LSHTM Academic Manual

Chapter 8b: Distance Learning Postgraduate Taught Degree Academic Regulations 2019-20

Contents

Reference

Archived source documents used in this chapter	Latest Version (Original Publication Date)	Section in chapter
LSHTM Postgraduate Taught Degree Regulations	2019-20	8b.1, 8b.2, 8b.4.1, 8b.5.3 - 8b.5.11, 8b.8.1- 8b.8.4, 8b.9.1-8b.9.2, 8b.11
Assessment Handbook (incl. Assessment Code of Practice)	2015	8b.4.2, 8b.4.3¸8b.4.4 - 8b.4.9, 8b.8.8-8b.8.10
Exam Board Guidance		8b.8.7, 8b.8.11-8b.8.33, 8b.9.3
Distance Learning Assessment and Award Scheme	2019-20	8b.9.4 - 8b.9.7.1, 8b.9.8.3-8b.9.8.8, 8b.10
Module Moderation Policy	2019	8b.6
Resits Policy	2013	8b.9.11
External Examiner Handbook	2018	8b.7
New additions		8b.3, 8b.8.5-8b.8.6, 8b.9.9

8b.1 Introduction

8b.1.1 These regulations apply to students registered on Distance Learning credit-bearing programmes at Level 7 of the [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-awarding Bodies](#) (FHEQ) at the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), including Master's degrees, Postgraduate Diplomas and Postgraduate Certificates.

8b.1.2 The **regulations for face-to-face postgraduate taught degrees** can be found in [Chapter 8a of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#).

8b.1.3 All students register for the award and re-register annually for the modules they are studying. Students are bound by the regulations in force each year of registration.

8b.1.4 This chapter sets out principles of assessment and rules for making awards for the following programmes offered by the University of London Worldwide under the academic direction of the LSHTM:

- Clinical Trials (CT)
- Demography and Health (DH)
- Epidemiology (EP)
- Global Health Policy (GHP)
- Infectious Diseases (ID)
- Public Health (PH)

8b.2 The Admission of Students to Taught Postgraduate Programmes

8b.2.1 In order to be admitted to a Taught Postgraduate degree programme of LSHTM, an applicant must meet LSHTM's minimum entry requirements, which can be found in LSHTM's [Postgraduate Taught Admissions Policy](#).

8b.2.2   Application for admission to a programme and registration shall be undertaken in accordance with procedures specified by LSHTM and the University of London Worldwide.

8b.2.3   Satisfaction of the criteria referred to in paragraphs 8b.2.1 to 8b.2.2 does not guarantee admission to LSHTM and the University of London Worldwide.

8b.2.4 Further to these regulations, LSHTM and the University of London Worldwide have a separate [Postgraduate Taught Admissions Policy](#) and [English Language Requirements Policy](#).

8b.3 Registration for Distance Learning Programmes

8b.3.1 Refer to the Registration section within the [University of London General Regulations.](#)

8b.4 Assessment and Award Scheme

8b.4.1 In the context of these regulations, 'assessment' refers to all types of assessed work within a Distance Learning (DL) taught postgraduate programme of study at LSHTM. This includes all varieties of module assessments including formal LSHTM examinations and Project Reports. Where the word 'examination' is used, this will refer explicitly to formal written examinations.

8b.4.2 The overall aim of assessment is to facilitate students' learning regarding key elements of each programme and module, and to test that the student has reached the minimum standard acceptable for the award. LSHTM assessment strategy sets out to:

i. Measure the achievement of specified learning outcomes in a valid, robust, reliable and fair way.

ii. Identify whether each student has attained a minimum level of achievement necessary to pass the programme or module, and identify those who fail to achieve that level.

iii. Support desirable learning strategies, including to focus learning on the important aspects of each programme or module and provide a means of encouragement.

iv. Provide feedback on performance so that learning may improve.

v. Interfere as little as possible with other important, but ungraded, aspects of students' educational experience.

vi. Identify those students achieving the highest standards so that they can be considered for a Distinction.

8b.4.3 LSHTM postgraduate taught programme assessment will test a range of knowledge and skills at Level 7 of the [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-awarding Bodies](#) and [Master's Degree Characteristics Statement](#) – testing and rewarding critical appreciation and the ability to apply what has been learnt, rather than the passive reproduction of memorised facts.

8b.4.4 At LSHTM assessment is an integrated learning experience and not used merely as a grading process. In line with the wider Higher Education sector, LSHTM uses both summative and formative assessment to support learning:

- **Formative assessments** result in feedback on a student's performance and is designed to help them learn more effectively and to maintain and improve their progress. Marks given to formative assessments do not contribute to any credit or the final mark, grade or class of degree awarded to the student.

- **Summative assessment** is a formal assessment of a student's work which contributes to the final result.

8b.4.5 Assessment reflects the intended learning outcomes and content of each programme or module, and cover both essential outcomes and the range of potential learning that students may be expected to demonstrate. Key

details about assessment methods and requirements are set out in programme specifications for each award-bearing programme, and in module specifications for modules.

8b.4.6 Assessment grading will be criterion-referenced, testing achievement against a specified set of abilities, skills and behaviours (although the awards of Distinction and Merit may take into account the proportion of students achieving higher grades). Sufficient information about grading criteria is made available with each assessment task so as to give both students and markers a broad understanding of what is required to pass or do well.

8b.4.7 Grading criteria should ensure that all students achieving a minimum standard will pass the relevant programme or module, subject to full participation.

8b.4.8 Feedback to students about in-course assessment performance is provided to students in sufficient detail to help students learn and improve for the future.

8b.4.9 The assessment process is subject to rigorous quality assurance procedures, including moderation by nominated internal moderators and sampling by External Examiners.

8b.4.10 Any suspected assessment irregularities (including, plagiarism, cheating or fraud, as defined by LSHTM) will be subject to procedures and penalties as detailed in the Plagiarism and Assessment Irregularities Policy in Chapter 7, *General Academic Regulations* of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

8b.4.11 Where assessment of individual students has been affected by unforeseen extenuating circumstances, this should be taken into account according to the procedures set out in the Extenuating Circumstances Policy in Chapter 7 of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

8b.4.12   Students who fail assessments such that they fail to gain credits for a relevant module or degree element should be granted a re-sit opportunity by the relevant Board of Examiners in line with the Re-sits Policy for Distance Learning Students detailed in <u>section 8b.9.11 of this chapter</u>.

Assessment structures and methods

8b.4.13   LSHTM operates a credit system covering the bulk of award-bearing and modular provision. Under this, credits are gained for passing individual modules or degree elements. Degree awards are determined on the basis of accumulating the required number of credits as specified in <u>Chapter 2, *Qualifications and Taught Credit Framework* of the LSHTM Academic Manual</u>.

8b.4.14   For degrees delivered by DL all programmes offers awards of Master of Science (MSc), Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip), and Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert).

8b.4.15   For degrees delivered by DL, all programmes will be composed of modules, which may be assessed by either examinations taken under formal conditions, coursework or a combination of both. Some programmes may also include a final project report.

8b.4.16   Boards of Examiners are responsible for setting module-level examination paper questions which are reviewed by the External Examiner. The Board of Examiners will set marking criteria/schemes for examinations and the research project.

8b.4.17   Oversight of individual module assessment is delegated by the relevant Boards of Examiners to individual Module Organisers, who will set and agree specific marking schemes for their modules in advance.

General assessment principles

8b.4.18   Grading scales and criteria

LSHTM uses a standard assessment system, marking against six integer grade points (GPs) on a scale from 0 to 5. Grades 2 and above are pass grades, whilst grades below 2 are fail grades. Table 1 outlines the standard descriptors which describe the level of work required to attain each grade.

8b.4.19 Marking schemes

More detailed criteria ('marking schemes') may be set for individual assessments to enable the placing of assessment in each grade category. The descriptors in Table 1 are intended as a general reference point to ensure consistency, but more specific requirements may differ from assessment to assessment.

8b.4.20 Double-marking

All summative assessed work will be double-marked and any discrepancies between markers resolved before a grade is agreed. Pairs of markers must agree any grades which are formally reported to students.

8b.4.21 Principles for combining grades

Where an assessment has a number of elements which are individually double-marked, these element grades may be averaged together (according to a weighting set out in the marking scheme) to generate a grade point average (GPA). Calculations and record-keeping systems should mathematically combine and bring forward data without rounding where possible; results should be reported to students (and if necessary, rounded) to two decimal places.

8b.4.22 Award components and elements

The major components of each programme or award are modules. Award components may be split into different elements – for example, an

'assessed assignment' element and an 'examination' element for a particular module.

