William College

Assessment and Marking Framework

© William College. All rights reserved

Document Version Control	
Document Title:	Assessment and Marking Framework
Version:	1
Reviewing Committee	Academic Board
Approving Committee	Academic Board
Document Lead:	Provost
Date of Last Review:	May 2026
Date of Approval:	May 2026
Date Effective from:	June 2026
Date of Next Review:	May 2027

© William College. All rights reserved

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 4
2. Purpose 4
3. Scope 4
4. Assessment Framework 4
4.1 Setting the Assessment Tasks Procedures 5
4.1.1 Responsibilities 5
4.1.2 Assessment tasks and marking scheme 6
4.1.3 Assessment Timetable and Submission Area settings 6
4.1.4 Assessment Publication to students 7
5. Marking and Feedback Procedures 7
5.1 Responsibilities 8
5.2 Marking Team 9
5.3 Marking Scheme and Grade Criteria 9
5.4 Feedback and Feed Forward 9
5.5 Anonymous Marking 10
5.6 Marking Deadlines 10
5.7 Marking and Moderation 10
5.7.1 Standardisation of Marking 11
5.7.2 First Marking 11
5.7.3 Internal Moderation 12
5.7.4 Live Assessment 13
5.7.5 External Moderation 13
5.8 Late Submission and Capping 13
5.9 Resubmission/Referral 14
5.10 Exceptional Circumstances 14
5.11 Academic Misconduct 14
5.12 Grade Distribution Reports 14
6. Assessment Boards and Outcomes Procedures 15
6.1 Responsibilities 15
6.2 Internal Pre-Module Boards 15
6.3 Partner University Assessment Boards 16
6.4 Passing a Module 16
6.5 Module Failure 17
6.6 Repetition 17
6.7 Compensation 17
6.8 Trailing 17
6.9 Outcomes and Reporting 18

© William College. All rights reserved

7. Document Review 18
8. Related Policies and Documents 18
9. Appendix A 19
Definitions 19

© William College. All rights reserved

1. Introduction

Assessment is central to how students learn, develop, and demonstrate their academic and professional capabilities. At William College, we are committed to ensuring that all assessment practices are fair, transparent, inclusive, and aligned with clearly defined learning outcomes. This commitment underpins the College's approach to designing assessment tasks, marking student work, providing meaningful feedback, and assuring academic standards across all programmes.

This Assessment and Marking Framework sets out William College's institutional framework for the planning, delivery, moderation, quality assurance, and recording of assessment activities. It establishes a consistent approach that applies to all forms of assessed work, including coursework, examinations, practical assessments, and dissertations, across every level and mode of study.

The document ensures alignment with external regulatory expectations, including the Office for Students (OfS) conditions of registration requirements, and reflects recognised good practice across the UK higher education sector. It also supports internal consistency by outlining the standards, responsibilities, and processes that guide staff in the design, marking, verification, and review of assessment.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this document is threefold:

- Give students a clear understanding of how assessment is planned, delivered, marked, and reviewed at William College, including how feedback is provided and how academic standards are maintained.
- Offer academic staff practical guidance for designing assessment tasks, implementing assessment processes, and supporting students through effective and timely feedback.
- To provide clarity for professional services staff and external stakeholders on the principles and standards that underpin assessment, grading, feedback, and moderation at William College.

3. Scope

This document applies to all taught modules and programmes delivered by William College. It covers all enrolled students, who are required to participate fully in the assessment processes, submission expectations, and feedback arrangements defined in this document.
The procedures set out here relate to every type of assessment and moderation activity conducted by the College. They apply to all staff involved in any part of the assessment cycle, including the review and approval, delivery, marking, internal checking, and evaluation of assessment tasks and outcomes.

Definitions of key terms can be found in the Appendix.

4. Assessment Framework

William College upholds a robust and coherent assessment framework designed to ensure academic standards, regulatory compliance, and a high-quality learning experience for all students.

The College is committed to implementing and maintaining rigorous, transparent, and fair assessment procedures that uphold the academic standards in line with the expectations of the partner universities and the Office for Students (OfS).

Assessment at William College is underpinned by principles of validity, reliability, inclusivity, and integrity. All assessment activities are designed to measure achievement against clearly articulated learning outcomes and to ensure that students are assessed fairly across modules and programmes.

The College ensures that:

- Assessment methods are aligned with programme aims and support accurate measurement of student learning.
- Marking is transparent, equitable, and supported by moderation and verification processes that safeguard standards.

