

Prifysgol Wreccsam
Wrexham University

Assessment Policy

2024/25

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Purpose of the Policy | 3 |
| 2. The general Principles for assessment | 3 |
| 3. The quality control and quality assurance of assessment | 3 |
| 4. Reasonable Adjustments | 4 |
| 5. Forms of assessment | 6 |
| 6. Feedback to Students | 9 |
| 7. Assessment extensions | 10 |
| 8. Extenuating Circumstances | 11 |
| 9. Marking and moderation of assessments | 11 |
| 10. Assessment Penalties | 13 |
| 11. Awarding marks..... | 14 |
| 12. Assessment Boards | 14 |
| 13. Resit opportunities..... | 15 |
| 14. Alternative Assessment..... | 16 |
| 15. Academic Appeals..... | 16 |
| 16. Retention of Work..... | 16 |
| 17. Data Protection..... | 16 |
| 18. Related information | 16 |
| 19. Glossary of terms | 17 |
| 20. Accessibility | 19 |
| <i>Appendix 1 Assessment Boards Terms of Reference</i> | <i>20</i> |
| 1. Overview | 20 |
| 2. Rationale | 20 |
| 3. Proceedings | 20 |
| 4. Functions of the Members of the Assessment Board..... | 20 |
| 5. Reporting..... | 20 |
| 6. Module Assessment Board | 21 |
| 6.1 Terms of Reference | 21 |
| 6.2 Membership Composition | 22 |
| 6.3 Module Assessment Board Membership | 22 |
| 6.4 Quoracy | 22 |
| 6.5 Absence of the Chair | 23 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 6.6 Absence of examiner representative of each assessed subject area/ Academic Representative from each partner organisation/Academic Link Tutor | 23 |
| 6.7 Absence of External Examiners | 23 |
| 6.8 Frequency | 24 |
| 7. Award/Progression Assessment Boards..... | 24 |
| 7.1 Terms of Reference | 24 |
| 7.2 Award/Progression Board Membership | 25 |
| 7.3 Quoracy | 25 |
| 7.4 Absence of the Chair | 26 |
| 7.5 Absence of Subject Programme Leader/Academic Representative from each partner organisation / Academic Link Tutor | 26 |
| 7.6 Absence of Chief External Examiner..... | 26 |
| 7.7 Frequency | 27 |
| 7.8 Students who have been deemed to have failed..... | 27 |
| 7.9 Formal admission to degrees | 27 |
| 7.10 Publication of results..... | 27 |
| <i>Appendix 2 – Generic Assessment Marking Rubrics</i> | 28 |
| 1. Level 3 Marking Framework | 28 |
| 2. Level 4 Marking Framework | 31 |
| 3. Level 5 Marking Framework | 35 |
| 4. Level 6 Marking Framework | 39 |
| 5. Level 7 Marking Framework | 45 |

1. Purpose of the Policy

1.1 This policy sets out the approach that the University will take to assessment for programmes that lead to its award. Its purpose is to be clear about the basis upon which the University will secure academic standards and best support students' learning including in accordance with the requirements of the [Quality Assurance Agency \(QAA\)](#) and the [UK Quality Code](#).

1.2 Assessment enables a student to demonstrate the extent to which they have met the learning outcomes of a module and programme. The overall approach to assessment for each programme will be considered through the University's quality assurance processes. This policy will apply equally to all provision made in the name of the University, including that which is delivered by or in collaboration with partner providers, unless stated otherwise within the individual academic partner agreement.

2. The general Principles for assessment

2.1 The following principles apply to the assessment of students work:

- i. each programme and module will have an assessment strategy which will be considered through the University's programme validation and re-validation processes.
- ii. each module will contain one or more assessments. The weighting allocated to each assessment will reflect its contribution to the module learning outcomes.
- iii. the assessment load within each module and across a programme remains proportionate.
- iv. students may choose to complete their assessment in Welsh or English, or a combination of both languages, unless otherwise stated within a partnership agreement.
- v. assessments are designed as: inclusive, clear, appropriately challenging, and supportive to students' learning and skills development.

3. The quality control and quality assurance of assessment

3.1 The University is committed to ensuring that assessments are appropriate to learning outcomes of the relevant programme/module and that all assessments are conducted and marked by staff qualified to do so, results are accurately recorded, processed, presented and returned to the students.

3.2 A number of processes are in place to ensure the University's assessment arrangements meet UK expectations and requirements and enhancement opportunities are identified to make improvements to its's assessments.

- i. Validation and re-validation
- ii. Programme and module modification
- iii. External examining

- iv. Peer review of examination papers
- v. Marking
- vi. Internal moderation
- vii. Assessment Boards

NB: the above list is not exhaustive.

3.3 It is the responsibility of the module leader to prepare the assessment tasks for their module. They must ensure that the assessment task meets the general principles for assessment and that the tasks set are unique for each resit. The programme leader and module leaders should review the assessment tasks for the programme/module in terms of consistency of standards and parity of student effort.

3.4 Peer review is a process where academics within programme teams review each other's assessment tasks to ensure that they follow the general principles for assessment ([see paragraph 2.1](#)). Peer review is not monitored centrally, where it is carried out locally this should be recorded.

3.5 In addition to the peer review process External Examiners should review and approve a minimum of 25% of all assessment briefs/tasks which contribute to an award, including all formal examination papers.

3.6 For modules delivered in a language other than English or Welsh, External Examiners should review and approve ALL assessment tasks/briefs which contribute to an award, including all formal examination papers.

3.7 Any comments on the assessment briefs/tasks is due within three weeks of it being sent to the External Examiner, after this deadline, the University will assume that there are no comment and that the assessment brief/task is approved. A record of the sample and the approval of the External Examiner should be retained by the programme leader.

3.8 For guidance on designing assessment tasks, resources and further advice can be found on the [Learning and Teaching hub](#). The QAA has produced useful guidance on [Academic Integrity](#) that should be consulted as part of the assessment design process.

4. Reasonable Adjustments

4.1 Reasonable adjustments should be made for students carrying out assessments where these have been recommended by Inclusion Services. Recommended adjustments for students should be checked regularly on EVision by appropriate academic staff as this data is updated by Inclusion Services throughout the academic year. Reasonable adjustments must be confirmed prior to the assessment taking place, normally this would be no later than one week. Partner students requiring additional support should in the first instance be referred to the respective service at the partner institution.

4.2 Reasonable adjustments may differ depending on the assessment task. Examples include:

- i. Extensions where required due to concurrent deadlines, faith observance or particular difficulties with course demands. These need to be pre-agreed in advance of the original deadline but there is no evidential requirement.
- ii. Additional time for a time constrained assessment such as an exam or in class test.
- iii. Deliver a presentation to a smaller group or the ability to pre-record a presentation task.
- iv. Use of recommended assistive technology such as transcription software or a screen reader.
- v. Use of recommended personal recording equipment in line with University policy.
- vi. Provision of resources in advance of sessions.
- vii. Provision of examination materials in an accessible format, which could include providing printed materials.
- viii. For centrally timetabled exams, timetabling will arrange rooms with additional time, readers etc built in
- ix. The Programme team are responsible for organising in class tests and VLE/online examinations to ensure reasonable adjustments are in place.

4.3 Students with specific queries related to reasonable adjustments should be signposted to the relevant team. Staff can make a referral for a student to help them access support from Inclusion here <https://wrxm.ac.uk/ask-staff>.

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Inclusion Services | The team can implement reasonable adjustments for students in relation to a long term medical condition, disability, mental health condition or specific learning difference. and can provide support and advice on applying for Disabled Students' Allowance. | inclusion@wrexham.ac.uk ask@wrexham.ac.uk |
| Chaplaincy Team | As a University, we also need to be aware of our responsibilities for responding to practical issues of faith observance on campus and requests from students for adjustments. | ask@wrexham.ac.uk |

5. Forms of assessment

5.1 The University will use a variety of assessment types to best support students' learning and to ensure that academic standards are upheld.

5.2 Assessment is categorised as either:

- i. Formative – which contributes to the students learning through commentary on submitted work but does not contribute to the module mark.
- ii. Summative – submitted work which is marked and contributes to the overall module mark.