Table 1: Standard descriptors for each grade*

Grade point	Descriptor	Typical work should include evidence of...	Simple general criteria for qualitative work	Simple general criteria for quantitative work
5	Excellent	Excellent engagement with the topic, excellent depth of understanding and insight, excellent argument and analysis. Generally, this work will be 'distinction standard'. NB that excellent work does not have to be 'outstanding' or exceptional by comparison with other students; these grades should not be capped to a limited number of students per class or cohort. Nor should such work be expected to be 100% perfect – some minor inaccuracies or omissions may be permissible.	A comprehensive discussion of the topic giving all relevant information, showing in-depth critical understanding of the topic, going beyond conventional answers, and bringing in additional relevant ideas or material.	All correct.
4	Very good	Very good engagement with the topic, very good depth of understanding and insight, very good argument and analysis. This work may be 'borderline distinction standard'. Note that very good work may have some inaccuracies or omissions but not enough to question the understanding of the subject matter.	A full discussion of the topic that includes all relevant information and critical evaluation.	Almost all correct, none incorrect.
3	Good	Good (but not necessarily comprehensive) engagement with the topic, clear understanding and insight, reasonable argument and analysis, but may have inaccuracies or omissions.	The major points are discussed, but relevant, though less important considerations, are omitted.	Most correct, a few incorrect allowed.
2	Satisfactory	Adequate evidence of engagement with the topic but some gaps in understanding or insight, routine argument and analysis, and may have inaccuracies or omissions.	Sufficient relevant information is included but not all major points are discussed, and there may be some errors in interpretation.	Essential parts correct (to be defined for each task), some incorrect.
1	Unsatisfactory / poor (fail)	Inadequate engagement with the topic, gaps in understanding, poor argument and analysis.	A few points are included, but lack of understanding is shown together with use of irrelevant points.	Some correct but essential part (to be defined for each task) incorrect or unknown.
0	Very poor (fail)	Poor engagement with the topic, limited understanding, very poor argument and analysis.	None of the major points present; many irrelevant points included and a serious lack of understanding	Very few (or none) correct, essential parts incorrect.

Grade point	Descriptor	Typical work should include evidence of...	Simple general criteria for qualitative work	Simple general criteria for quantitative work
0	Not submitted (null)	Null mark may be given where work has not been submitted, or is in serious breach of assessment criteria/regulations.	Not submitted	Not attempted

* See Table 3 for the conversion table used by Clinical Trials.

Specific assessment rules

8b.4.23 Grades for module assignments

8b.4.23.1 Module assessed assignments will be graded by two markers, who should assign an agreed GP (5, 4, 3, 2, 1 or 0).

8b.4.23.2 Percentage or numeric marking schemes may be used for some elements of work. In such cases, percentages or numeric mark totals should be converted to a GP on the standard scale, which can be taken forward for combination with other GPs or GPAs. (See Table 3 for the conversion table used by Clinical Trials.)

8b.4.24 Grades for unseen written examinations

8b.4.24.1 Exam Boards must approve specific marking schemes for each exam paper at the point where the exam questions are approved. In most cases, individual exam questions should be marked as a single unit of assessment on the integer grading scale. However, exam questions may be based on numeric marking schemes, producing numeric results which are then converted to a GPA using an appropriate specific conversion scheme.

8b.4.24.2 Where a question is being marked with an overall integer GP, if the two markers have awarded different grades, then the difference must be reconciled by discussion between them, not in some way averaged away. Where a question is marked using a numeric marking scheme (*see* paragraph 8b.4.24.3 below), the two marks may be averaged and then

converted to a GP, provided that the marks do not differ by more than 20% of the available marks – in which case the markers must discuss and reconcile to a final mark.

8b.4.24.3 Where a numeric marking scheme is used, and the exam paper marking scheme requires that an integer GP be awarded for the question, the two markers will agree a final mark for each question – to be converted to a GP using the agreed scheme for that paper (see Table 4 for the scheme used by Epidemiology). Where the exam paper marking scheme does <u>not</u> require an integer GP to be awarded for individual questions, the procedure outlined in paragraph 8b.4.24.5 below should be followed.

8b.4.24.4 After paragraph 8b.4.24.2 or 8b.4.24.3 above have been applied, the final GPs for each question in the paper will be combined and the mean calculated to provide the final GPA for that paper, in line with question weightings in the agreed marking scheme for the paper, as follows:

$$\textstyle\sum \text{(Question GP x Question weighting)} = \text{GPA for whole paper.}$$

8b.4.24.5 As an alternative to paragraphs 8b.4.24.2, 8b.4.24.3 and 8b.4.24.4 above, approved marking schemes may specify that individual exam questions be marked numerically, and scores combined into a numeric result for the overall paper which is then converted to a GPA for the paper (this conversion should produce a GPA and should not round to an integer GP). Numeric marks should be reconciled between markers for each individual question (as per 2.1 above), such that a single agreed numeric mark can be calculated for the paper as a whole and then converted to a GPA. (See Table 3 for the conversion table used by Clinical Trials.)

8b.4.25 Grades for modules overall

8b.4.25.1 Module assessment is summarised in Table 2.

8b.4.25.2 Where a module is assessed solely by an assessed assignment (AA), the module will be graded as outlined in paragraphs 8b.4.23.1 and 8b.4.23.2 above.

8b.4.25.3 Where a module is assessed solely by an unseen written exam, the module will be graded as outlined in Section 8b.4.24 above.

8b.4.25.4 Where a module is assessed by two elements of assessment, the module will be graded with an overall GPA calculated as outlined in Table 2.

8b.4.25.5 Where a module has changed assessment method and students registered in a previous year for the module have not completed all elements of assessment for the module or are required to resit some/all of the module assessment, such students will normally be required to sit the assessment method set in the year they first entered to be examined in the module.

Table 2: Module assessment summary

Modules	Assessment and GPA calculation
CTM1	Unseen written examination (100%)
CTM202, CTM204, CTM205, CTM207, CTM208	(20% x AA GP) + (80% x exam GPA) = module GPA
CTM201	(80% x AA GP) + (20% x group work contribution) = module GPA
CTM210	AA (100%)
CTM203	(30% x AA1 GP) + (70% x AA2 GP) = module GPA
CTM206, CTM209	(50% x AA1 GP) + (50% x AA2 GP) = module GPA
DEM1, DEM2	(30% x AA GP) + (70% x exam GPA) = module GPA
EPM101, EPM102, EPM103	Unseen written examination (100%)
EPM105, EPM201, EPM202, EPM304	AA (100%)

Modules	Assessment and GPA calculation
EPM202, EPM301, EPM307	(30% x AA GP) + (70% x exam GPA) = module GPA
GHM101, GHM102, GHM103	Unseen written examination (100%)
GHM104, GHM204	(30% x AA GP) + (70% x exam GPA) = module GPA
GHM201	(50% x AA1 GP) + (50% x AA2 GP) = module GPA
GHM202, GHM203	(30% x AA1 GP) + (70% x AA2 GP) = module GPA
IDM101, IDM103, IDM104	Unseen written examination (100%)
IDM102	(50% x AA1 GP) + (50% x AA2 GP) = module GPA
IDM2, IDM3, IDM5, IDM601	(30% x AA GP) + (70% x exam GPA) = module GPA
PHM1	Unseen written examination (100%)
PHM201, PHM203, PHM205, PHM206, PHM207, PHM209, PHM210, PHM2011, PHM212, PHM213, PHM214, PHM215, PHM216, PHM218 PHM219	(30% x AA GP) + (70% x exam GPA) = module GPA
PHM204	(30% x AA1 GP) + (70% x AA2 GP) = module GPA

8b.4.26 Project Reports

8b.4.26.1 MSc projects (assessed wholly by a Project Report) will be marked by two markers who will award an agreed GP (5, 4, 3, 2, 1 or 0).

8b.4.27 Qualifying examination (EP only)

8b.4.27.1 For the MSc EP programme, the additional qualifying examination EPM400 will be marked by an unseen written paper as set out in paragraph 8b.4.24 above.

Award scheme

8b.4.28 Credits will be awarded for the successful completion of programme components (which may be offered by individual courses on a compulsory or elective basis), as follows:

- PHM1 modules *[known as 'core' modules]* – 10 credits each
- CTM1, DEM1, EPM1, GHM1 and IDM1 modules *[known as 'core' modules]* – 15 credits each
- CTM2, DEM2, EPM2, EPM3, GHM2, IDM2, IDM3, IDM5, IDM6, PHM2 modules *[known as 'elective' modules]* – 15 credits each
- CTM210 (integrating module) – 30 credits
- DH, EP, GHP, ID and PH project reports – 45 credits*

* Where the previous shorter project option has already been taken by MSc PH students registered prior to 1 September 2011 who transfer into the credit framework, this will be assigned 30 credits.

