	-12 marks
More than 30% and up to 35% over	-14 marks
More than 35% and up to 40% over	-16 marks
More than 40% and up to 45% over	-18 marks
More than 45% over	-20 marks

*Penalties for unauthorised changes to approved or prescribed titles for submitted written work and dissertations*

The Examination Board may, *at its discretion*, apply penalties to work submitted with titles that depart from those which have been officially approved according to *Examination Regulations*. In these cases, the Examination Board has agreed the following tariff marks to be deducted:

<b>Type of unauthorised change</b>	<b>Penalty</b>
Minor changes to punctuation or expression which do not affect content	0 – 5 marks
Changes to wording which affect content to some degree	0 – 10 marks
Changes to wording which result in a different essay from the one that was approved	0 – 20 marks
Changes to wording which result in an essay which does not satisfy the assessment requirements of the paper for which it has been offered	A fail mark recorded

#### **4.3. Penalties for academic misconduct and plagiarism (to be applied by the admin team)**

Academic misconduct is any act whereby a student may obtain for themselves, or for another student or group of students, an advantage which may lead to a higher mark than their abilities would otherwise secure. This includes plagiarism, poor academic practice, cheating, and collusion.

For procedures regarding academic misconduct, including the use of AI tools, please refer to the College's [Academic Misconduct Policy](#).

Penalties are issued in line with the [AMBeR Tariff](#), which is a points-based penalty system for Higher Education institutions.

#### **4.4. Penalties for late submission (to be applied by the admin team)**

A late submission can only be accepted within six (6) working days from the deadline of an assignment.

A submission that is late by seven (7) or more working days will be refused and a mark of zero will be given.

Where an assignment is submitted late, and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances, a 10% reduction for each late working day will be implemented until the 40% or the 50% pass mark of the related programme is reached.

## **Appendix 5- Assessment and QAA Quality code**

The QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education has a strong emphasis on assessment in the [Advice and Guidance- Assessment](#). The Expectations and practice are listed here:

### **Expectation for Standards**

The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.

The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.

### **Expectation for Quality**

Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed.

### **Core Practice for Standards**

The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks.

The provider ensures that students who are awarded qualifications have the opportunity to achieve standards beyond the threshold level that are reasonably comparable with those achieved in other UK providers.

The provider uses external expertise, assessment and classification processes that are reliable, fair and transparent.

### **Guiding Principles**

Assessment methods and criteria are aligned to learning outcomes and teaching activities

Assessment is reliable, consistent, fair and valid

Assessment design is approached holistically

Assessment is inclusive and equitable

Assessment is explicit and transparent

Assessment and feedback is purposeful and supports the learning process

Assessment is timely

Assessment is efficient and manageable

Students are supported and prepared for assessment

Assessment encourages academic integrity