© William College. All rights reserved

- Students receive constructive, timely feedback that enables meaningful academic development.
- Academic integrity requirements are upheld and enforced across all levels of study.
- Appropriate adjustments and support are provided for students with declared disabilities or learning differences, consistent with the Equality Act 2010.
- Assessment data, records, and outcomes are stored and managed securely in accordance with data protection legislation.

Through this framework, William College ensures that awards granted to students are credible, comparable, and reflect consistent academic standards, in line with OfS conditions of registration and sector best practice.

4.1 Setting the Assessment Tasks Procedures

Assessments are designed by our Partner Universities to encourage students to adopt good academic practice, and to minimise opportunities for academic misconduct, i.e. by ensuring students undertake assessments which are demonstrably their own work.

Modules can be assessed in different ways, depending upon the nature of the module, its level, content and learning outcomes.

Together with the assessment tasks, the partner university provides the marking schemes for each assessment.

4.1.1 Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Module Leader	• Reviews assessment tasks and marking schemes for alignment with learning outcomes, accessibility, and academic integrity. • Notifies students of the date of mark release on Moodle. • Informs students when marks and feedback are available to view on Moodle, ensuring students are aware that marks will be formally confirmed at the next exam board. • Records feedback and amendments on the Grading Form. • Works with the Quality Manager to communicate amendments to the partner university. • Receives and reviews external feedback. • Ensures the Assessment Brief includes the approved task information. • Publish Assessment Briefs at the beginning of the semester in the relevant Moodle module area. • Delivers guidance to students who have failed. Guidance should summarise main reasons for failure and can be delivered online live or recorded.
Programme Leader	• Receives feedback forms (Grading Form) to ensure quality of feedback. • Assigns proof-readers once revised tasks are received. • Conducts holistic review of final tasks and marking schemes to ensure alignment with Module & Programme Specifications and Learning Outcomes. • Submits finalised tasks and marking schemes to the Quality Team. • Completes the assessment timetable for the academic year. • Ensures assessment workload is balanced and avoids bunching.
Quality and Governance Officer	• Communicates Module Leader feedback to the Partner University Link Tutor. • Logs all actions and feedback in **Log 1**. • Shares external feedback with Module and Programme Leaders. • Uploads approved tasks to the correct folders for record-keeping.
Student Support	• Contacts students who have failed upon release of marks to offer additional support through the resubmission period.
Academic Administrator	• Maintains the master academic calendar. • Ensures all module information, briefs, and Turnitin links are uploaded to Moodle.

© William College. All rights reserved

	• Checks VLE content for accessibility. • Publishes academic calendar and assessment timetable on the website and VLE.
Link Tutor (Partner University)	• Sends approved module documentation to William College (Partnership Manager/Quality Manager/Dean/Programme Leader). • Receives feedback from William College (via Quality Manager) and returns amended tasks.
Partner University	• Designs, approves and owns assessment tasks and marking schemes. • Shares received assessment tasks with Module Leaders. • Provides up-to-date Module Specifications, Assessment Tasks and Marking Schemes via the Link Tutor. • Gives final approval of assessment tasks.

4.1.2 Assessment Tasks and Marking Scheme

Assessment tasks and marking schemes are designed, approved, and owned by the partner universities. William College is responsible for ensuring that these assessments are implemented accurately, clearly, and consistently in line with the approved Module Specifications.

Module Leaders review assessment tasks to confirm alignment with learning outcomes, accessibility requirements, and academic integrity standards. Any required clarifications or amendments are communicated to the partner university via the Programme Manager/Year Lead and Link Tutor.

Final approval of assessment tasks rests with the partner university. Once approved, assessment briefs are published to students via the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) at the commencement of the module and retained for audit purposes.

Procedures

- The partner universities through the Link Tutor provide the up-to-date Module Specification, Assessment Tasks and Marking Scheme to the Programme Manager/Year Leader.
- The Programme Manager/Year Leader shares the tasks with the Module Leader who has subject knowledge, checks each task and marking scheme against the Module Specification.
- Feedback and any suggested amendments are recorded on Grading Form and sent to the Programme Leader/Year Lead, who will in turn, share the feedback with the Partner University's Link Tutor.
- The Quality and Governance Team logs all actions and feedback in Log 1. Once external feedback is received, it is shared with Module Leaders and Programme Leaders, and final adjustments are made if necessary.
- Once the initial stage of the review is complete and/or the partner university Link tutor has come back with the amended tasks, the Programme Leader will assign a proof-reader to each module.
- The proofreader reviews the finalised tasks for inclusive language, clarity, formatting, and presentation. Any required changes are discussed with the Module Leader and recorded on the Grading Form.
- Once the tasks are finalised, the Programme Leader conducts a holistic review of the finalised assessment tasks and marking schemes to ensure alignment with Module and Programme Specifications and Learning Outcomes.
- The Programme Leader confirms that the tasks meet the required standards, he/she submits the finalised assessment task, including examination papers, and marking schemes to the Quality and Governance Team.
- The Quality and Governance Team uploads the approved tasks to the relevant folder for record keeping and shares with the Module Leaders the final, approved assessment task into the Assessment Brief as PDFs.