8b.4.29 In order to gain credits for a particular award component, students must normally pass that component with an overall GP or GPA of at least 2.00. Otherwise, credit may only be awarded using the credit compensation rules in section 8b.9.8 below.

8b.4.30 Students cannot gain credits for a particular award component if they obtain an overall GP or GPA of less than 1.00 for any of:

- The award component overall
- The assessed assignment element (where there is an assessed assignment)

8b.4.31 Students cannot gain credits for any of the following specific award components if they obtain an overall GP or GPA of less than 2.00:

- The Project Report (DH, EP, GHP, ID or PH MSc students)

- CTM210 Integrating Module (CT MSc students only)
- CTM101 Fundamentals of Clinical Trials (CT students only)
- DEM101 Introduction to Demographic Analysis (DH students only)
- DEM102 Population Studies (DH students only)
- EPM101 Fundamentals of Epidemiology (EP students only)
- EPM102 Statistics for Epidemiology (EP students only)
- PHM206 Environmental Health Policy (only for MSc Public Health students registered on the Environment & Health stream)
- PHM212 Organisational Management (only for MSc Public Health students registered on the Health Services Management stream)
- PHM213 Principles and Practice of Health Promotion (only for MSc Public Health students registered on the Health Promotion stream)

These are known as 'uncompensatable' award components. (See also Table 8 below.)

8b.4.32 Where a student fails to gain credits for a module, they have the option to either resit the failed component of the module assessment, as outlined in the Resits Policy for Distance Learning Students in section 8b.9.11 below, or substitute the failed module with an alternative elective module, as outlined in paragraph 8b.9.11.2 below in order to gain credit.

8b.4.33 DH, GHP, ID and PH students choosing to study the Project report must pass the Project report with a grade of 2.00 or above. Students who have failed the Project report once have the option to re-submit it. Alternatively, students have the option to substitute three further elective modules in place of the report in order to gain credits. For PH students who have taken the shorter project option (not available for students registered for the project after 2010-11), then two further elective modules should be substituted rather than three.

Table 3: Conversion table used by Clinical Trials

Mark (out of 100)	GP/GPA	Descriptor	Typical work should include evidence of...
76 up	4.6 - 5	Excellent	Excellent engagement with the topic, excellent depth of understanding and insight, excellent argument and analysis. Generally, this work will be 'distinction standard'.
			NB that excellent work does not have to be 'outstanding' or exceptional by comparison with other students; these grades should not be capped to a limited number of students per class or cohort. Nor should such work be expected to be 100% perfect – some minor inaccuracies or omissions may be permissible.
66.5 - 75.99	3.65 - 4.59	Very good	Very good engagement with the topic, very good depth of understanding and insight, very good argument and analysis. This work may be 'borderline distinction standard'.
			Note that very good work may have some inaccuracies or omissions but not enough to question the understanding of the subject matter.
56.5 - 66.49	2.65 - 3.64	Good	Good (but not necessarily comprehensive) engagement with the topic, clear understanding and insight, reasonable argument and analysis, but may have inaccuracies or omissions.
50 - 56.49	2 - 2.64	Satisfactory	Adequate evidence of engagement with the topic but some gaps in understanding or insight, routine argument and analysis, and may have inaccuracies or omissions.

| 40 - 49.99 | 1 - 1.99 | Unsatisfactory /poor (fail) | Inadequate engagement with the topic, gaps in understanding, poor argument and analysis. |
| 0 - 39.99 | 0 - 0.99 | Very poor (fail) / not submitted (null) | Poor engagement with the topic, limited understanding, very poor argument and analysis. Null mark may be given where work has not been submitted, or is in serious breach of assessment criteria/regulations. |

Table 4 Conversion scheme used by Epidemiology

The mean percentage of all questions for an exam paper is calculated, and the following formula is used, subject to the discretion of the Board of Examiners, to convert this mean percentage to an overall grade point for the module exam paper:

Mean percentage (P)	Grade point (GP)
If P >= 80%	GP = 5
If 40% <= P <=79%	GP = (P –30)/10
If P < 40%	GP= 0

8b.5 Regulations for Examinations

8b.5.1 Information about Distance Learning (DL) Examinations at the University of London (UoL) can be found at https://london.ac.uk/current-students/examinations

8b.5.2 DL Students are notified of their admissions notice by the UOL which is downloadable from the UOL Student Portal. Information about examination entry can be found at https://my.london.ac.uk/examination-entry

8b.5.3   The Board of Examiners may permit the use of books, notes, instruments or other materials or aids in specific examinations (written, practical, oral or similar). If this is permitted the requirements will be set out in the instructions for the examination. Upon entry to the examination room, all other belongings (including bags and coats) not expressly permitted for the exam must be placed at the front or side of the examination room well away from the students and in sight of the invigilators.

8b.5.4   Except as provided in paragraph 8b.5.3 above, no books, notes, instruments or other materials or aids whatsoever may be introduced into an examination room or be handled or consulted during an examination. Any such materials or aids in the possession of the student on entry to the examination room must be deposited immediately with the Invigilator.

8b.5.5 Where electronic calculators are permitted they may be pre-programmable calculators. Personal digital assistants (PDAs), mobile phones or other devices which may have a wireless or internet connection are strictly forbidden.

8b.5.6   Any unauthorised materials or aids introduced by a student into an examination room must be given to the Invigilator upon request. Any aids may be handed over by the Invigilator to LSHTM authorities which may make copies and the original aids (together with any copies) may be retained by LSHTM at its absolute discretion.

8b.5.7   Students shall not, unless expressly so authorised, pass any information from one to another during an examination nor shall any student act in collusion with another student or other person or copy from another student or engage in any similar activity.

8b.5.8   At any examination by written papers taken under supervision or where the regulations for any qualification provide for part of an examination to consist of 'take-away' papers, essays or other work written in a student's own time, coursework assessment or any

similar form of test, the work submitted by the student must be their own and any quotation from the published or unpublished works of other persons must be duly acknowledged.

8b.5.9   Failure to observe any of the provisions of paragraphs 8b.5.1 – 8b.5.*8* above will constitute an examination offence. All examination offences will be treated as cheating or irregularities of a similar character under LSHTM's Assessment Irregularities Policy as detailed in [Chapter 7 of the LSHTM Academic Manual](). Under these regulations students found to have committed an offence may be excluded from all further examinations of LSHTM.

8b.5.10 All answers to examination questions must be written in English.

8b.5.11 Examination scripts are the property of UoL and will not be returned to students.

8b.6 Internal Moderation

Distance Learning Module Moderation Policy

Document Type	Policy
Document owner	Pro Director (Education)
Approved by	Quality & Standards Committee
Approval date	March 2016
Review date	
Version	1.2
Amendments	1.0 Policy established (March 2016)
	1.1 Policy updated (June 2019)
	1.2 Included in Academic Manual, DL and F2F sections split (August 2019)

Related Policies & Procedures	Provide hyperlinks

- This document is available electronically, along with copies of relevant forms, on the [Quality & Academic Standards webpages](#).

8b.6.1 SCOPE (i.e. who does this affect)

8b.6.1.1 This document sets out LSHTM's formal policy and procedures for reconciliation and moderation of module assessment tasks and grades. It lists what actions need to be taken, by whom and when. All staff involved in these processes should be aware of these details.

8b.6.1.2 All modules which form part of the LSHTM's main (Master's-focused) module portfolio should be covered by this policy – though procedures work slightly differently for London-based and Distance Learning (DL) modules. All modules offered by LSHTM are expected to be at Master's level, level 7 of the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications of Degree-Awarding Bodies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ).

8b.6.1.3 Modules which are run primarily as part of a non-Master's programme and which do not form part of the main module portfolio should also follow the approach outlined in this policy. If individual programme regulations make a different approach more appropriate, this should be specifically agreed by the relevant Board of Examiners and the Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee (SPGTC).

8b.6.2 OVERALL POLICY

8b.6.2.1 **Marking policy:** All staff involved in the moderation process should be aware of the LSHTM's marking practices and procedures, contained in [section 8b.4 of this chapter](#) and in the [Assessment Handbook and Board of Examiner Guidance](#).

8b.6.2.2 **Board of Examiners' responsibilities for individual modules:** Each module has been allocated to a Board of Examiners, to take responsibility for assuring the standard and practice of assessment on the module (this includes assessment-setting, as detailed in the [Board of Examiners Guidance](#)). The allocation of modules to Boards is agreed annually by the SPGTC, and details for the current academic year can be found [here](#). Individual face-to-face modules may be taken by students from across a number of programmes, but will be allocated to one named Board of Examiners (even if the module is seen as equally core to other programmes). DL modules are generally moderated by the Board for the programme to which the module code prefix refers.

