

## St George's, University of London

### Scheme of Assessment for BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science Year 1

#### 1. General

- 1.1 This Scheme of Assessment details the assessments for Year 1 of the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science degree, as required under section 7 of the SGUL General Regulations for Students and Programmes of Study. The Board of Examiners for the BSc (Honours) Degree in Healthcare Science (the Board) has ultimate responsibility for the standard of the examinations and for their fair conduct.
- 1.2 The Scheme of Assessment is formulated and approved by the Undergraduate Course Committee for Healthcare Science as a supplementary document to the Programme Regulations and General Regulations. The details of assessments in this Scheme are subject to the provisions for assessment in paragraphs 8 – 11 of the Programme Regulations.
- 1.3 The module leaders for Year 1 modules shall act as Internal Examiners. These Examiners will co-ordinate the setting of examination papers and assessments for their module; obtain approval of the assessments from the External Examiner(s); arrange for the marking of assessment and oversee the conduct of assessments and report results to the Board.
- 1.4 An External Examiner will be appointed and will moderate the setting of questions in examinations, moderate the marking of assessments and may choose to attend practical examinations.
- 1.5 The BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science degree programme comprises modules with an overall credit value of 360 credits (120 at level 4, 120 at level 5 and 120 at level 6).
- 1.6 The modules and the number of credits allocated for Year 1 modules are as follows:

<u>Year 1 Modules</u>	<u>Credits</u>
Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 1	30 credits
Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 2	30 credits
Scientific Basis of Cardiovascular, Respiratory & Sleep Science	30 credits
Professional Practice 1	15 credits
Clinical Training 1	15 credits

- 1.7 The successful completion of all modules for which a student is registered is required for the award of the degree.

#### 2. Overview of Year 1 assessments

- 2.1 Each Year 1 programme module has prescribed assessment components as detailed in the following table. All assessment components are summative unless otherwise indicated. Formative assessments are conducted to enhance the student's learning experience and provide a mechanism for providing the student with personalised feedback regarding their clinical skills. No marks are generally allocated to such assessments, but if they are, they are only to guide students and do not contribute to the calculation of the overall Year mark or the classification of honours.

YEAR 1					
Module	Credit	Indicative assessment components	Weighting %	Indicative timing	Achieving a pass
Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 1	30	1 Written examination 1 hour SBA and/or SAQ	100%	January	The examination must be passed in order to pass this module.
Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 2	30	1 Written examination 1 hour SBA and/or SAQ	100%	July	The examination must be passed in order to pass this module.
Scientific Basis of Cardiovascular, Respiratory & Sleep Science	30	2 In-course essays 1 Resp/Sleep 1 Cardiac Approx 2000 words each	15% for each essay	March & May	The essay component and exam component must be passed separately in order to achieve an overall pass for this module.
		1 Written examination 1 hour SBA and/or SAQ	70%	July	
Professional Practice 1	15	1 Formative IFP Teamwork Presentation	N/A	December	The essay component must be passed in order to achieve an overall pass for this module.
		2 In-course reflective essays Approx 700 words each	50% for each essay	May	
Clinical Training 1	15	1 Formative Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) Approx 5 stations	N/A	December	Each summative assessment component must be passed separately in order to achieve an overall pass for this module.
		Satisfactory attendance at work-based placements	Pass / Fail	Completion by end of module (July)	
		Satisfactory demonstration of specified Clinical Competencies DOPS/CBD	Pass / Fail	Completion by end of module (July)	
		Satisfactory demonstration of specified Professional Competencies	Pass / Fail	Completion by end of module (July)	
		Portfolio	Pass / Fail	Completion by end of module (July)	

## 2.2 Late submission of in-course written assessments

Students who fail to submit coursework assessments by the submission deadline without an agreed extension will incur the following penalty: work submitted within

seven days of the original submission deadline will be accepted for marking but the marks awarded will be capped at 40.00%. Work submitted after the seven day period without an agreed extension, or students who do not submit any work will receive a mark of 0 for that attempt.

- 2.3 Where a penalty has been applied to an assessment mark due to late submission or non-submission, the calculation of the final overall year mark will use these adjusted marks.

