

ST GEORGE'S, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Scheme of Assessment for Intercalated BSc (Hons)

2021-22

This Scheme of Assessment is made by the Intercalated BSc Course Committee under paragraph 8 of the Programme Regulations for the BSc Honours Degrees in Basic Medical Sciences.

- 1.1 The Regulations for the BSc (Honours) course and examinations in the Intercalated BSc for students of St George's, University of London provide for examinations to assess students' performance in the first (final) year of the course.
- 1.2 This scheme outlines the form of the examinations under those regulations. The Board of Examiners for the Intercalated BSc (Honours) Degree in Basic Medical Sciences (the Board) has ultimate responsibility for the standard of the examinations and for their fair conduct.
- 1.3 A Chief Examiner will be appointed for the Year. The Chief Examiner will: co-ordinate the setting of each examination paper in consultation with the module organisers; obtain approval of these papers from the External Examiners; arrange for the marking of the examinations; oversee the conduct of assessments and report the results to the Board, making an annual report on the conduct and standard of the examination.
- 1.4 Module organisers act as responsible examiners for the module that they coordinate. They have a duty to: help ensure the standard and fair conduct of assessments within that module and to assist the Chief Examiner in the reporting of results to the Board of Examiners .
- 1.5 External Examiners will be appointed in accordance with the constitution of the Board. The External Examiners will moderate the setting of questions in the examinations and moderate the marking of those questions and associated practical examinations.
- 1.6 Presentations given by students may be audio or video recorded for quality assurance purposes. They will remain confidential and will be available only to responsible examiners or their nominees and to External Examiners during the performance of their duties.

2. Structure of Intercalated Examinations

- 2.1 Modules shall be examined by distinct elements of assessment (e.g. In-Course Assessment, Written Examination, Practical Assessment) and it is a requirement that a pass mark is achieved for each element of assessment. The assessment components that constitute an element of assessment shall be detailed in each module outline.
- 2.2 Students will usually be examined by in-course assessment during each semester in the taught modules that form part of that semester. These assessments may include essays, oral presentations, poster presentations, practical tests or critical reviews.
- 2.3 Taught modules will usually be examined by final exams in April/May. Each module will set a paper of not more than three hours duration that will concentrate on topics taught during that module as well as looking for evidence of further integration of scientific information, wider reading and critical analysis. The paper may include short-answer questions, long-answer questions, essay questions, data analysis or single-best-answer questions.
- 2.4 Each module will provide the opportunity for formative assessments prior to the summative assessments in that module. Formative assessments may be delivered in a variety of ways, for example, as online feedback quizzes or by traditional assignment and marking by individual assessors.

3 Instructions to Markers

3.1 Marking of Assessments

Each component of the examination (ie each question of the written paper, in-course assessment, project report and viva) should be marked on a percentage scale. The table below is a generic description of the criteria used in marking written assignments within examinations and in-course assessments. Specific guidance and descriptions outlining the criteria for marking in-course assessments, assignments and practical work may be provided separately within modules. Specific criteria descriptions for marking reports, vivas and in-course assessment of research projects are provided separately with the research project report form. A project report form should be completed for each project and the form returned to the Chair of the Board of Examiners (currently Dr Paris Ataliotis). Written assessments, whether conducted under supervised or unsupervised conditions, shall be marked in detail by one Internal Examiner or Assessor, with at least one other Internal Examiner or Assessor having an overview of the work submitted for assessment. The research project dissertation and research project vivas should be double marked independently.

Mark (%)	Degree Equivalent	Notes to examiners marking individual pieces of work
90 - 100	1st	Well organised and well-expressed answer which is outstanding in all criteria. Demonstrates clear understanding, evidence of independent study and critical evaluation. Covers all aspects of the subject that could reasonably be expected, accurately and in sufficient detail.
80 - 89	1st	Well organised and well-expressed answer which shows excellent understanding, evidence of independent study and critical evaluation. Covers all aspects of the subject that could reasonably be expected, accurately and in sufficient detail.
70 - 79	1st	Well organised and well-expressed answer which shows very good understanding, and evidence of independent study or critical evaluation. Covers all major aspects of the subject that could reasonably be expected, accurately and in sufficient detail.
60 - 69	2i	Generally well organised and well expressed answer which shows good understanding. Covers all, or almost all, major aspects of the subject accurately and in sufficient detail.
50 - 59	2ii	Broadly accurate answer covering most of the major aspects of the subject. Lacks some details or contains some errors or is not sufficiently well constructed or argued for a 2i.
40 - 49	3rd	Incomplete coverage of the subject. Important errors or omissions, or poor presentation.
35 - 39	Borderline fail	Very limited answer. Small amount of correct relevant material presented adequately, or more relevant points but presented poorly.
21 - 34	Fail	Very poor attempt to answer the question, or insufficient correct material, or very poor expression of material. The higher marks in the range should reflect either more relevant points or better presentation.
0 - 20	Fail	No, or almost no, relevant material. If no answer or totally irrelevant, give 0; if one or two points related in any way to the question, give up to 10; if one or two relevant points, give 10-20.

3.2 Late submission of in-course work (without prior agreed special arrangement)

- (a) For any in-course element **except for the research project report**, where a candidate is absent or fails to submit assessed work by the stipulated date the examiners shall award zero marks. In-course assessments that have been submitted up to one week after the deadline will be marked as normal. Marks and feedback should be returned to the student and any mark deduction will normally be carried out by the Chair of the Board at the time of final assembly of marks.
- (b) **For research project reports** submitted late, 5% of the total marks available will be deducted for each day (or part of 24 hours) that the deadline is exceeded up to a maximum of 25% per week; there is no limit to this penalty and the mark remaining may reach zero. This deduction will normally be carried out by the Chair of the Board at the time of final assembly of marks.