8b.6.2.3 **Reconciliation of grades:** All assessments are marked by a first and second marker, with the first marker responsible for compiling feedback. When the first and second markers disagree about the grade to be given to a particular piece of work or question, then the differences must be reconciled by discussion between them, and not averaged away. It is considered that through discussion the true benefits of double marking – ensuring that every grade awarded truly represents the quality of the work submitted – can be obtained. Where the first and second markers strongly disagree, they should seek additional input from a senior marker. A senior marker is an experienced marker with relevant subject expertise and may include, but is not restricted to, the Module Organiser (MO). The senior marker's role is to provide additional neutral perspective to aid the considerations of the first and second markers in reaching an agreed mark. The senior marker may review the work in question in order to provide informed insight but should not undertake to mark the work. In the event that the first and second marker are still unable to agree a mark, even after consulting with a senior marker, the Exam Board Chair should be advised of the impasse and the Chair will take the final decision on the mark to be awarded.

8b.6.2.4 **Moderation of grades:** For modules which include a specific summative assessment, when all work has been graded it is the responsibility of the appointed Board of Examiners to moderate the grades. As detailed at paragraphs 8b.6.6.2 and 8b.6.7.1 below, under 'Action by Moderators', this entails:

i) Reviewing the assessment task, marking guidelines and grading criteria.

ii) Reviewing a sample of assessed work.

iii) Reviewing the distribution of grades for the module as a whole.

iv) Requesting the Board of Examiners to direct any re-marking of selected sets of work if problems are identified.

v) Finally, confirming the validity of all grades by means of a Module Moderator's Report.

8b.6.2.5 Moderation will normally be carried out by the relevant Exam Board Chair, or may be delegated by the Chair to a nominee. Persons undertaking this role are referred to as the 'Moderator' in this policy. Chairs of the Boards of Examiners should report back to their Board on how moderation work has been divided or allocated.

MODERATION FOR DL MODULES

8b.6.3 SPECIFIC POLICIES FOR DL MODULE MODERATION

8b.6.3.1 **Scope:** Procedures for moderation of DL module grades should apply equally to coursework assignments and to exams, although it will be at the discretion of individual Boards or Moderators as to whether these are looked at together or separately.

8b.6.3.2 **Allocation of responsibility:** Chairs of the Boards of Examiners will normally carry out the moderation, or will delegate this task to a nominee who is another member of the Board of Examiners, of the different modules under their remit. This is to ensure an appropriate spread of workload, so as not to overburden individual members of the Board, and to ensure that modules are reviewed by a subject expert.

8b.6.3.3 **Role and responsibilities of Moderators:** Moderators' specific responsibilities are to scrutinise the consistency and standard of assessment marking for both assessed assignment scripts and exam scripts from their designated module(s).

- Moderators may not alter marks. Moderator may make recommendations to the Board of Examiners to revisit marking if they have sufficient justification for doing so.

- The role of the Moderator does not in any way replace the responsibilities of the Board of Examiners or External Examiners, who still have ultimate oversight of all assessments for a programme so as to assure overall standards. Rather, moderation provides a mechanism for thorough quality assurance of assessment, at the same time spreading the workload amongst a number of individuals.

8b.6.3.4 **Moderation timescales:** DL module moderation is expected to be completed **between the end of exam marking and the Boards of Examiners sitting in July or in the autumn to ratify module grades**. While this is a short window, it is generally consistent with deadlines for face-to-face modules.

- Moderation should ideally be completed before meetings of any Board of Examiners for programmes which included students who took the module that year; and should always be completed ahead of the meeting of the Board responsible for the module.

- Moderation of DL coursework assignments may be undertaken separately, and ahead of, moderation of DL exam scripts. This can help reduce the workload required during the peak period between exams and Board of Examiners meetings.

8b.6.4 NOMINATIONS OF MODERATORS FOR DL MODULES

8b.6.4.1 The Exam Board Chair will normally carry out the moderation of modules or will delegate this task to a nominee who is another member of the Board.

8b.6.4.2 Moderators must be members of that Board of Examiners. If a potential Moderator is identified who is not currently a member of the relevant Board then they may be co-opted as a new member. External Examiners are not involved in the module moderation process.

8b.6.4.3 Moderators should not normally have been involved in any of the assessments, e.g. question-setting or marking, for the module they are moderating. However, it is permissible for them to have had some involvement (especially on specialist areas where it may be very difficult to identify staff who have not already been involved in some way) if a strong argument can be made that they would otherwise be the best Moderator for this material.

8b.6.4.4 MOs must not act as Moderator for their own module(s). In the event that the Exam Board Chair is also MO for a module under the authority of that Board, moderation must be delegated to an alternate.

8b.6.4.5 The Exam Board Chair should advise the Distance Learning Office (DLO) of who the Moderator for each module will be, ahead of the process commencing.

8b.6.5 MARKING PROCEDURE TO GENERATE PROVISION GRADES

8b.6.5.1 **Action by Markers:** All assessed work for the module must be double-marked and reconciled in line with formal LSHTM policy. Marks are entered online, and the agreed mark confirmed by both markers, via the Assignment Management System (AMS). First markers also write feedback about each candidate's performance in coursework tasks.

8b.6.5.2 **Action by MOs – monitoring grades:** Grades entered via the AMS will flow through to the DL student database. The DLO will ensure systems allow MOs to be kept informed of provisional module marks as they come in over the course of the year, and/or to be able to review up-to-date lists of grades at any point.

- Unlike for face-to-face programmes, DL MOs are not expected to conduct preliminary checks before students are sent their provisional grades. This is due to the large number of assignments involved, and the fact that these are marked and fed back to students as they come in rather than being held until a set point after the assignment deadline.

- However, MOs may wish to check or sample grades at a preliminary stage, as they see fit – e.g. to consider whether there is consistency between pairs of markers or whether some are more lenient/strict than others. Occasionally, at this stage the MO may identify a need for work to be re-marked.

- MOs are also encouraged to review samples of assessment feedback written by markers – particularly new markers – to assure its quality and consistency. This may be done before final agreed feedback is uploaded to the AMS and made available to students.

8b.6.5.3 **Disseminating grades to students:** Students will be able to access their provisional grades and assessment feedback (as written by first-markers) via the AMS.

8b.6.5.4 All module marking should normally be completed, so that overall module grades are available for each student who has completed the necessary assessments, usually within 4-6 weeks of the last exam or hand-in deadline. All materials required for moderation should thus be available within three weeks of this date, and be forwarded to the relevant Moderator as soon as possible thereafter.

8b.6.6 MODERATION PROCEDURE FOR DL MODULES

8b.6.6.1 **Action by Module Administrators – despatching moderation material:** For each module, after all relevant work has been graded, the Programme Administrator or other appropriate member of DLO staff must **send materials for moderation** to the Moderator (cc the MO, if they have not already seen a final list of provisional grades for the module).

- The list of standard material to be sent should serve as a checklist both for the Programme Administrator in despatching materials, and the Moderator on receiving them. Examples of all the materials on this list must be sent for moderation.

- Note that for DL modules, 'module grade sheets' normally take the form of Excel spreadsheets based on a download from the AMS; while the cover sheet with the sample of assessment scripts should usually

give Student Numbers rather than Candidate Numbers (since the latter are only used for examinations in DL).

- The Moderator may also request additional material from the Programme Administrator, either before or after receiving the standard set of materials. Should the DLO have any difficulties in meeting such a request, the Programme Administration Manager should report back on this to the Moderator.

8b.6.6.2 **Action by Moderator:** The moderation process, namely scrutiny and confirmation by the Moderator, may be divided into five distinct tasks as follows:

Moderators should **review the distribution of grades** for the module. As outlined in the Code of Practice on Assessment, if this deviates significantly from other grade distributions at Programme or LSHTM level, this should be considered in more depth – to confirm that the marks given are indeed in line with LSHTM criteria. For comparative purposes, the DLO should supply longitudinal data for the most recent five years, at least for the LSHTM as a whole.

More extensive information is also available from Head of DLO on request, e.g. for individual modules or groups of modules.

i) Moderators should also **review the sample of assessed work**. If there are any queries, or if grades are difficult to understand, Moderators may wish to discuss matters with the MO.

ii) Moderators may recommend the re-marking and re-grading of the assessed work. Any re-marking must be equitable, and the work of all students who may have been similarly affected should be reviewed for potential re-marking, whilst ensuring that no student is disadvantaged by this process. However, it is not necessary to revisit all module grades if the issue identified will not affect all students. For modules, re-marking should normally be done by MOs in the first instance, or other marking staff designated by them in the second instance. The Moderator should consult with the MO to understand the actions taken before ratifying any re-marking.

iii) Moderators should **affirm the appropriateness of the assessment task, the marking guidelines and the criteria used to award grades**. Matters to consider include:

- Whether the assessment task was set at an appropriate level for a Master's award, as per the FHEQ. Further guidance about this is given in the LSHTM [Course & Module Design Code of Practice](#).