5.3 Assessment can take the form of coursework, practical, in-class tests or examinations:

- i. Coursework – work which is completed in the student's own time and which has to be submitted by a specific time and date. Coursework may include many methods of assessment such as practical write ups, essays, portfolios, case studies, projects and dissertations.
- ii. Practical - assessment of student's practical skills or competence. Practical skills assessments focus on whether and /or how well a student performs a specific practical skill. Examples of practical assessments include: clinical skills, Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE), simulations, laboratory work, and oral assessments such as presentations and discussions, (where the student is being assessed on their delivery and/or contribution)
- iii. Examinations – an event that a student must attend at a particular time and place. Examinations may include methods of assessment such as in-class tests, online, and on-campus. Further guidance for academic staff can be found in the [Delivering Exams Guidance](#) (on the Learning and Teaching Hub)
 - a. All examinations are conducted during formal examination periods (as defined by the academic calendar). The timetabling team (timetables@wrexham.ac.uk) will coordinate the scheduling of examination dates and an examination timetable will be formulated.
 - b. Examinations will be conducted electronically, exceptions to this must be approved by the Programme Leader (with input from principal lecturers/subject leads).
 - c. The date, time and duration of the examination will be made available four calendar weeks prior to the commencement of the relevant examination period.
 - d. The time duration of examinations should align with the assessment details in the module specification.
 - e. It is expected that examination papers for all formal examinations including first and resit papers will be prepared, peer reviewed, externally approved by 31 October each year for Semester 1 assessment and by 28th February each year for Semester 2 and Semester 3 assessment. This process seeks to ensure consistency between the initial assessment and the resit assessment.

- f. any use of unfair means in online examinations will lead to disciplinary action under the academic integrity procedure.
 - g. Communication of examination paper content with other students is forbidden before, during and after the examination.
 - h. The University Fit to Sit statement will apply to all examinations.
 - i. Any errors found in the examination paper must be notified to the partner or other examination sites. Where the error cannot be remedied, it must be reported to the Dean of the Faculty who will report to the Assessment Board.
 - j. For examinations held at partner institutions, queries should be addressed to the Academic Link.
 - k. Force majeure – the University will not be liable when an examination has to be cancelled due to unforeseen circumstances. Information regarding the cancellation and rescheduling of examinations will be communicated to students on the University website.
- iv. Online examinations – where students are required to complete an examination remotely under timed conditions and to return answers electronically by the end of the examination via the University's virtual learning environment (VLE).
- a. Students may use their own device in any location and does not require invigilation. If students do not have access to their own device to undertake an online examination, they should inform their module leader in the first instance.
 - b. They can be in the format of an open or closed book examination.
 - c. Prior to the examination students must read the examination guidance notes and complete a self-declaration for academic integrity.
 - d. The module examiner will be the appointed module leader, at the site of delivery.
 - e. The module examiner will be approachable online via the VLE or Email at local working time (8:30am-5:00pm) during the examination period to deal with queries of examination papers and make corrections if applicable.
 - f. Students must submit their answers before the end of the examination duration. Late submissions will not be considered and will be classed as absence, unless there are proven technical problems with the VLE platform or examination software, or if the student is eligible for additional time.
 - g. Students who encounter technical difficulties during the examination must report the issue to their module examiner immediately. If problems cannot be resolved during the exam period, students can submit their answer files via email to the module examiner before the examination ends and this should only be allowed when students are not able to submit their work for marking on the VLE.

- v. On-campus examinations – where students are required to complete an examination on campus under timed conditions. Where possible, on-campus examinations should be held in one room and be of the same duration, start and end time, unless reasonable adjustments are in place.
 - a. On-campus examinations must be approved by Programme Leaders and the Timetabling team contacted so that a room can be scheduled.
 - b. They should be conducted electronically, students may use their own device, or equipment will be provided in a computer room/laboratory. Printed examinations cannot be supported by the University, except where this is to meet an agreed reasonable adjustment or Professional Body requirement.
 - c. Module Leaders must inform all students how the examination will be conducted in advance and facilitate any practice runs of equipment, if required.

- vi. In-class tests - an event that a student must attend at a particular time and place which may be online or on-campus and will be scheduled during teaching weeks.
 - a. Programme teams are responsible for organising in-class tests, the Timetabling Team will update timetables accordingly and advise on room availability.
 - b. In-class tests should not occur during formal examination weeks and the module tutor involved should liaise with the programme leader to prevent clashes.
 - c. Students should be given at least four weeks' notice of the date of an in-class test.
 - d. The time duration for an in-class test should align with the assessment details in the module specification.

- vii. Invigilation guidelines:
 - a. There must be a minimum of two invigilators per room, where more than one student is taking an examination. Normally, additional invigilators are required if there are more than 50 students in the examination room.
 - b. The Chief Invigilator will normally be the module leader. They will be responsible for ensuring that the examination is conducted in a proper manner and will complete an Invigilation report to record any incidents.
 - c. If the student becomes unwell during the examination, they should advise an invigilator before leaving the examination room. The student should be advised to seek immediate medical attention and refer to the Extenuating Circumstances procedure for guidance. Once a student has left the examination room unsupervised, they will not be permitted to return.

- d. If the fire alarm sounds during an on campus examination or in-class test, the students will be instructed to leave the examination room by the Chief Invigilator. The examination may need to be rescheduled if it has not been possible to maintain examination conditions.

viii. Examination Conduct:

This section should be read in conjunction with the [Academic Integrity Procedure](#).

- a. Where it becomes known that an examination paper has been compromised, prior to the examination taking place, then a replacement paper will need to be supplied by the programme team as a matter of urgency to prevent students from being disadvantaged.
- b. Where it becomes known that an examination paper has been compromised, after the examination has taken place then the examination will be nullified and students will be expected to sit a new, unseen paper at the earliest opportunity.
- c. If the invigilator believes that a student is causing a disturbance to other students in the room, they have the authority to require the student to leave the examination room. Normally, one warning should be issued and a record of the warning made, if this is not heeded, then the student should be instructed to leave.
- d. Where there is a suspected a breach of academic Integrity during the examination, the student(s) involved will be notified by the invigilator that the incident will be reported under the Academic Integrity Procedure. The Chief Invigilator will record the time and details on the incident on the Invigilation report. The student(s) may be permitted to continue with the examination but should be advised that their examination mark will be held, subject to the outcome of the [Academic Integrity Procedure](#).
- e. A student may be subject to disciplinary procedures for inappropriate conduct in an examination.

6. Feedback to Students

6.1 Students must be provided with feedback on their assessed work to help support their learning. The feedback should include a provisional mark as well as information about how well the student has met the required learning outcomes in relation to the assessment criteria, how the mark was derived and any areas for development. The provisional mark is unconfirmed until it has been approved at the Assessment Board.

6.2 The nature of the delivery of feedback should relate to the nature of the assessment and may include:

- i. Verbal feedback to an individual student or group of students (e.g. on a presentation)
- ii. Written or audio feedback (e.g. on coursework or projects)
- iii. Model answers or example solutions with associated commentary (e.g. examinations)

6.3 All summative assessment feedback must be evidenced on the VLE. Where verbal feedback is given for a summative assessment, this must be recorded.

6.4 Students may have temporary supervised access to the digital examination for feedback purposes or will be provided with a separate feedback document to review comments that have been made by the marker. This feedback will be provided in a session facilitated by the marker or other member of staff who is able to support the student.

6.5 The University will ensure that any agreed Reasonable Adjustments are addressed in the way in which feedback is provided to a student to best support their needs and learning.

6.6 Students will normally be provided with feedback on their assessment within three working weeks of its submission or completion of an examination or test. In exceptional cases, students will be informed of any deviation from this timescale and the reasons why.

6.7 In programme areas with no Welsh speaking tutors, translation services will be used to enable marking and provide feedback in the Welsh language or in some instances external markers will be sourced.

7. Assessment extensions

7.1 Students are entitled to submit a request for a one-week extension to submission of assessed coursework¹ **Forms of assessment**. The request must be made at least 24 hours ahead of the original submission date. Students should email the request to the relevant Module Leader.

7.2 The University will only consider requests of up to one week, submitted within the deadline. Students should be referred to the Extenuating Circumstances procedure for any other requests.