### 3. Marking of assessments

- 3.1 Year 1 assessments are marked on a percentage scale with the exception of assessments within the Clinical Training modules which are marked as pass/fail only. The pass mark for each Year 1 module is 40.00% except Clinical Training 1 for which students must achieve 'Pass' in all summative elements in order to pass.
- 3.2 Non-competency based examinations and in-course written assessments will be marked on a percentage scale. Assessment criteria for these assessments are appended to this Scheme.
- 3.3 For all supervised examinations, candidates shall be given a candidate number to ensure anonymity during marking. Written assessments shall be marked in detail by one Internal Examiner or Assessor, with a second Internal Examiner or Assessor having at least an overview of the work. Written examination components in which an objective scheme for the award of marks is pre-determined (e.g. Short Answer Questions) shall be marked by one Internal Examiner or Assessor.
- 3.4 Where the two marks for a candidate diverge significantly, the two examiners will discuss and agree a mark; where agreement between the two examiners cannot be reached, this shall be referred to the Chief Examiner who shall allocate the final mark.
- 3.5 Standard setting may be applied to computer-marked questions in order to adjust the whole cohort's marks whilst maintaining the pass mark at 40.00. This will be achieved using a recognised method selected to suit the variables of the assessment (normally Anghoff).
- 3.6 Mark rounding will take place for each module mark. The module mark will be determined by rounding the final mark to two decimal points.
- 3.7 Module Mark weighting will be applied in order to calculate a year mark for each year of the programme. The mark for each of the modules pertaining to that year of the programme will be weighted according to the contribution they make to that year. The weighted scores for each module will be summed to give an overall year mark. The year mark will be rounded to the nearest whole number, with marks of .50 and above being rounded up and marks of .49 and below being rounded down. The following is given as a worked example:

Module	Credit value	Mark awarded
Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 1	30 credits	66.03
Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 2	30 credits	63.72
Scientific Basis of Cardiovascular, Respiratory & Sleep Science	30 credits	69.00
Professional Practice 1	15 credits	68.50
Clinical Training 1	15 credits	Pass

Weighted mark for Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 1 =  $(66.03 \times 30/105)$

Weighted mark for Scientific Basis of Healthcare Science 2 =  $(63.72 \times 30/105)$

Weighted mark for Scientific Basis of Cardiovascular, Respiratory & Sleep Science =  $(69.00 \times 30/105)$

Weighted mark for Professional Practice 1 =  $(68.50 \times 15/105)$

**Year 1 overall:**  $((66.03 \times 30/105) + (63.72 \times 30/105) + (69.00 \times 30/105) + (68.50 \times 15/105)) = 66.5714$

**Rounded year 1 overall mark = 67%**

3.8 The rounded Year 1 mark shall contribute 10% to the final degree mark calculation.

#### 4. Reassessment

4.1 A student will, as of right, be permitted one re-entry/resubmission for all failed examinations or assessment components.

4.2 A student who fails a Clinical Training module may be required to undertake a remedial reflective assignment and/or attend additional placement weeks to enable fulfilment of attendance requirements, completion of competency requirements or other work-based assessments, or to gather further evidence required for resubmission of the portfolio. The reassessment may take place outside of scheduled term dates for the programme. In some cases the student may be required to re-sit the entire placement in the following academic year. The arrangements for reassessment will be negotiated between the SGUL Work-Based Placement Co-ordinator and the NHS Work-Based Placement Supervisor according to the student's needs.

4.3 All re-sits of non-competency based examinations and in-course written assessments examinations and resubmission of coursework will be capped at 40.00%. Where a component of a module is re-sat or resubmitted it is the component that will be capped at 40.00% at reassessment rather than the overall module mark.

4.4 A student who fails at re-assessment(s) will be eligible to be considered for a discretionary third and final attempt at failed assessments, in accordance with the *Procedure for consideration for a final discretionary attempt at an assessment*, as approved by Senate. Under this procedure, Boards of Examiners will have the authority to approve a discretionary third attempt if a candidate meets programme-specific fast-track criteria. For candidates who do not satisfy the programme-specific fast-track criteria, a Discretionary Panel of Senate will consider the student's application for a discretionary third attempt.

4.5 The discretionary panel fast-track criteria for the BSc Healthcare Science programme will be published in the assessment section of the course Moodle pages.