- Whether it appropriately assessed the learning objectives of the Module.

- Whether the assessment task was of reasonable scope, expecting neither too much nor too little, and well-matched to the credit value of the module.

- Whether instructions to students were consistent with the task and grading criteria, so as to give students a clear idea of what was expected in order to get a specific grade.

- Whether marking guidelines were sufficiently clear to guide markers in determining a student's grade.

iv) Moderators should then **complete and sign the [Moderator's Report form](#)** and return it to the appropriate TPD.

- For DL modules, moderation is intended to act as a quality assurance check on the consistency, standard and validity of marking – but note that it does *not* change the status of relevant grades from 'provisional' to 'confirmed'. **Module grades should not be confirmed <u>prior to</u> the Boards of Examiners**.

- Since most DL modules are assessed through substantive module exams in addition to any coursework, final module grades should only be confirmed at the Board of Examiners' meetings and may still be subject to alteration by the Board at that point. **Once grades have been confirmed by the designated Board of Examiners, they may <u>not</u> be subsequently altered by either this or any other Board.**

8b.6.6.3 **Moderation deadline:** As noted earlier, moderation is expected to be completed between the end of exam marking and Boards of Examiners sitting in July to ratify module grades, although coursework assignments may be moderated earlier.

- **The deadline for the completion of moderation for DL modules is a week prior to the Board of Examiners or pre-Board meeting, whichever is the earliest.**

REPORTING ON MODERATION AND CONFIRMING GRADES

8b.6.7 REPORTING ON THE MODERATION PROCESS

8b.6.7.1 **Action by Moderators:** Moderators should confirm completion of the process, and ratification of final grades, by means of their reports. Where possible, Moderators should attend relevant interim Board of Examiners' meetings. Moderators' reports do not need to have been countersigned by TPDs before being seen by Boards of Examiners.

8b.6.7.2 **Action by TPDs:** Once received from Moderators, the appropriate TPD for each module should countersign Moderator's Report forms – noting any specific issues for follow-up, signing, and returning the form to the relevant Module Administrator with a copy to the Exam Board Chair. The TPD should also follow up with the relevant MO and/or Exam Board Chair on any identified issues.

8b.6.7.3 **Monitoring by SPGTC:** TPDs should report back to the SPGTC regarding any issues identified in or followed up from Moderators' reports. This should normally be done via the 'Module Review Summary' which TPDs are asked to produce for SPGTC annually. SPGTC also considers analysis of grade distributions annually.

8b.6.8 CONFIRMATION OF GRADES TO STUDENTS

8b.6.8.1 **Grades for students registered on LSHTM programmes** (whether face-to-face or DL) should be fed back to them directly after marking, as "provisional subject to final ratification by the Board of Examiners".

8b.6.8.2 **Grades for Module students** (i.e. those not registered on a formal or award-bearing LSHTM programme) should be treated as final following moderation, and fed back to them directly with their certificate of attendance. Procedures and record-keeping should, however, make allowance for cases of assessment irregularities or administrative errors

subsequently being identified which might necessitate a revision to the
mark.

8b.6.8.3 **If provisional marks change** following moderation, for registered
students, the changes may (at the discretion of the Moderator or the
Exam Board Chair, and the MO) be fed back prior to the Board of
Examiners confirming them – but still indicated as provisional, despite
marks being unlikely to change again. Definitive marks should only be fed
back after the Board of Examiners has confirmed them.

8b.6.8.4 **Final grades for inclusion in degree transcript or Diploma
Supplement records** will be generated from master data held on SITS for
London-based students, and held on a University of London Worldwide
database for University of London Worldwide students.

8b.7 External Moderation

8b.7.1   The purpose of external moderation is to give each External
Examiner confidence in the appropriateness and consistency of marking
in line with the LSHTM's marking criteria and to establish benchmarks and
make recommendations to be discussed at to the Board of Examiners,
especially relating to borderline cases. External Examiners will be
provided with samples of exam scripts, assignments and projects, to
review prior to the final Exam Board, along with grades sheet covering all
candidates from the programme

8b.7.2 For further information on the External Examining procedure for Distance
Learning Programme see the University of London Worldwide website
page: About External Examiners

8b.8 Boards of Examiners

8b.8.1 University of London Worldwide (UoLW) shall set up Boards of Examiners for each programme in consultation with LSHTM.

8b.8.2 Each Board shall include examiners who are not members of staff of LSHTM and UoLW. These External Examiners shall have regard to the totality of each degree programme and shall be involved and particularly influential in the decisions relating to the award of every degree. They shall report to UoLW and LSHTM each year, and shall comment specifically on the validity and integrity of the assessment process and the standard of student attainment.

8b.8.3 Examination procedures shall ensure that assessment is and can be shown to be fair and impartial.

8b.8.4 Each Board of Examiners shall ensure, among other things, that the application of LSHTM's Distance Learning Award Scheme and Programme Regulations including local rules where allowed, has regard to the totality of the programme and to the requirements for progression within it, and to the requirement for each student to achieve a satisfactory overall standard.

8b.8.5 The Board of Examiners will meet to confirm grades and determine progression at 2 point during the academic year to confirm module grades and ratify awards:

- July Board of Examiners meeting to consider and confirm module grades and recommendations for resits

- November Board of Examiners meeting to consider and confirm examination and project grades and to ratify final awards or, progression/resit recommendations.

8b.8.6 On occasion it may be appropriate for the Board of Examiners to consider exit awards via circulation and approved by Chair's Action.

8b.8.7 Report on Chair's action

- The Chair should note any grades confirmed or awards ratified by Chair's action since the last meeting, e.g. for candidates given a project extension or similar, such that their grades were not available at the last meeting but it was not appropriate to defer ratification.

8b.8.8 Assessment for each award or set of awards (relating to a programme) comes under the authority of a specific Exam Board. Oversight of module assessment also comes under the authority of specific nominated Exam Boards. Students' grades are confirmed and awards ratified at final Exam Board meetings annually.

8b.8.9 Each Board includes:

- An Exam Board Chair and Deputy Chair who co-ordinate activities;
- One or more External Examiners who help to provide specific external confirmation about academic standards and the rigour of assessment processes;
- Further Internal Examiners (staff members) who are involved in setting exam questions, marking all types of assessed work, and take part in final Board meetings.

8b.8.10 Assessors may be appointed to assist Exam Boards in the setting, conducting and marking of assessments. They are not Exam Board members and cannot confirm grades or ratify awards.

General Appointment Criteria

8b.8.11 The Chair, Deputy Chair and Internal Examiners should be members of LSHTM staff, including honorary staff. The Director, Faculty Deans, Pro-Director of Education, Associate Deans of Education and Faculty Taught Programme Directors (TPDs) cannot serve as Chair, Deputy Chair or Internal Examiners.

8b.8.12 Staff should normally only hold one appointment as an Exam Board Chair at any given time unless there are good reasons (e.g. chairing

several Exam Boards in parallel due to strong academic linkages). Exam Boards will usually be set up so that linked qualifications are covered by a single Board.

8b.8.13   Staff may serve as Internal Examiners of multiple Exam Boards at the same time.

8b.8.14   The number of examiners appointed to an Exam Board, including External Examiners, should be at least the minimum sufficient to set, manage and scrutinise the relevant assessments efficiently.

8b.8.15   Appointments of External Examiners must conform to the criteria given in the External Examiner Appointment Criteria given in Chapter 5, *External Expertise* of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

Conflict of Interest

8b.8.16   Any Exam Board member (including Chairs and External Examiners), Assessor, or other member of staff or persons contracted to work in any way with LSHTM assessment or Exam Board processes must advise the Head of LSHTM Registry and UoLW of any conflict(s) of interest in this regard, as soon as they become aware of any conflict.

8b.8.17   Conflicts of interest would include having a family or personal relationship with any candidate on a Programme with which staff may be involved; being simultaneously employed or contracted by LSHTM and registered part-time for a Programme assessed via LSHTM; etc.

8b.8.18   Detailed criteria regarding conflicts of interest in External Examiner appointments are set out in Chapter 5 of the LSHTM Academic Manual or can be referred to UoLW.

8b.8.19   If a declaration is made, the Head of Registry or UoLW will decide upon reasonable action to take in consultation with those involved.

Records will show only that a declaration has been made and the action taken but not the details.

Periods of Appointment

8b.8.20   Board of Examiners are nominally appointed for calendar years, from 01 January to 31 December, but are expected to scrutinise student performance against specific academic years, which run from September to September.