7.3 Where a student with a reasonable adjustment already has an extension to their submission date, recommended by Inclusion Services, they can submit a further request as

¹ The term coursework in the policy is defined as work which is completed in the student's own time and which has to be submitted by a specific time and date. Coursework may include many methods of assessment such as practical write ups, essays, portfolios, case studies, projects and dissertations.

per the above paragraph, but it must be submitted at least 24 hours ahead of their revised submission date.

8. Extenuating Circumstances

8.1 Where a student is experiencing unforeseen extenuating circumstances beyond their control which may have an impact on their academic performance an extenuating circumstances claim can be submitted in accordance with the University's [Extenuating Circumstances Procedure](#).

9. Marking and moderation of assessments

9.1 The University is committed to use of the full range of the marking scale and has advised its staff and external examiners accordingly. This is particularly important at the higher and lower ends of the range. Marks are awarded on a percentage scale (0-100%), except where other scales are required.

9.2 All members of the full time and part-time academic staff of the University are approved by Academic Board as Internal Examiners. Internal Examiners for Research Degrees must be appointed in accordance with the appropriate Regulations for MPhil and PhD Awards.

9.3 Where, for whatever reason, such as illness or absence from the University, the member of academic staff who would normally mark scripts or coursework for a programme is unable to act, another member of staff with the appropriate knowledge would normally be requested to undertake the work.

9.4 The Dean of Faculty with Associate Deans will also be responsible for ensuring that appropriate records of Internal marking and moderation (MEMR forms) are maintained and stored centrally within the CME Teams site so that they are fully auditable, a folder entitled MEMR forms should be created within the relevant subject folder and all forms uploaded to this folder.

9.5 The University uses the following methods for marking assessments:

- i. First Marking
- ii. Internal Moderation
- iii. Second Marking

| Type | Requirements |
|----------------------|--|
| <i>First marking</i> | A first marker is a member of academic staff involved in teaching the topic being assessed who allocates marks to be awarded against the learning outcomes that are aligned with relevant grade descriptors. First markers also provide a written commentary for student feedback. All assessments must be first marked. |

| Type | Requirements | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------|------------|------|---------|-----|----------|-----|------|-----|
| Internal Moderation | <p>A group of academic staff review a sample of assessed work for each module annually. The moderation exercise will determine the consistency of the marks and ensure they are a fair representation of sector standards, the application of the marking process and that the marking criteria has been applied correctly.</p> <p>The sample must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be 10% or 5 pieces of work, whichever is greater. • Represent the full range of marks. • Include samples for all locations where there is more than one. • Include borderline and fails. • Include samples of all first markers when there is more than one. • Include samples of assessments completed bilingually or in other languages. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Second marking | <p>A second marker is a member of academic staff involved in teaching the topic. They cannot also be a first marker.</p> <p>Second marking is only applied to final year dissertations and projects. The size of the cohort will determine the sample size of second marking.</p> <p>The sample must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include all failures. • Include all borderlines. • Represent the full range of marks. • Include samples for all first markers where there is more than one. • Include samples for all locations where there is more than one. • Include samples of assessments completed bilingually or in other languages. <table border="1" data-bbox="603 1615 1270 1812"> <thead> <tr> <th>Student numbers</th> <th>Sample size</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>20 or less</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>21 – 49</td> <td>75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 – 199</td> <td>50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>200+</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Student numbers | Sample size | 20 or less | 100% | 21 – 49 | 75% | 50 – 199 | 50% | 200+ | 25% |
| Student numbers | Sample size | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 or less | 100% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21 – 49 | 75% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 – 199 | 50% | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200+ | 25% | | | | | | | | | | |

| Type | Requirements |
|---------------------------|--|
| External examining | <p>External examiners must review a sufficient sample of assessment tasks and student work which include all modules for which they are appointed.</p> <p>The sample must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be 10% or 5 pieces of work, whichever is greater. • Represent the full range of marks. • Include samples for all locations where there is more than one. • Include borderline and fails. • Include samples of all first markers when there is more than one. • Include samples of assessments completed bilingually or in other languages. <p>A bilingual External Examiner will be sourced within programmes who offer provision bilingually in Welsh and English or other languages.</p> |

9.6 Where it is not possible for first or second markers to agree marks, the matter will be referred to the Programme Leader. If necessary, a third internal marker will be appointed before work is submitted to the External Examiner/s. The External Examiner should not be used as a third marker.

9.7 The assessment tasks sent to External Examiners should be accompanied by module handbooks and marking schemes for all sites of delivery. The Programme Leader shall ensure that module packs of student work to be moderated are made available to External Examiners, adhering to the University's [Records Management Policy](#). The submission of paper copies of student work for moderation should be for exceptional reasons and approved by the relevant Associate Dean.

9.8 These module packs, as a minimum, will include:

- i. a schedule of the sample chosen with reasons for the selection and evidence of second marking and any moderation discussion.
- ii. the module specification.
- iii. the assignment brief, sample answers (where relevant) and module handbook
- iv. the marking criteria.
- v. a draft set of the marks for the cohort.

10. Assessment Penalties

10.1 In addition to the late assessment penalties set out in the General Regulations, paragraph E4: ii; you may also be subject to word count penalties if you exceed the word count

limit for a coursework assessment by 10%. The penalty for exceeding the word count will be 5 marks per 1000 words excess.

10.2 Assignments must be marked in their entirety and the penalty imposed at the end.

10.3 Guidance and information regarding assessment penalties must be stated clearly in programme handbook or assignment brief (as set out in the General Regulations, E4:iv) for the benefit of students, internal markers and external examiners.

11. Awarding marks

11.1 Students will be provided with criteria for each assessment that will align with the specific learning outcomes that are being assessed, and these should be explained to students in advance of them undertaking the activity. The assessment criteria provided to students will be the same criteria that is used by staff in the marking process.

11.2 The criteria will be set out in a rubric that will advise students on the outputs that need to be shown in the assessment to achieve a particular grade. Assessment criteria (learning outcomes outlined in the relevant module specification) will align with the [University Generic Assessment Marking Rubrics](#) (Appendix 3). Wording included in the generic rubrics, relating to the extent that a student has met the criteria (learning outcome) can be amended as appropriate to the learning outcome. However, the wording should remain consistent with the QAA level descriptors for the relevant level. These are used across all programmes that lead to a University award to ensure consistency of academic standards, including the qualities that need to be demonstrated for a particular degree classification.

11.3 For programmes that are recognised by a Professional Statutory or Regulatory Body, there will be specific criteria that a student will need to meet to demonstrate that they meet professional standards.

12. Assessment Boards

12.1 Assessment Boards are formal meeting of academic staff associated with the delivery of a programme and attended by External Examiner(s). Assessment Boards are charged with consistently applying and upholding the Academic Regulations and any derogation from Academic Regulations as they apply to programmes of study.

12.2 The Assessment Board may also include other External members; such as representatives of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies where required by that body.

12.3 Terms of reference, membership composition and quoracy for Assessment Boards are detailed in [Appendix 1](#).

12.4 Separate requirements pertain to the Boards that consider the theses of research degree students and are described in the relevant section of the [Academic Regulations](#) for those awards.

12.5 The University have two types of Assessment Boards:

- i. The *Module Assessment Board* will consider and approve the module results for each student.
- ii. The *Award/Progression Assessment Board* will consider and approve the overall results for each student enrolled on a programme.

Information on the conduct and terms of reference of the Assessment Boards can be found in [Appendix 1](#).

12.6 An External Examiner should be present at Assessment Boards, where they are absent this should be recorded in the assessment board minutes and they must provide in writing a written response containing the following information:

- i. the date
- ii. details of the Assessment Board meeting
- iii. the reason for absence
- iv. confirmation of involvement in the assessment (module assessment boards only) and concurrence with the final recommendations of which they have been apprised.

12.7 A Chief External Examiner will attend an Award/Progression board to ensure the validity and integrity of the processes are upheld. They will:

- i. confirm the award of credit to students on modules passed by compensation
- ii. confirm student eligibility for progression or award on the basis of accumulated credit
- iii. ensure any award specific requirements have been met.

12.8 The Assessment and Awards team will ensure that all students are advised of their results. The Programme Leader will make arrangements to inform students, in writing, of any reassessment requirements.