4.6 A student granted a third and final attempt may be required to repeat that Year, or part thereof, in order to re-take the failed assessments. Where a component of a module is re-sat or resubmitted as a third and final attempt it is the component that will be capped at 40.00% at reassessment rather than the overall module mark.

## **5. Progression**

- 5.1 Students must pass all Year 1 modules to formally progress from Year 1 to Year 2. Students must normally pass all Year 1 programme modules before commencing Year 2 studies.

## **6. Intermediate Award**

- 6.1 An intermediate award shall only be given to students who cease to be registered on the BSc Hons Healthcare Science programme (that is to say, it is an exit qualification, not a qualification that students will automatically get *en route* to the BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science).
- 5.2 Students who have successfully completed all modules of the first year of the programme for BSc (Hons) Healthcare Science shall be eligible for the SGUL award of Undergraduate Certificate in Healthcare Science.

## **7. Reporting of Results**

- 6.1 Provisional examination and in-course assessment marks may be issued throughout the academic year. Candidates will be given formal notice of their confirmed assessment marks, module marks and end of year mark within 6 weeks of the Board of Examiners meeting.

<b>Marking criteria for Year 1 (Level 4) non-competency based examinations and in-course written assessments</b>						
<b>LEVEL 4</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> (70-100%)</b>	<b>2.1 (60-69%)</b>	<b>2.2 (50-59%)</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> (40-49%)</b>	<b>Borderline Fail (35-39%)</b>	<b>Fail (0-35%)</b>
<b>Addressing the task</b>	Clear comprehensive evidence of addressing the task	Sound evidence of addressing the task	Adequate evidence of addressing the task	Limited evidence of addressing the task	Largely fails to address the task set	Fails to address the task set
<b>Structure/ content/ focus</b>	Clear and well structured, logical, concise, focussed, comprehensive	Clear and appropriate structure. Covers main areas. Logical, focussed in the main	Structure apparent but some inconsistencies. Covers most of the key areas	Some attempt at appropriate and relevant structure but lacks focus and clarity at times. Major areas are included but one or two key omissions	The structure is inconsistent, lacks focus and clarity. Some of the key areas are introduced	Lacks structure, focus and clarity in the main. Key areas superficially addressed and there are a number of important omissions
<b>Use of literature</b>	The ability to select, appraise and apply relevant literature is demonstrated consistently	Uses a variety of relevant literature with evidence of appropriate application	The literature included is relevant with some evidence of appropriate application.	Some relevant literature is included but the range is limited and mainly descriptive	Limited use of literature	Literature is not used
<b>Demonstration of Knowledge</b>	Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the topic.	Demonstrates appropriate knowledge and understanding of the topic	Demonstrates reasonable knowledge and understanding of the topic	Demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the topic	Knowledge and understanding of the topic is limited and superficial	Fails to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the topic.
<b>Application</b>	Relevant, insightful, innovative and in-depth application of knowledge to the task set.	Largely relevant and in-depth application of knowledge to the task set.	Mostly relevant and demonstrates application of knowledge to the task set	Adequate relevance and application to the task set	Limited relevance and superficial application to the task set.	Lacks relevance and application to the task set
<b>Referencing</b>	Consistently accurate and Appropriate	Relevant and mainly accurate	Minor inconsistencies and inaccuracies in referencing	Referencing evident but with a few omissions and some inaccuracy/ inconsistency	Limited referencing with omissions, inaccuracies and inconsistencies	Referencing very limited or non-existent
<b>Ethics</b>	Thorough consideration of ethical issues	Adequate consideration of ethical issues	Some consideration of ethical issues	Limited consideration of ethical issues	Cursory consideration of ethical issues	No consideration of ethical issues
<b>Presentation</b>	Excellent organisation and presentation.	Good organisation and presentation	Generally good organisation and presentation.	Organisation and/or presentation could be improved.	Poor organisation and /or presentation.	Very poor organisation and presentation
<b>Numeracy</b>	Uses correct notation and units. Figures are accurately quoted and when used in calculation working is shown.	Uses correct notation and units. Figures accurately quoted and when used in calculation working is sometimes shown.	Uses correct notation and units. Figures are generally accurate. Working is not clear.	Figures are quoted without units or with incorrect units. Values imprecise. Workings incomplete.	Figures are wildly out. Values are grossly inaccurate. Calculations are incorrect and do not show working.	No numeric work has been done when it would be expected.