8b.8.21   Year-to-year responsibilities may cross over during Term 1, when that calendar year's Board members may have to assess any summative MSc practical exams, and members who are expected to continue may be asked to start preparing summer exam questions. Membership of the Board for any given year shall remain valid until the following year's Board is appointed.

8b.8.22   Chairs and Deputy Chairs will be appointed for four consecutive academic years. In exceptional cases tenure may be extended for one further academic year providing a rationale is found acceptable by the Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee (SPGTC). This is in alignment with the length of an External Examiner tenure, however, where possible these three roles should be staggered to maintain a level of continuity at the Board of Examiners.

Appointment and Approval Procedure

8b.8.23   Re/approving Membership: The Board of Examiners membership must be submitted to the Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee SPGTC and UoLW for approval; if no nominations are received, the previous year's membership list will be put forward by the Assessments Manager for re-approval.

8b.8.24   Membership of the Board of Examiners for the following year is discussed at the final meeting of the academic year. This should include

the nomination of a new Chair and Deputy if required. Nominations will be recorded in the minutes by the Exam Board Secretary and confirmed by the Chair after the meeting. The Chair will undertake any follow up work as directed by the Board of Examiners which may include making additional nominations for new Internal Examiners or External Examiners.

8b.8.25 New External Examiners: The Exam Board Chair should be mindful of the External Examiner's tenure and be proactive in sourcing replacements. The appointment procedure for prospective External Examiners is set out in Chapter 5 of the LSHTM Academic Manual. The Exam Board Chair may require support from the Programme Director and Dean of Faculty in this procedure and it is recommended that any nominees are approached informally in the first instance.

8b.8.26 The Quality & Academic Standards office have oversight of the nomination, approval and appointment procedure for External Examiners (for more information please see Chapter 5 of the LSHTM Academic Manual);

8b.8.27 New internal members: Following the final Board of Examiners the Secretary to the Board will forward nominations for the internal membership to the Assessments Manger (Registry). The Assessments Manager will prompt where necessary to ensure this is done.

- The list of nominations must be endorsed by the Dean of Faculty before being submitted for approval;
- The list of nominations should be submitted to SPGTC and UoL for approval, however, it may be appropriate to request Chair's Action to ensure a timely approval;
- The secretary for SPGTC will send formal notification to any new Exam Board Chairs (on behalf of the Chair of SPGTC), with appropriate further guidance and information;

8b.8.28 Note on endorsing and approving nominations; the following must be scrutinised:

- Whether the proposed members of the Exam Board, including Chairs and External Examiners, are academically appropriate and competent

to examine the programme, in terms of the subject area and the level of the qualifications concerned (consistent with the national Framework for Higher Education Qualifications), and the responsibilities entailed;

- Whether nominations of new External Examiners fulfil the Appointment Criteria;

- Whether the proposed membership is consistent with the standard Constitution for Exam Boards;

- The length of time that each Chair and External Examiner has already served in their role, and whether any one-year extensions are warranted.

8b.8.29   The Assessment Manager will confirm full membership lists to each Exam Board Chair and Secretary plus Faculty TPDs; and send out links to the Assessment and Exam Board Handbook to all staff involved in examinations processes.

8b.8.30   Confirmation that all Boards have been appointed should be reported to the next meetings of SPGTC and Senate, noting that External Examiner appointments meet all the criteria set out in the Appointment Criteria.

Updates to Exam Board Membership in-year

8b.8.31   Changes to Exam Board membership may occur during the year as staff join or leave LSHTM or their commitments changes. Ex-officio members shall cease to be members on vacation of the relevant office.

8b.8.32   The Assessment Manager (Registry) must be informed immediately whenever membership changes are prompted or proposed. This will be the responsibility of the Exam Board Chair or Faculty TPD.

8b.8.33   The appointment of External Examiners and internal members is approved as per the procedure set out in paragraph in paragraphs 8b.8.25 or 8b.8.27 respectively. This is reported to the summer meeting of

SPGTC. Amendments after this point are discouraged but may be approved by Chair's Action in exceptional circumstances

8b.9 Decisions of the Board of Examiners

8b.9.1 The Board of Examiners review and confirm candidates' grades and ratify final degree awards based on the agreed Award Scheme for each programme.

8b.9.2 To be eligible for the award of a taught Master's degree, Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate, a student must, within the maximum period of registration, pass degree elements amounting to at least the minimum number of credits specified below.

8b.9.3 The Board will:
   i.   Receive confirmation that module grades have been moderated.
   ii. Receive confirmation that External Examiners have reviewed sample exam and project work, as well as sample module work. Associated External Examiner Exam/Project Moderation Forms may be tabled.
   iii. Review any relevant data on grade distributions, which may further inform any decisions about scaling of grades.
   iv. Confirm all relevant grades not previously confirmed.
   v.   Note any penalties to grades as reported to the Board of Examiners and in accordance with the penalty regulations in section 8b.9.9.
   vi. Follow the rules on Compensation in section 8b.9.8 of this chapter

8b.9.3 Review and ratification of awards
   i.   The grades sheet will include a provisional list of distinctions, merits, passes and fails for the degree(s) overall, determined according to the Taught Programme Regulations. Further to this:
   ii. The Chair and External Examiner(s) should recommend final classifications for candidates in a borderline range. Reasons should be given and recorded, and be ratified by the full Board.

iii.   The Board should decide on any candidates to be awarded a prize in line with set criteria for each prize.

8b.9.4   The number of credits that must be obtained to achieve each award is outlined in Table 5.

Table 5: Number of credits required for an award

Award	Number of credits required
Postgraduate Certificate	60
Postgraduate Diploma	120
MSc	180

8b.9.5 For an award to be made, credits must be gained from an approved list of required components. These are listed in the detailed Programme Regulations.

8b.9.6   **Final award classification rules**

8b.9.6.1 Where all elements of an award have been completed and any compensation rules applied, an 'award GPA' should be calculated to assess eligibility for an award with distinction or merit. The relevant formulae for different programmes and awards are outlined in Table 6:

Table 6: Determination of final award GPA

Programme	Award	Final GPA algorithm
CT	PGCert	= Average GPA across 4 CTM1 modules.
CT	PGDip	= [(3/7) x (average GPA across 4 CTM1 modules)] + [(4/7) x (average GPA across 4 elective modules)]
CT	MSc	= [30% x (average GPA across 4 CTM1 modules)] + [50% x (average GPA across CTM201 and best 4 other elective modules)] + [20% x (CTM210 GPA)]

Programme	Award	Final GPA algorithm
DH	PGCert	= Average GPA across DEM101, DEM102, EPM101 and EPM102 modules
DH	PGDip	= [(3/7) x (average GPA across DEM101, DEM102, EPM101 and EPM102 modules)] + [(4/7) x (average GPA across 4 elective modules)]
DH	MSc	*where no project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across DEM101, DEM102, EPM101 and EPM102 modules) + [70% x (average GPA across best 7 elective modules)] *where a project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across DEM101, DEM102, EPM101 and EPM102 modules)] + [40% x (average GPA across best 4 elective modules)] + [30% x (project GPA)] *if a project is taken but the project grade is lower than that for any elective module, but not lower than 2.00:* = [30% x (average GPA across DEM101, DEM102, EPM101 and EPM102 modules)] + [50% x (average GPA across all 5 elective modules)] + [20% x (project GPA)]
EP	PGCert	= Average GPA across 4 EPM1 modules
EP	PGDip	= [(3/7) x (average GPA across 4 EPM1 modules)] + [(4/7) x (average GPA across EP201, EP202 and 2 elective modules)]
EP	MSc	= [20% x (average GPA across 4 EPM1 modules)] + [40% x (average GPA across EPM201, EPM202 and best 2 other elective modules)] + [30% x (project GPA)] + [10% x (EPM400 GPA)]
GHP	PGCert	= Average GPA across 4 GHM1 modules
GHP	PGDip	= [(3/7) x (average GPA across 4 GHM1 modules)] + [(4/7) x (average GPA across 4 elective modules)]