13. Resit opportunities

13.1 Resits will take place at the next available opportunity, the timing of which will be determined by the programme team. The resits may take place in-year where permitted by the programme team, for examinations taken in semester one, the resit would take place during the semester two examination period.

13.2 Further information regarding resits for each award can be found within the award specific [Academic Regulations](#).

13.3 Reassessments are subject to additional fees, charged at the rates specified in the Tuition Fee Regulation, found on the [Fees and Funding](#) page of the University website.

14. Alternative Assessment

14.1 The University encourages our provision to adopt a diverse assessment strategy, through this there will be a range of assessment types to challenge our students and support their learning journey. As part of this there may be instances where we are unable to recreate the original assessment type within a re-sit opportunity.

14.2 In these instances an alternative assessment will be created by the programme team which will be as close to the original assessment type as possible and support students to achieve the relevant module learning outcomes. Alternative assessments will usually be used in instances where there is group, practical or performance based assessment types.

14.3 Each alternative assessment task will be designed on a case by case basis and apply to any student who is required to re-sit the assessment task the alternative assessment applies to within that module. Further information regarding Alternative Assessments will be provided in the module handbook or module specification.

15. Academic Appeals

15.1 A student seeking to make an academic appeal must meet the grounds for appeal and submit their form and supporting evidence within the specified timescales, as detailed in the [Academic Appeals procedure](#).

16. Retention of Work

16.1 The University has a records retention schedule that sets out for how long students' work should be held. The purpose of retaining work is to provide evidence in case there is a review of the decision of the Assessment Board and for quality assurance purposes. The [records retention schedule](#) forms part of the information and guidance on records management and compliance with the University's [Records Management Policy](#).

17. Data Protection

17.1 When the work is no longer required for the purpose for which it is retained Faculties should have in place a robust system for the confidential deletion of assessed work.

18. Related information

18.1 All of our policies and procedures have been written through a trauma informed lens using the [TrACE Toolkit](#), and informed by the Welsh Language Standards and CYFLE, Wrexham University's [Welsh Medium Academic Strategy and Action Plan](#). This policy should be read in conjunction with related regulations, policies and procedures, including:

- i. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy
- ii. Student pregnancy, maternity, adoption and secondary carer policy and procedure
- iii. Race Equality Charter

NB: the above list is not exhaustive.



19. Glossary of terms

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Assessment | An assessment is defined as the means of which the attainment of a student is summatively examined and graded in some way. Assessment can take the form of coursework, practical, in-class tests or examinations. |
| Award | A certificate, diploma, degree (or other qualification title) indicating that a named route or a Programme has been successfully completed to an approved standard. |
| Compensation (FC or RC) | Within specified credit limits a student can be awarded credit for modules that they have not passed. |
| Credits | Credits are assigned to a module indicating the contribution that the module makes to a programme of study. |
| Deferral (D) | Deferral is when the Assessment Board ratifies the decision of the Extenuating Circumstances Panel that a student whose performance in a module or modules has been affected by extenuating circumstances will be permitted to retake that assessment without loss of attempt. |
| External Examiners | All External Examiners for taught programmes must be appointed in accordance with the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education - Advice and Guidance: External Expertise. All External Examiners for Research Degrees must be appointed in accordance with the appropriate Regulations for Postgraduate Research Awards. |
| Failure (F) | A 'fail' is when a student enrolled on a programme of study exhausts all attempts permitted for a module. |
| Held (H) | A held mark indicates that the mark is being held whilst another university procedure is being followed Eg. Academic Integrity Investigation |
| Level | Modules offered at the University are assigned to levels in accordance with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and in line with The Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales (CQFW). |
| Module | A credit rated unit of study with specific learning outcomes, curriculum and assessment scheme. |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Not attempted (N) | Non submissions are recorded and are counted as a used attempt. This means that for the reassessment, the maximum mark will be 40% or a pass grade. |
| Overshooting | Overshooting arises when a student enrolled on a taught programme accumulates more credit points at a given level than are required for the award they are pursuing. |
| Pass (P) | The criteria for a “pass” to be awarded are specified in the relevant award regulations. |
| Programme | A Programme is a collection of modules in a particular sequence, the successful completion of which meets the requirements for a designated award. |
| Progression | Progression is when a student satisfies the academic requirements to proceed to the next level, stage or year of their programme. |
| Reassessment | Reassessment is where an Assessment Board agrees that an undergraduate student who has failed a module or modules at a referral attempt (second attempt) may be offered an exceptional third attempt to retrieve the failure by re-sitting or resubmitting the assessment. Postgraduate taught students are limited to two attempts at a module. This is subject to any PSRB requirements that may pertain to the programme in question with regard to the number of attempts that a student may have to achieve a pass for a module. |
| Referral (R) | Referral is when the Assessment Board agrees that a student who has failed a module or modules at the first attempt can be offered an opportunity to retrieve the failure by re-sitting the relevant examination or resubmitting the relevant assessment. The maximum mark for such modules will be 40% (unless derogation has been approved by Academic Board) or a pass grade. |
| Student | A person who has completed an application to the University and met any conditions set for entry to the course/programme(s) applied for as confirmed by the admissions tutor(s) concerned and has completed the formal enrolment process to join the programme(s) of study, provided the required personal information to the University and signed a formal University enrolment form and has returned it to and has been accepted by Strategic Planning. |

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| Technical Deferral | A technical deferral is awarded by an Assessment Board when a student(s) have been adversely affected by programme management issues or external issues outside of their control. |
| Trailing | Trailing is where an Assessment Board permits a student to proceed to the next level, stage or year of a programme, having not successfully completed all modules at the previous level, stage or year. A student in such cases is required to study for the modules that they have yet to successfully complete in parallel with the modules they are studying at the next level, in accordance with relevant award regulations |

20. Accessibility

20.1 Wrexham University strives to be a supportive and trauma-informed university in the design and operation of all our processes and procedures. If you need adjustments to access this procedure or have any other comments to make on the accessibility, wording or any part of this procedure, please do email us on quality@wrexham.ac.uk.

Appendix 1 Assessment Boards Terms of Reference

1. Overview

Assessment Boards are a sub committee of Academic Board. Reporting to Academic Board and acting in accordance with the Standing Order on the Conduct of Committees.

2. Rationale

To support the Academic Board in its discharge of responsibility for ensuring:

- i. the academic standards of the University programmes meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.
- ii. The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualifications and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.

3. Proceedings

The Chair must ensure that the Assessment Boards have available the current University regulations and the regulations of the specific programme of study and that members are aware of the regulations under which decisions are to be made.

The methods of assessment shall be in accordance with the Validated Programme document and any approved amendments. Any exceptional variation to the method of assessment shall be approved by the Board and recorded in the Board record of decisions.

4. Functions of the Members of the Assessment Board

The Chair shall be responsible for convening and facilitating meetings and maintaining their impartiality in the decision-making process. In addition, they will be responsible for ensuring regulations are implemented in line with guidance and that the Board's recommendations are correctly recorded.

5. Reporting

The Assessment Board proceedings must be recorded and lodged with Strategic Planning and Student Administration (SPSA). Assessment Board paperwork is classed as confidential documentation and should record the Board's decisions, including notes where students' marks have been amended.

6. Module Assessment Board

6.1 Terms of Reference

The Module Assessment Board is responsible to the Academic Board of the University. The Module Assessment Board may form such sub-committees as required to carry out its duties provided such committees report directly to the Module Assessment Board. The constitution and terms of reference of each sub-committee must be approved and recorded by the Module Assessment Board and reported to Academic Board.

Formally instituted Academic Board Panels including but not exclusive to the Extenuating Circumstances Panel, Academic Misconduct Panel and the Appeal Panel are empowered to make decisions which shall be implemented directly by the Module Assessment Board.