3.3 Word limit policy

- (a) Students who exceed the prescribed word limit will have their work marked but markers **will stop marking when the word count exceeds the maximum word count set** for that assignment. Markers will indicate on the text the point at which the limit is reached which is, by definition, where they have stopped marking. Hence, any words written beyond the stipulated limit will not be read by the examiners; no marks will be awarded and no feedback provided for any text beyond the prescribed

limit. Although a formal penalty is not applied, a mark will be awarded only for the content up to this point.

(b) Assignments which are below the word limit set for an assignment will not attract a specific penalty.

4 Instructions to Module Examiners

When the marks for all components of the course module examination are available, the examiner concerned should aggregate them, using the weighting for each component already approved by the School and University and shown on each mark sheet. All marks for all components should be on the above scale and calculations throughout should be to one decimal place, rounding up or down as appropriate. Completed marksheets should then be sent to the Chief Examiner (currently Dr Paris Ataliotis).

5. Instructions to Board of Examiners

5.1 Averaging the course unit marks for each candidate

The Chair of the Board of Examiners averages the module marks for each candidate. Modules are weighted according to credits. Students must take a total of 120 credits in modules at Level 6. 45 credits are awarded for Research Projects, and a further 75 credits are made up from a combination of 15-credit and 30-credit taught modules.

Calculation of final weighted average – “Exit Velocity” Enhancement

Marks for each 15-credit module x 15, divided by 135
+
Marks for each 30-credit module x 30, divided by 135
+
Marks for each 45-credit module x 45, divided by 135
+
MAX Mark from any of above modules x 15, divided by 135 (exit velocity enhancement)

=Final weighted average

The final weighted average is calculated to the nearest integer, rounding up or down as appropriate.

5.2 Overall class of Honours

To be awarded the Degree, a candidate must achieve a final weighted average mark of 40.00 or more from modules totalling 120 credits, all at the final year honours degree level. It is a requirement that all elements of summative assessment within each module shall also be passed (40.00% or more). No compensation between elements of assessment is permitted.

Final Weighted Average	Class of Honours
70 - 100	1st
60 - 69	2i
50 - 59	2ii
40 - 49	3rd
0 - 39	Fail

Candidates shall normally stay in the class indicated by their final weighted average. They can only be moved up if they fall into the borderline category defined below.

5.3 Definition of borderline category:

Criteria for automatic promotion of degree classification

Students who achieve BOTH of the following two requirements will automatically be promoted to the next highest degree classification. Students will be identified by the Chair of the Board of Examiners and approved by the exam board.

Boundary	Final Weighted Average	Final Year modules totalling at least 60 credits with the following marks:
1st/2i	69	≥ 69.0
2i/2ii	59	≥ 59.0
2ii/3rd	49	≥ 49.0

5.4 Degree Titles

The degree title shall be **BSc (Hons) Basic Medical Sciences**. If a student undertakes a minimum of 75 credits in a particular subject area (e.g. Pharmacology), the title of their degree shall be amended to reflect the modules taken, i.e. BSc (Hons) in Basic Medical Sciences with a particular subject.

5.5 Re-entry to Assessment (re-sit)

5.5.1 To be awarded the Degree, a candidate must have satisfied the examiners by reaching the pass mark in modules to the value of 120 credits. Candidates who fail to meet the criteria for achieving a degree classification will be permitted to re-enter for the relevant assessment(s) on one further occasion, usually in the following September, although the Board of Examiners may require that a student defer such re-entry. All examination periods are subject to change. A candidate who re-sits elements of assessment is required to achieve a final mark of at least 40.0 in each element. The final re-sit mark for an element of assessment will be capped at 40.0 and combined with marks from elements that were passed at first attempt to determine the candidate's overall module mark. Marks at re-assessment will be combined with marks from modules that were passed at first attempt to determine the candidate's overall class of honours, as described in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.

5.5.2 A candidate who has not passed all required assessments following one re-sit attempt, will be eligible to be considered for a discretionary third 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. Detailed information about process and timescales is published on the Student Affairs section of the Website.

5.5.3 To be considered for a discretionary, third attempt at assessments by the fast-track process, students must have no more than TWO modules with an overall mark below 40.0%.

5.5.4 The offer of a discretionary, third attempt at an assessment by the fast-track process shall be conditional upon evidence of engagement by the student. Specifically, the student must confirm acceptance of the offer (in writing) within 5 working days of notification.

5.5.5 A student will be permitted to undertake a discretionary third attempt at assessments on only ONE occasion during the Intercalated BSc programme.

5.5.6 A student who has failed an assessment shall be permitted to have that attempt discounted where the Board of Examiners are satisfied that one or more of the following conditions have been met:

- I. The result was affected by an administrative error
- II. The assessment was not conducted in accordance with the Scheme, Regulations and approved procedures of St George's

The student's performance had been adversely affected by illness or other relevant factors which either the student had, for good reason, been unable to make known to the Mitigating Circumstances Panel at the appropriate time in accordance with General Regulation 10.4, or which the Mitigating Circumstances Panel had failed properly to take into account

Last revision: August 2021