Programme	Award	Final GPA algorithm
GHP	MSc	*where no project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across 4 GHM1 modules) + [70% x (average GPA across best 7 elective modules)] *where a project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across 4 GHM1 modules)] + [40% x (average GPA across best 4 elective modules)] + [30% x (project GPA)] *if a project is taken but the project grade is lower than that for any elective module, but not lower than 2.00:* = [30% x (average GPA across 4 GHM1 modules)] + [50% x (average GPA across all 5 elective modules)] + [20% x (project GPA)]
ID	PGCert	= Average GPA across 4 IDM1 modules.
ID	PGDip	= [(3/7) x (average GPA across 4 IDM1 modules)] + [(4/7) x (average GPA across 4 elective modules)]
ID	MSc	*where no project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across 4 IDM1 modules)] + [70% x (average GPA across best 7 elective modules) *where a project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across 4 IDM1 modules)] + [40% x (average GPA across best 4 elective modules)] + [30% x (project GPA) *where a project is taken but the project grade is lower than that for any elective module, but not lower than 2.00:* = [30% x (average GPA across 4 IDM1 modules)] + [50% x (average GPA across all 5 elective modules)] + [20% x (project GPA)]
PH	PGCert	= Average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules
PH	PGDip	= [(3/7) x (average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules)] + [(4/7) x (average GPA across 4 elective modules)]
PH	MSc	*where no project is taken:* = [30% x (average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules) + [70% x (average GPA across best 7 further elective modules)]

Programme	Award	Final GPA algorithm
		where a project is taken: = [30% x (average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules)] + [40% x (average GPA across best 4 further elective modules)] + [30% x (project GPA)
		where a project is taken but the project grade is lower than that for any elective module, but not lower than 2.00: = [30% x (average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules) + [50% x (average GPA across all 5 further elective modules)] + [20% x (project GPA)]
		where the project was/is completed at the previous weighting: = [30% x (average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules)] + [50% x (average GPA across best 5 further elective modules)] + [20% x (project GPA)]
		where the project was/is completed at the previous weighting, graded lower than that for any elective module, but not lower than 2.00: = [30% x (average GPA across 6 PHM1 modules)] + [60% x (average GPA across all 6 elective modules)] + [10% x (project GPA)]
		For students who have HSM core module credits, references to '6 PHM1 modules' in any of the formulae above should be substituted with '4 HS1 modules'.

8b.9.6.2 Where a student has gained more than the requisite amount of credits for an award, the set of components with the best grades should normally be included in the final award GPA.

8b.9.6.3 The final award classification should then be determined as outlined in Table 7:

Table 7: Determination of final award classification

Award GPA	Classification
2.00 - 3.84	Pass
3.70 – 3.84	Consider merit
3.85 – 4.29	Merit
4.15 - 4.29	Consider distinction
4.30 - 5.00	Distinction

8b.9.6.4 In the case of 'Consider Merit' or 'Consider Distinction' candidates, Exam Boards will decide the final classification (either Pass, Merit or Distinction) using the scrutiny procedure laid out in the Assessment Handbook and Board of Examiner Guidance.

8b.9.7 **Exit awards on expiry of registration**

8b.9.7.1 If a student's registration expires and is not renewed before they have completed the award they initially registered for, the Exam Board should consider whether they satisfy the requirements for an alternative award (e.g. a PGDip or PGCert) and award this accordingly.

8b.9.7.1 Progression rules governing how and when students may proceed through different stages of their programme and be given permission to study further or elective modules, or transfer to another award within the programme, are set out in the Detailed Regulations.

8b.9.8 Compensation

8b.9.8.1 Consideration of compensation for a failed Module requires that the overall Learning Outcomes of the Programme have been met. Where compensation arrangements are permitted, these are detailed below and will be applied in accordance with any Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirement.

8b.9.8.2 Compensation can only be awarded by a Board of Examiners and must be applied within the limits and conditions as stated below:

8b.9.8.3 While credit is normally given for successful completion of award components with a grade of 2.00 or above, credit may also under certain very limited circumstances be given where a grade between 1.00 and 1.99 is obtained. This is known as compensation. Compensation requires that the student achieves higher grades across a designated range of other modules and award components so as to 'compensate' a poorer grade.

8b.9.8.4 If a student receives grades between 1.00 and 1.99 for modules other than the uncompensatable modules listed in paragraph 8b.4.31 above, these may be treated as 'compensatable' until sufficient other modules or award components have been taken.

8b.9.8.5 Students may choose to resit any failed but compensatable module(s) or element(s), as described in section 8b.9.11 below.

8b.9.8.6 Compensation should be determined i.e. either approved or denied, as set out in Tables 8 and 9. Table 8 summarises what must be taken into account for this (i.e. that to compensate a specific component, performance across a wider set of components must be considered). Table 9 describes precisely how to calculate the associated 'compensation GPA' (which is different from the 'award GPA' described in paragraph 8b.9.6 of this chapter), weighting the award components involved (e.g. modules, project, integrating module) according to their credit values.

8b.9.8.7 MSc EP only: if a GPA between 1.00 and 1.99 is obtained for the EPM400 qualifying exam, then it may be compensated provided no more than one module has been compensated, and the 'compensation GPA' (calculated against all components contributing to the award, as per Table 9) is at least 2.00.

Table 8: Determination of compensation

Award	Compensatable element	Components used to consider compensation	Decision to allow compensation
PGCert	One core module (i.e. from CTM1, EPM1, GHM1, IDM1, PHM1) with GPA 1.00-1.99	All core modules	If overall GPA across all components considered ≥ 2: allow compensation.
PGDip	One module from across any of those taken (core or elective) with GPA 1.00-1.99	All modules taken for PGDip	If overall GPA across all award components ≥ 2: allow compensation.
MSc	One core module (i.e. from CTM1, EPM1, GHM1, IDM1, PHM1) with GPA 1.00-1.99 and/or One further module (i.e. from CTM2 (not CTM210), DEM2, EPM2, EPM3, GHM2, IDM2, IDM3, IDM5, IDM6, PHM2) with GPA 1.00-1.99 [*Or, for MSc EP only:* an EPM400 GPA between 1.00 and 1.99 may be compensated, along with one other core or elective module.]	All core modules and/or All credit-bearing components of the award taken after the core stage (i.e. elective-stage modules and any project or integrating report). [*For MSc EP only, if compensating EPM400:* All components of the total award, also factoring in EPM400.]	If overall GPA across 'core' components ≥ 2: allow compensation and/or If overall GPA across remaining components of the award≥ 2: allow compensation. [*For MSc EP only, if compensating EPM400:* If overall GPA across all components & elements of the award ≥ 2: allow compensation.]

Table 9: Determining compensation GPA

Award and component for which compensation is to be applied	Algorithm for 'compensation GPA' *(formulae below must produce a GPA of 2.0 or above to allow compensation)*
A PGCert module	= (100% x average GPA for all core modules) [*i.e. ∑ (GPAs for all core modules) ÷ (no. of core modules)]
A PGDip module	= (50% x average GPA for all core modules) + (50% x average GPA for 4 best elective modules) [Note that it is possible that more than 4 elective modules will have been taken; if so only the best 4 should be counted.]
A core MSc module	= (100% x average GPA for all core modules) [*i.e. ∑ (GPAs for all core modules) ÷ (no. of core modules)]
An elective-stage MSc module	For CT: = (75% x average GPA for CTM201 and 5 elective modules) + (25% x GPA for integrating report) For EP: = (62.5% x average GPA for EPM201, EPM202 and 3 other elective modules) + (37.5% x project GPA) For DH, GHP, ID or PH where no project is taken: = (100% x average GPA for all 8 elective modules) For DH, GHP, ID or PH where a project <u>is</u> taken: = (62.5% x average GPA for all 5 elective modules) + (37.5% x project GPA) For PH where the shorter project is taken *(2011-12 only)*: = (75% x average GPA for all 6 elective modules) + (25% x project GPA)
MSc qualifying exam (EP only, if EPM400 GPA is 1.00 to 1.99)	For EP: = [20% x (average GPA across 4 EPM1 modules)] + [40% x (average GPA across EPM201, EPM202 and 3 other elective modules)] + [30% x (project GPA)] + [10% x (EPM400 GPA)]

8b.9.8.8 Once compensation has been calculated and approved it will normally be possible to make an award immediately (or where an MSc student is compensated for a core module, to confirm permission to continue to

elective studies). If compensation is not approved, then either the student may need to resit in order to be re-considered for the award, or they may considered for exit from the programme with an alternative award (see paragraph 8b.9.11.4 of the Resits Policy for DL Students below).

8b.9.9 Penalties

8b.9.9.1 The Exam Board may apply penalties to grades where students have not complied with conditions of assessment as described below:

Exceeding the word count

8b.9.9.2 Penalties for exceeding the maximum word count apply to all summative assessments, both module assessments and research projects.

8b.9.9.3 The maximum word count for individual assessments will be determined by the Programme Director (PD) or MO and made known to students in advance.

8b.9.9.4 The maximum word count will include in-text citations but excludes reference lists (bibliographies) and appendices.

8b.9.9.5 The PD or MO will specify the number of figures, tables, captions, footnotes and length of legends permitted in the assignment.