The Module Assessment Board shall have the responsibility and authority delegated to it from Academic Board to discharge the following duties:

- i. to consider the marks for all students undertaking the modules being assessed and to satisfy itself that the marks are appropriate
- ii. to forward the agreed marks to the appropriate Award/Progression Assessment Board
- iii. to ensure the maintenance of appropriate standards of assessment;
- iv. to ensure that students are assessed in accordance with the approved regulations and procedures;
- v. to ensure methods of assessment are in accordance with the Validated Programme document. Any exceptional variation to the method of assessment shall be approved by the Board and recorded in the Board minutes.
- vi. to act upon any decisions made by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel
- vii. to withhold the student's result or defer the decision where it is subject to an investigation under the Academic Integrity procedure until an outcome has been reached.
- viii. to produce a record of module results which is approved by members of the Board;
- ix. to determine the forms of assessment for students resitting examinations in accordance with the module specification. (The structure of such an examination shall normally be the same as when the students concerned were first presented for examination)
- x. to authorise the Chair to take such Executive action as may be necessary to expedite urgent business following the Board. These decisions must be in the agreed format and formally approved and signed by the Chair. This documentation will be retained with the relevant Assessment Board paperwork.
- xi. to authorise an alternative Chair with no direct association with the module or programme being considered, to take such Executive action as may be necessary to expedite urgent business following the Board to formally approve and sign Chair's Action exceptionally, where the original Chair is not available.

6.2 Membership Composition

Academic Board will approve academic members of staff to be added to the list of Chairs. The position of Chair can be filled by an academic with the appropriate skills and experience to perform the role successfully, as nominated by the Dean of Faculty or Associate Deans. Deans of Faculties and/or Associate Deans can nominate members of staff by advising the Assessment and Awards team, who will seek approval from Academic Board. Approved nominations must be made prior to the Assessment Boards in order for the requisite training to be completed before the nominee can Chair a meeting.

The designation of staff eligible to chair assessment boards is subject to demonstrating experience of assessment quality assurance which could be gained through any of the following activities:

- i. Moderator and External Examiner of assessed work
- ii. Experience as a Chair in other boards or panels
- iii. Sound understanding of University regulations and impact of board decisions

The Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration, or nominee, will have the authority to request an alternative Chair if there is a possibility that the nominated Chair is too closely associated with the module or programmes being considered at a Board.

6.3 Module Assessment Board Membership

Each Module Assessment Board shall consist of:

- i. Chair
- ii. Associate Deans of Faculties of Programmes and Modules under consideration
- iii. External Examiner(s) associated with Programmes and Modules under consideration
- iv. External assessor (where appropriate)
- v. Representatives of Professional Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (where appropriate)
- vi. Representatives of Partners or nominated Link Tutor (where appropriate)
- vii. Internal Examiners for Programmes and Modules under consideration
- viii. Programme Leaders
- ix. In attendance:
 - a. a member of Strategic Planning and Student Administration shall attend in an advisory capacity
 - b. a Board Administrator

Ex Officio: The Chair and Vice-Chair of Academic Board may attend the Assessment Board.

6.4 Quoracy

The quorum for a Module Assessment Board shall normally be:

- i. The Chair

- ii. At least one examiner representative of each assessed subject area, for the year or part of the programme under consideration as determined by the Chair.
- iii. Academic Representative from each partner organisation from which marks are being presented or appropriate Academic Link Tutor. In addition, Module Boards will not proceed unless the nominated Board Administrator is present to provide the appropriate paperwork and to record proceedings and a representative from SPSA is in attendance to provide advice.
- iv. If the Module Board is not quorate, it will normally be reconvened at a later date. However, in exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Assessment Board or has the authority to allow a Module Assessment Board to proceed where a board is not quorate.

6.5 Absence of the Chair

In the event that a Chair does not attend the scheduled board meeting, the SPSA representative in attendance will be able to advise the board members present that they can nominate another member present to act as Chair to ensure the board can continue.

The person nominated will be required to have previous Chair or assessment board experience and will be supported in a regulatory capacity by the SPSA representative.

Following the board meeting, the Chair who had been scheduled to attend will be contacted and asked to review the board outcomes and confirm whether they are in accordance with the decisions made.

It is the responsibility of the scheduled Chair to accept the meeting invite and inform the Assessment and Awards Team in advance if they are unable to attend the meeting.

6.6 Absence of examiner representative of each assessed subject area/ Academic Representative from each partner organisation/Academic Link Tutor

In the event that any of the above member do not attend the scheduled Board meeting, the SPSA representative in attendance will be able to advise board members present that the relevant student marks/modules/profiles will not be considered during the board.

Following the Board meeting, the Assessment and Awards Team will provide a summary of the relevant student marks/modules/profiles to the relevant subject representatives/Academic Link Tutors and the Chair for review and approval. It is the responsibility of the subject representative/Academic Link Tutor to accept the meeting invite and inform the Assessment and Awards Team in advance if they are unable to attend the meeting.

6.7 Absence of External Examiners

An external examiner(s) in the subject(s) concerned, and moderators where appropriate, is expected to attend at least one Module Assessment Board in each academic year. If they exceptionally cannot attend a meeting where their presence is formally required they should provide written confirmation that they have seen the required sample of assessed work and

are satisfied with the standard of assessment and marking. If the Board cannot be assured that the external examiner has seen the required sample of assessed work, the relevant student marks/modules/profiles will be considered during the board but will be subject to approval following confirmation of the above post board by the relevant External Examiner(s).

6.8 Frequency

Module Assessment Boards shall meet as often as required by the University or as often as necessary to carry out the above duties.

7. Award/Progression Assessment Boards

7.1 Terms of Reference

The Award/Progression Assessment Board is responsible to the Academic Board of the University. The Award/Progression Assessment Board may form such sub-committees as required to carry out its duties provided such committees report directly to the Assessment Board. The constitution and terms of reference of each sub-committee must be approved and recorded by the Award/Progression Assessment Board and reported to Academic Board.

Formally instituted Academic Board Panels including but not exclusive to the Extenuating Circumstances Panel, Academic Misconduct Panel and the Appeal Panel are empowered to make decisions which shall be implemented directly by the Award/Progression Assessment Board.

The Award/Progression Assessment Board shall have the responsibility and authority delegated to it from Academic Board to discharge the following duties:

- i. to ensure the maintenance of appropriate standards of assessment;
- ii. to ensure that students are assessed in accordance with the approved regulations and procedures;
- iii. to determine each student's progress in the stage under consideration from marks and other assessments supplied, including, where appropriate, reports on professional training;
- iv. to confirm the deadline for re-submission of student work and to use its academic judgment to consider and provide a decision on cases where:
 - a. a variation to the normal pattern of progression is proposed
 - b. an extension to the normal period of registration for an award is requested and it is not appropriate for consideration by the Extenuating Circumstances Panel
- v. Where the University is aware that there have been irregularities in the delivery and management of the programme prior to the Board, advice will be sought from Strategic Planning and Student Administration on the specific interpretation and implementation of the regulations to avoid disadvantaging students. The Board will consider this advice in its final judgment and must seek direct approval from Academic Board if varying from these recommendations.

- vi. Where the Extenuating Circumstances Panel has agreed that a student is absent with good cause from a final examination or assessment and is unable to complete further assessment, to consider recommending to Academic Board either:
 - a. the award of a qualification without further assessment provided that at least two thirds of the credits which count towards the final award have been successfully completed or;
 - b. the student is recommended for an aegrotat award;
- vii. to produce a record of decisions made to be signed off by the Chair of the Board and the External Examiner.
- viii. to admit students to their respective awards

7.2 Award/Progression Board Membership

Each Award/Progression Assessment Board shall consist of:

- i. Chair
- ii. Associate Deans of Faculties of Programmes and Modules under consideration;
- iii. Chief External Examiner
- iv. Representatives of Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (where appropriate)
- v. Representatives of Partners or nominated link tutor (where appropriate)
- vi. Programme Leader(s) or nominee

In attendance:

- i. a member of Strategic Planning and Student Administration shall attend in an advisory capacity
- ii. a Board Administrator

Internal Examiners may attend as observers.

Ex Officio: The Chair and Vice-Chair of Academic Board may attend the Assessment Board.

7.3 Quoracy

The quorum for an Assessment Board shall be:

- i. The Chair
- ii. Programme Leader(s) (or representative approved by the Dean of Faculty) for the programme(s) under consideration).
- iii. Academic Representative from each partner organisation from which progression/awards are being considered or appropriate Academic Link.
- iv. At least one Chief External Examiner where the Board is authorised to admit students to their awards.

- v. In addition, boards will not proceed unless the nominated Board Administrator is present to provide the appropriate paperwork and to record proceedings and a representative from SPSA is in attendance to provide advice.
- vi. If the Award/Progression Board is not quorate, it will normally be reconvened at a later date. However, in exceptional circumstances, the Chair of the Assessment Board has the authority to allow proceedings to continue when a board is not quorate.

7.4 Absence of the Chair

In the event that a Chair does not attend the scheduled board meeting, the SPSA representative in attendance will be able to advise the board members present that they can nominate another member present to act as Chair to ensure the board can continue.

The person nominated will be required to have previous Chair and/or assessment board experience and will be supported in a regulatory capacity by the SPSA representative.

Following the board meeting, the Chair who had been scheduled to attend will be contacted and asked to review the board outcomes and confirm whether they are in accordance with the decisions made.

It is the responsibility of the scheduled Chair to accept the meeting invite and inform the Assessment and Awards Team in advance if they are unable to attend the meeting.

7.5 Absence of Subject Programme Leader/Academic Representative from each partner organisation / Academic Link Tutor

In the event that any of the above does not attend the scheduled Board meeting, the SPSA representative in attendance will be able to advise board members present that the relevant student marks/Progression/Awards/profiles will not be considered during the board.

Following the Board meeting, the Assessment and Awards Team will provide a summary of the relevant student marks/Progression/Awards/profiles to the relevant Programme Leader/Academic Link Tutors and the Chair for review and approval.

It is the responsibility of the Programme Leader/Academic Link Tutor to accept the meeting invite and inform the Assessment and Awards Team in advance if they are unable to attend the meeting.

7.6 Absence of Chief External Examiner

If the Chief External Examiner exceptionally cannot attend a meeting where their presence is formally required, the relevant student marks/progression/awards/profiles will be considered during the board but will be subject to approval following confirmation post board by the relevant Chief External Examiner.

7.7 Frequency

Award/Progression Assessment Boards shall meet as often as required by the University or as often as necessary to carry out the above duties.

7.8 Students who have been deemed to have failed

The relevant Assessment Board must arrange for all candidates who have been failed by the Assessment Board to be notified in writing. Resit requirements should be stated where appropriate.

7.9 Formal admission to degrees

The Award/Progression Assessment Board is authorised by Academic Board to admit students to their respective awards and confer the awards and privileges in accordance with the regulations of the University.

7.10 Publication of results

SPSA will ensure that all students are advised of their results. The Programme team will make arrangements to inform students, in writing, of any resit requirements.

Appendix 2 – Generic Assessment Marking Rubrics

1. Level 3 Marking Framework

The marking framework aligns to the following External Reference points:

Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales (CQFW) Level Descriptors

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 90% | 90-100% | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|-------|
| Learning outcome: 1. | Non-submission | Unsatisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Minimum [insert learning outcome] | Satisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Fairly good [insert learning outcome] | Good [insert learning outcome] | Excellent [insert learning outcome] | Exceptional [insert learning outcome] | Outstanding [insert learning outcome] | |
| | | Does not meet the learning outcome and criteria to pass the assignment | Minimum ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | Satisfactory ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | Fairly good ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | Good ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | Excellent ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | Exceptional ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | Outstanding ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills. Minimum demonstration of independent learning and judgement. | |
| | | | Minimum awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area | Satisfactory awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the | Fairly good awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the | Good awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the | Excellent awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area | Exceptional awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the | Outstanding awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--|--|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| | | | of study or work. | area of study or work | area of study or work | area of study or work | of study or work | area of study or work | of study or work | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | | |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-----------------|--------|--|
| 1 st | 90-100 | Outstanding: Outstanding ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. This includes an outstanding demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works also evidences an outstanding awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. |
| | 80-90 | Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). |
| | 70-79 | Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There may be some minor inaccuracies/omissions. |
| 2.i | 60-69 | Good: Good ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. This includes a good demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works also evidences a good awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. |
| 2.ii | 50-59 | Fairly Good: Fairly good ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. This includes a fairly good demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works also evidences a fairly good awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. |
| 3 rd | 40-49 | Satisfactory: Satisfactory ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. This includes a satisfactory demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works also evidences a satisfactory awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. |

| | | |
|-----|-------|--|
| R/F | 35-39 | Marginal Refer/Fail: Some ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. This includes some demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works also evidences some awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. |
| | 30-34 | Refer/Fail: Minimum ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. This includes a minimum demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works lacks awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. Work may be incomplete. |
| | 1-29 | Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory ability to identify and use relevant understanding, methods and skills to complete tasks and address problems that, while well-defined, show some complexity. There is little to no demonstration of taking responsibility for initiating and completing tasks and procedures, as well as using independence and judgement within the defined boundaries of the assessment. Works lacks awareness of different viewpoints or approaches within the area of study or work. Work is incomplete |

2. Level 4 Marking Framework

The marking framework aligns to the following External Reference points:

[Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales \(CQFW\) Level Descriptors](#)

[The Frameworks for Higher Education qualifications of UK degree awarding bodies 2024 \(FHEQ\)](#)

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 90% | 90-100% | Total |
|--|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|---|-------|
| Learning outcome: [insert learning outcome] | Non-submission | Unsatisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Minimal [insert learning outcome] | Satisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Fairly good [insert learning outcome] | Good [insert learning outcome] | Excellent [insert learning outcome] | Exceptional [insert learning outcome] | Outstanding [insert learning outcome] | |
| | | Does not meet the learning outcome and criteria to pass the assignment | Minimum knowledge of relevant theories unsupported by research. | Basic knowledge of relevant theories supported by basic research. | Reasonable knowledge of relevant theories supported by a fair range of research. | Good knowledge of relevant theories supported by a good range of research. | Excellent knowledge of relevant theories supported by wide ranging research. | Exceptional knowledge of relevant theories supported by extensive research. | Outstanding knowledge of relevant theories supported by extensive research. | |
| | | | Lacks evaluation, arguments lack planning and structure. Ideas are poorly | Limited evaluation, arguments lack planning and structure. Ideas are not | Some evaluation, arguments show some planning and structure. Adequate | Good evaluation, arguments are planned and structured. Good | Excellent evaluation, arguments show excellent planning and structure. Excellent | Exceptional evaluation, exemplary arguments, original and insightful. Exceptional | Outstanding evaluation, exemplary arguments, unique and insightful. Outstanding | |

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 90% | 90-100% | Total |
|--------------------|---|-------|----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|
| | | | communicated . | communicated effectively. | communication of ideas. | communication of ideas. | communication of ideas. | communication of ideas. | communication of ideas. | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | | |

| Class % | Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors |
|-----------------|---|
| 1 st | 90-100 Outstanding: Outstanding knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] . Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] is unique and insightful. The work demonstrates outstanding ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make sound judgements. Presentation is remarkable with no errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of extensive reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is exemplary. Outstanding evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. |
| | 80-90 Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). |
| | 70-79 Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There may be some minor inaccuracies/omissions. |
| 2.i | 60-69 Very Good: Good knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] . Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] shows some originality and insight. The work demonstrates ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make sound judgements. Presentation is good with no significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of a good range of reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is good. However, the work is not as strongly original or distinctive as a first class piece of work, and there may be some omissions, or irrelevancies. Good evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. |

| Class % | Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors |
|--------------------------|---|
| 2.ii 50-59 | Fairly Good: Sound knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with no major inaccuracies or omissions. Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] lacks originality, is largely descriptive and superficial. The work demonstrates some ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation is satisfactory and does not contain a large number of significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of some appropriate reading and scholarship, though the range may be narrow. Argument structure and coherence is satisfactory. Some evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. |
| 3 rd 40-49 | Satisfactory: Basic knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with some inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] is limited, descriptive and superficial. The work demonstrates limited ability to present, evaluate and interpret data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style are poor with meaning sometimes impeded by ungrammatical sentence construction. There is limited evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is limited; work may be incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. |
| R/F 35-39 | Marginal Refer/Fail: Some basic knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Lacks evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] . Poor presentation, evaluation and interpretation of data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style are poor with minimum evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. (<i>Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level</i>). |
| 30-34 | Refer/Fail: Minimum knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] with serious inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Lacks evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study] . Little or no presentation, evaluation and interpretation of data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style are poor with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. Minimum evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. |

| Class % | Specific QAA Criteria Descriptors |
|---------|--|
| 1-29 | <p>Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory knowledge of the underlying concepts and principles associated with the [area of study] overall, work is irrelevant with very little material of any value. No evaluation and interpretation of the underlying concepts and principles of this [area of study]. No presentation, evaluation and interpretation of data to develop arguments and make judgements. Presentation and writing style is unacceptable with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is poor, work is incomplete. No evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.</p> |
| 0 | <p>Refer/Fail: Non-submission</p> |