8b.9.9.6 For Assessments that exceed the maximum word count the following penalties will be applied by the Taught Programme Directors (TPDs).
- Assessment > 2% and up to and including 10% over length will be marked and graded using the full GP criteria, however, the Board of Examiners will deduct 1 grade point; for a standard 2000 word essay this will be a maximum of 200 words.

- Assessment >10% over length will not be marked and be given an automatic zero; the Board of Examiners will consider this a failed attempt at assessment and a resit opportunity will be granted where applicable.

8b.9.9.7 There will be no penalty for students who use less than the maximum word count and have demonstrated that they have met the required assessment objectives.

8b.9.9.8 The regulation allow a 2% margin of error for variation in automated word counts, i.e., a maximum word count of 2,000 words is 40 words to allow for different software word counts.

Penalties for late submission

8b.9.9.9 Penalties for a late submission of assessment will be applied to all summative assessments, both module assessments and projects that do not meet either the standard deadline or extended deadline (as outlined in any learning support agreements), and prior to any extenuating circumstances being considered.

8b.9.9.10 Late submissions will be reported to the TPDs and the following penalties will be applied:
- Assessments that are < 48 hours will be marked and graded using the full GP criteria and **1 grade point will be deducted**;
- Assessments that are over 48 hours late will not be accepted and the student will be required to submit a new assessment for the module the following year or a later year

8b.9.10 Deferred Assessments and Extensions

8b.9.10.1 Students will be clearly notified of extension and deferred assessment requirements or options, being given suitable advance notice of key dates and deadlines.

8b.9.11 Re-sits of Assessments

Resits Policy for Distance Learning Students

Document Type	Policy
Document owner	Pro-Director of Education
Approved by	Associate Dean of Studies
Approval date	
Review date	
Version	1.2
Amendments	1.0 Policy established 1.1 Policy updated (29 May 2013) 1.2 Edited for inclusion in the Academic Manual, made specific to distance learning (August 2019)
Related Policies & Procedures	Provide hyperlinks

POLICY

8b.9.11.1 If a student fails to gain credits for a particular award component on the first attempt (after applying the rules in paragraphs 8b.4.28 to 8b.4.33 and section 8b.9.8 above), they will be permitted one further attempt, as a 'resit'. Only failed elements of failed award components, i.e. those with GPA below 2.00, may be re-sat – as determined by the Exam Board. Where a component has a single assessment which is not divided into further

elements (e.g. as is generally the case for projects), this component must be re-sat as a whole. Where any element has been re-sat, the overall component GPA will be capped to 3.00 – although a higher GPA may be achieved, and reported back to the student, for the specific elements which have been re-sat.

8b.9.11.2 Where an elective component is failed once, the student may choose not to resit and instead register for (and pay for) a substitute elective component, provided further choices remain available. Only three elective modules may be changed in this way. The substitute component is not considered to be a resit and the standard number of attempts will be permitted.

8b.9.11.3 Determination of awards may include compensation of failed modules, as described in section 8b.9.8 above. Provided sufficient credit has been achieved to make an award, any additional modules which have been taken and failed will not affect or be included in the final award calculation.

8b.9.11.4 If a student fails to gain credits for a required award component on the second attempt, they will be ineligible for the award and will be withdrawn from the programme. However, the student will retain credits for components which have otherwise been passed or appropriately compensated. If the components they have completed to date (excluding the twice-failed component) satisfy the requirements for an alternative award, then their eligibility for the alternative may be assessed, with any compensation re-calculated. The student may then exit the programme with this alternative award, as outlined in Table 10:

Table 10: Eligibility for an award when exiting programme

Stage of study	Element failed twice (credits denied)	Credits already gained from other elements passed	Outcome for student
Core modules	Core module – i.e. CTM1, DEM1, EPM1, GHM1, IDM1, PHM1	Up to 45 credits from other core modules	No award

Stage of study	Element failed twice (credits denied)	Credits already gained from other elements passed	Outcome for student
Elective modules	Elective module – i.e. CTM2, DEM2, EPM2, EPM3, GHM2, IDM2, IDM3, IDM5, IDM6, PHM2; project or integrating report.	All 60 core credits; but less than 60 further credits	May exit with PGCert
		All 60 core credits, and 60 or more further credits	May exit with PGDip

8b.9.11.5 The right to re-sit/resubmit an assessment will be subject to the agreement of the Board of Examiners of LSHTM. Students will receive notification from UoLW.

8b.9.11.6 For distance learning (DL) programmes, the re-sits regulations should also be consistent with the requirements of the University of London Worldwide Guidelines for Examinations.

8b.9.11.7 Re-sit/resubmission will normally take place at the next available opportunity. This may vary depending on the nature of the task (e.g. coursework or exam), and the type and mode of provision.

8b.9.11.8 Students will be clearly notified of re-sit requirements or options, being given suitable advance notice of key dates and deadlines. Students who have options about what or when to re-sit may receive guidance on this from relevant staff.

8b.9.11.9 Assessments which have been passed may not be re-sat. Students may not re-sit/resubmit an assessment element (whatever its mark) if they have passed the programme overall.

8b.9.11.10 Students taking a re-sit/resubmission assessment shall be bound by the regulations which were in force at the time of the first attempt of the assessment.

8b.9.11.11 The resit/resubmission will be marked using the full GP range. Grades will be reconciled in line with standard double-marking practice and timescales.

8b.9.11.12 The Board of Examiners will consider and ratify resit/resubmission assessments at the next meeting or Chair's Action may be taken to ratify any final awards to students. External Examiners should have the opportunity to participate in this

8b.9.11.13 To be eligible for the award of a Master's degree, Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate a student must satisfy the examiners in the assessment prescribed for the programme within the maximum period of registration permitted by these regulations.

APPLICABILITY OF THIS POLICY

8b.9.11.14 Re-sit regulations should apply to all forms of summative assessment, i.e. which counts towards an award or credit. It is not intended to be applicable for formative assessment undertaken purely for learning purposes, for which re-sits will not normally be allowed. However, students who fail formative assessments may be asked to undertake further progress tests in line with LSHTM's withdrawal procedure.

8b.9.11.15 Determination of re-sit requirements should be conducted with reference to both these re-sits regulations and the specific rules set out for individual programmes in Award Schemes. Specific task requirements and operational arrangements for conducting re-sits may be agreed by individual Exam Boards or Programme Committees (for assessments under their authority), and communicated to students via programme handbooks, module specifications and similar.

8b.9.11.16 For joint programmes, the relevant Award Scheme will determine when re-sits are required or permissible, which may differ from the standard LSHTM rules set out in the re-sit regulations. However, re-sits of any LSHTM elements of provision (e.g. modules run by LSHTM) should operate in accordance with the re-sit regulations, save where rules for individual joint programmes specify otherwise.

TIMING AND CONDUCT OF RESITS

8b.9.11.17 Whether a re-sit is required, when it is scheduled and what it entails doing may vary depending on the nature of the task and the type of provision – e.g. the standard timing and structure of assessment differs between face-to-face and DL modes of study, entailing similar differences for re-sits. Re-sits will largely be scheduled as follows:

- **For DL modules**: students who need to re-sit should do so in a subsequent year, attempting the same standard paper/task as that year's cohort – i.e. either submitting coursework by the annual deadline or sitting relevant formal unseen written exams in the summer (typically June). A resit fee is payable to the University, and exam hall fees will apply for written exams.

- **For DL projects**: depending on the recommendation of the Exam Board, re-sits may require both 'revision and resubmission' within a timescale determined by the Board of Examiners, or extensive new work for submission by the following year's standard project deadline.

8b.9.11.18 Note that new or first attempts at assessments following extenuating circumstances or deferrals will be scheduled on the same basis.

8b.9.11.19 All coursework-type re-sit tasks and project re-sits must be submitted via the DL Assignment Management System

- **For all DL module coursework** re-sits or project re-sits, standard submission criteria and arrangements will apply.

8b.10 Confirmation of Grades and Notification of Final Results

8b.10.1 Award results must be agreed by the Board of Examiners and signed off by the Chair and the External Examiner(s).

8b.10.2 The University of London (UoL) and the LSHTM will advise candidates of their award results in line with the [UoL General Regulations](.).

8b.11 Revoking Awards

8b.11.1   The Chair of Senate may, on behalf of the Council of the University or Senate of LSHTM, revoke any Degree or Diploma granted by LSHTM if it shall be discovered at any time and proved to the satisfaction of LSHTM that:

a) There was an administrative error in the award made under the procedures required by the Standing Orders of Council to regulate the conduct of Master's, Diploma and Certificate programmes;

b) Subsequent to an award, a Board of Examiners, having taken into account information which was unavailable at the time its decision was made, determines that a student's classification should be altered; or

c) That in exceptional circumstances, the award should be revoked for any other good cause, after consultation with the Secretary & Registrar.