3. Level 5 Marking Framework

The marking framework aligns to the following External Reference points:

[Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales \(CQFW\) Level Descriptors](#)

[The Frameworks for Higher Education qualifications of UK degree awarding bodies 2024 \(FHEQ\)](#)

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 90% | 90-100% | Total |
|--|----------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|-------|
| Learning outcome: 1. [insert learning outcome] | Non-submission | Unsatisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Minimum [insert learning outcome] | Satisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Fairly good [insert learning outcome] | Good [insert learning outcome] | Excellent [insert learning outcome] | Exceptional [insert learning outcome] | Outstanding [insert learning outcome] | |
| | | Does not meet the learning outcome and criteria to pass the assignment | Minimum basic knowledge of relevant learning theories unsupported by research. | Some basic knowledge of relevant learning theories supported by basic research. | Reasonable knowledge of relevant learning theories supported by a fair range of research. | Good knowledge of relevant learning theories supported by a good range of research. | Excellent knowledge of relevant learning theories supported by wide ranging research. | Exceptional knowledge of relevant learning theories supported by extensive research. | Outstanding knowledge of relevant learning theories supported by extensive research. | |
| | | | Lacks critical analysis, arguments lack planning and structure. Ideas are poorly communicated | Limited critical analysis, arguments lack planning and structure. Ideas are not communicated effectively. | Some critical analysis, arguments show some planning and structure. Adequate communication of ideas. | Good critical analysis, arguments are planned and structured. Good communication of ideas. | Excellent critical analysis, arguments show excellent planning and structure. Excellent communication of ideas. | Exceptional critical analysis, exemplary arguments, original and insightful. Exceptional communication of ideas | Outstanding critical analysis, exemplary arguments, unique and insightful. Outstanding communication of ideas | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | | |



| Class | % | Criteria |
|-----------------|--------|--|
| 1 st | 90-100 | <p>Outstanding: Outstanding knowledge and critical understanding well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed. The work demonstrates outstanding application of key theories and principles to practice with outstanding knowledge and critical evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analysis and interpretations of data is remarkable.</p> <p>There is outstanding critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques providing unique and insightful answers to problems that arise from that analysis.</p> <p>The work demonstrates outstanding communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences. The student has an outstanding ability to effectively implement [area of study] approaches. Presentation is remarkable with no errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of extensive reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is exemplary. Outstanding evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that requires personal responsibility and decision-making.</p> |
| | 80-90 | <p>Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed though there may be negligible errors.</p> |
| | 70-79 | <p>Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors and some minor inaccuracies/omissions.</p> |
| 2.i | 60-69 | <p>Very Good: Good knowledge and critical understanding well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed. The work demonstrates good application of key theories and principles to practice with good knowledge and critical evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analysis and interpretations of data is good.</p> <p>There is proficient critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques providing answers of some originality and insight to problems that arise from that analysis.</p> <p>Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is good. The student's ability to effectively implement key [area of study] approaches is good. Presentation is accomplished with no significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of reading and scholarship, argument structure and coherence is good. However, the work is not as strongly original or distinctive as a first class piece of work, and there may be some omissions, or irrelevancies. Good evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that requires personal responsibility and decision-making.</p> |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-----------------|-------|--|
| 2.ii | 50-59 | <p>Fairly Good: Sound knowledge well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with some critical understanding and no major inaccuracies or omissions. The work is largely descriptive and superficial with some application of key theories and principles to practice and reasonable knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analyses and interpretations of data is adequate. Critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques is limited, so that answers to problems that arise from that analysis lack originality and insight.</p> <p>Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is sound and the student is able to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation is satisfactory and does not contain a large number of significant errors in academic writing style (including spelling, punctuation, grammar, sentence construction, and referencing). There is evidence of some appropriate reading and scholarship, though the range may be narrow, whilst argument structure and coherence is satisfactory. Some evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that requires personal responsibility and decision-making.</p> |
| 3 rd | 40-49 | <p>Satisfactory: Basic knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with some inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. The work is descriptive and superficial with limited application of key theories and principles to practice and limited knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student's understanding of how their knowledge is limited and the effect this has on their analyses and interpretations of data is inadequate. The works lacks critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques.</p> <p>Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is poor and the student shows limited ability to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are poor with meaning sometimes impeded by ungrammatical sentence construction There is limited evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is limited; work may be incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.</p> |
| R/F | 35-39 | <p>Marginal Refer/Fail: Some basic knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. The work lacks application of key theories and principles to practice, is descriptive and superficial with insufficient knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. Little or no evidence of the student understanding of how their knowledge is limited or how this affects their analyses and interpretations of data. The work lacks critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques.</p> <p>Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is poor and the student shows limited ability to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are poor with minimum evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility. (<i>Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level</i>).</p> |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-------|-------|---|
| | 30-34 | <p>Refer/Fail: Minimum knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed with serious inaccuracies, omissions or misunderstanding. Little or no application of key theories and principles to practice, is descriptive and superficial with insufficient knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. The student does not evidence understanding of how their knowledge is limited or how this affects their analyses and interpretations of data. The work lacks critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques.</p> <p>Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is poor and the student does not evidence ability to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are poor with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is weak, work is incomplete. Limited evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.</p> |
| | 1-29 | <p>Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory knowledge of well-established principles in [area of study] and how those principles have developed, work is irrelevant with very little material of any value. Unsatisfactory application of key theories and principles to practice, with unacceptable knowledge and evaluation of data collection and approaches to solving problems. No evidence understanding of how their knowledge is limited or how this affects their analyses and interpretations of data. No critical analysis of information using a range of established techniques.</p> <p>Communication of information, arguments and analysis in a range of forms to specialist and non-specialist audiences is unacceptable and unable to implement key [area of study] approaches. Presentation and writing style are unacceptable with no evidence of appropriate reading and scholarship. Argument structure and coherence is poor, work is incomplete. No evidence of qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that expects some demonstration of personal responsibility.</p> |
| | 0 | Refer/Fail: Non-submission |

4. Level 6 Marking Framework

The marking framework aligns to the following External Reference points:

[Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales \(CQFW\) Level Descriptors](#)

[The Frameworks for Higher Education qualifications of UK degree awarding bodies 2024 \(FHEQ\)](#)

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 89% | 90-100% | Total |
|--|----------------|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|---|-------|
| Learning outcome: 1. [insert learning outcome] | Non-submission | Unsatisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Minimum [insert learning outcome] | Satisfactory [insert learning outcome] | Fairly good [insert learning outcome] | Good [insert learning outcome] | Excellent [insert learning outcome] | Exceptional [insert learning outcome] | Outstanding [insert learning outcome] | |
| | | Does not meet the learning outcome and criteria to pass the assignment | Minimum understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | Satisfactory understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | Fairly good understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | Good understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | Excellent understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | Exceptional understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | Outstanding understanding and knowledge of key ideas in [area of study] , some of which informed by forefront of [area of study] . Lacks systematic, in depth engagement with key concepts. | |



| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 89% | 90-100% | Total |
|--------------------|---|-------|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | <p>Minimum analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Arguments are poorly developed with minimum support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Ideas are poorly communicated.</p> | <p>Satisfactory analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Arguments are satisfactorily developed with satisfactory support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Ideas are satisfactorily communicated.</p> | <p>Fairly good analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Development of arguments is fairly good with fairly good support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Communication of ideas is fairly good.</p> | <p>Good analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Development of arguments is good with good support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Communication of ideas is good.</p> | <p>Excellent analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Development of arguments is excellent with excellent support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Communication of ideas is excellent.</p> | <p>Exceptional analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Development of arguments is exceptional with exceptional support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Communication of ideas is exceptional.</p> | <p>Outstanding analysis, enquiry and critical evaluation. Development of arguments is outstanding with outstanding support from research, some of which at the forefront of [area of study], to make judgements or find solutions.</p> <p>Communication of ideas is outstanding.</p> | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | | |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-----------------|--------|--|
| 1 st | 90-100 | <p>Outstanding: Outstanding systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Outstanding accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Outstanding conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Outstanding conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. An outstanding appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences outstanding application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is outstanding critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates outstanding communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Outstanding evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. An outstanding learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.</p> |
| | 80-90 | <p>Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed though there may be negligible errors.</p> |
| | 70-79 | <p>Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the classification above are displayed. There may be negligible errors and some minor inaccuracies/omissions.</p> |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-------|-------|---|
| 2.i | 60-69 | <p>Very Good: Very good systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Very good accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Very good conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Very good conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. A very good appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences very good application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is very good critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates very good communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Very good evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. A very good learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.</p> |
| 2.ii | 50-59 | <p>Fairly Good: Fairly good systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of [area of study]. Fairly good accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Fairly good conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Fairly good conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. A fairly good appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences fairly good application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is fairly good critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates fairly good communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Fairly good evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. A fairly good learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.</p> |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-----------------|-------|--|
| 3 rd | 40-49 | <p>Satisfactory: Satisfactory systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of [area of study]. Satisfactory accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Satisfactory conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Satisfactory conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. A satisfactory appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences satisfactory application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is satisfactory critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates satisfactory communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Satisfactory evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. A satisfactory learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature.</p> |
| R/F | 35-39 | <p>Marginal Refer/Fail: Limited systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Limited accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Limited conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Limited conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. Limited appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences limited application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is limited critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates limited communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. limited evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. Limited learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature. (<i>Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level</i>).</p> |

| Class | % | Criteria |
|-------|-------|---|
| | 30-34 | <p>Refer/Fail: Minimal systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Minimal accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Minimal conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Minimal conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. Minimal appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences minimal application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is minimal critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates minimal communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Minimal evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. Minimal learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature. (<i>Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level</i>).</p> |
| | 1-29 | <p>Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory systematic understanding of key aspects of [area of study], including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of youth and community work. Unsatisfactory accurate use of established analysis and enquiry techniques within [area of study]. Unsatisfactory conceptual understanding used to devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using some ideas and techniques at the forefront of a discipline. Unsatisfactory conceptual understanding also used to describe and comment upon particular aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, in the discipline. Unsatisfactory appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge, management of own learning and use of scholarly reviews and primary sources (for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline).</p> <p>Work evidences unsatisfactory application of learned methods and techniques to review, consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding, and to initiate and carry out projects. There is unsatisfactory critical evaluation of arguments, assumptions, abstract concepts and data (that may be incomplete), to make judgements, and to frame appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identify a range of solutions - to a problem.</p> <p>The work demonstrates unsatisfactory communication of information, ideas, problems and solutions to specialist and non-specialist audiences. Unsatisfactory evidence of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require decision-making in complex and unpredictable contexts. Unsatisfactory learning ability for undertaking appropriate further training of a professional or equivalent nature. (<i>Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level</i>).</p> |
| | 0 | <p>Refer/Fail: Non-submission</p> |

5. Level 7 Marking Framework

The marking framework aligns to the following External Reference points:

[Credit and Qualifications Framework for Wales \(CQFW\) Level Descriptors](#)

[The Frameworks for Higher Education qualifications of UK degree awarding bodies 2024 \(FHEQ\)](#)

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 90% | 90-100% | Total |
|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|-------|
| Learning outcome: 1. | Non-submission | Unsatisfactory (insert learning outcome) | Minimum (insert learning outcome) | Satisfactory (insert learning outcome) | Fairly good (insert learning outcome) | Good (insert learning outcome) | Excellent (insert learning outcome) | Exceptional (insert learning outcome) | Outstanding (insert learning outcome) | |
| | | Does not meet the learning outcome and criteria to pass the assignment | Minimum systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | Some basic systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | Reasonable systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | Good systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | Excellent systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | Exceptional systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | Outstanding systematic understanding of knowledge with critical awareness of current issues and insights unsupported by research. | |

| Grade Boundaries % | 0 | 1-29% | 30-39% | 40 – 49% | 50 – 59% | 60 – 69% | 70 – 79% | 80 – 90% | 90-100% | Total |
|--------------------|---|-------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|-------|
| | | | Lacks critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Little to no evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Ideas are poorly communicated. | Limited critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Limited evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Limited communication of ideas. | Some critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Some evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Fairly good communication of ideas. | Good critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Good evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Good communication of ideas. | Excellent critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Substantial evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Excellent communication of ideas. | Exceptional critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Extensive evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Exceptional communication of ideas. | Outstanding critical evaluation, creativity and original application of knowledge. Unprecedented evidence of autonomy in planning and organisation of work. Outstanding communication of ideas. | |
| Comments | | | | | | | | | | |

| | % | Criteria |
|-------------|--------|---|
| Distinction | 90-100 | <p>Outstanding: Outstanding systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates an outstanding knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with outstanding practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work evidences outstanding critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of outstanding systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Outstanding communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Outstanding self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of an outstanding ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>An outstanding display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.</p> |
| | 80-90 | <p>Exceptional: In most areas, the qualities required for the grade above are displayed, though there may be negligible errors.</p> |
| | 70-79 | <p>Excellent: In most areas, the qualities required for the grade above are displayed. There may be negligible errors and some minor inaccuracies/omissions.</p> |

| | % | Criteria |
|------|-------|--|
| Pass | 60-69 | <p>Very Good: Very good systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates a very good knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with very good practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work evidences very good critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of very good systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Very good communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Very good self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a very good ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>A very good display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.</p> |
| | 50-59 | <p>Fairly Good: Fairly good systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates a fairly good knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with fairly good practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work evidences fairly good critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of fairly good systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Fairly good communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Fairly good self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a fairly good ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>A fairly good display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.</p> |

| | % | Criteria |
|------------|-------|---|
| | 40-49 | <p>Satisfactory: Satisfactory systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates a satisfactory knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with satisfactory practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work evidences satisfactory critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is evidence of satisfactory systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Satisfactory communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Satisfactory self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a satisfactory ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>A satisfactory display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.</p> |
| Refer/Fail | 35-39 | <p>Marginal Refer/Fail: Some systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates some knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with some practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work evidences limited critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. There is some evidence of systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data. Limited communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Some self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a limited ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>A limited display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development. (<i>Compensation is possible within regulations of board for undergraduate & postgraduate level</i>).</p> |

| % | Criteria |
|-------|---|
| 30-34 | <p>Refer/Fail: Minimal systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work demonstrates minimal knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is original with minimal practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work evidences minimal critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. Evidence of systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data is lacking. Limited communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Minimal self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with evidence of a limited ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>Minimal display of the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.</p> |
| 1-29 | <p>Clear Refer/Fail: Unsatisfactory systematic understanding of knowledge and critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, informed by the forefront of the academic discipline, field of study or area of professional practice. The work lacks knowledge of techniques applicable to research and advanced scholarship. Application of knowledge is unoriginal without practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the subject discipline.</p> <p>Work lacks critical evaluation of current research, advanced scholarship and methodologies to propose new hypotheses if appropriate. Evidence of systematic and creative management of complex issues to make sound judgements in the absence of complete data is insufficient. Poor communication of conclusions to specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p> <p>Inadequate self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems with little to no ability to advance personal knowledge and understanding and to develop new skills at a high level.</p> <p>Work does not display the qualities and transferable skills needed for employment that require initiative and personal responsibility, complex decision-making and independent learning for continued professional development.</p> |
| 0 | <p>Refer/Fail: Non-submission</p> |