4.1.3 Assessment Timetable and Submission Area Settings

Programme Leaders complete the assessment timetable from the start to the end of the academic year in alignment with the master academic calendar maintained by the Academic Administrator. The

© William College. All rights reserved

deadlines are set in alignment with the Assessment Board dates communicated by the partner universities.

Programme Leaders are responsible to ensure that assessment workloads are balanced across modules and that no student faces unreasonable bunching.

All assessment submissions must occur within the normal working day. As a matter of good practice, submission times should allow for potential technical issues to ensure students have adequate opportunity to submit their work, therefore the submission deadline is normally set for 12pm for all assessments submitted electronically. Wherever possible, Mondays should be avoided as the submission day.

Submission are settings should be enabled to permit the following:

- Students should be able to submit multiple drafts until the deadline.
- Students should be able to view Originality Reports for each draft submitted via Turnitin.
- Students should be able to submit work after the published deadline, and in line with Partner Universities' regulations (see Section 2.8). This work will be capped at the pass mark unless an extension has been granted in advance.

The Academic Calendar and the Assessment Timetable is published at the start of the academic year on the William College website and the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) Moodle by Academic Administrators.

4.1.4 Assessment Publication to students

The Module Leader, with oversight from the Programme Manager, is responsible to add the final approved assessment tasks into the Assessment Brief template. The template includes:

- Assessment learning outcomes.
- Assessment weighting.
- Assessment task.
- Word count limit / time limit.
- Assessment deadline.
- Submission information and method.

The Assessment Briefs are published to students at the beginning of the semester in the relevant area of each module on Moodle.

The Academic Administrator ensures that all module information, including briefs and Turnitin links, is uploaded to the VLE and is checked for accessibility.

5. Marking and Feedback Procedures

Marking is the process through which academic staff evaluate the quality of a student's summative work against the published assessment criteria. It involves making informed academic judgements, determining an appropriate grade that reflects the student's level of achievement, and offering clear, constructive feedback.

Feedback should follow the College's Feedback Guidelines. Feedback should be inclusive and motivating and should explain the strengths of the work, identify areas for improvement, and guide students on how they can enhance their performance. All feedback must be explicitly aligned to the marking criteria to support learning and progression.

The marking and moderation process includes the following stages, completed before and after provisional grades are released:

- Standardisation.
- First Marking.
- Internal moderation/Second Marking.
- External moderation.
- Production of Internal Grade Distribution Reports, which support the completion of the Module Monitoring Report (MMR) and the Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (AMER).
- Assessment Boards.

© William College. All rights reserved

5.1 Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Student	• Submit work using student IDs only in filenames and documents. • Remove identity metadata. • Recognise that all marks are provisional until ratified by Assessment Board. • Meet submission deadlines; understand penalties for late submission.
Academic Administrator	• Allocates first markers, second markers (where appropriate), and internal moderators in consultation with Programme Leaders. • Issues written confirmation of allocations with deadlines, grade sheets, and MMR form links. • Requests creation of Turnitin/VLE submission points from IT Services. • Provides IT Services with all necessary assessment information.
Module Leader	• Part of the marking team; ensures consistency of marking standards. • Monitors first marking progress and supports markers where needed. • Ensures consistent application of marking criteria across markers. • Ensures anonymous marking is carried out where appropriate and standards are maintained. • Documents standardisation decisions and agreements. • Logs standardisation and moderation actions. • Documents moderation for resits and any special cases.
Markers/ First Markers	• Mark work against approved marking criteria and rubric. • Provide clear, structured, criterion referenced feedback and feedforward which is inclusive and motivating. • Use VLE tools (QuickMarks, comments, audio) where permitted. • Maintain impartiality and anonymity, using student IDs only. • Note if they believe they recognise a student (without naming) on MMR form. • Meet turnaround deadlines unless agreed otherwise. • Notify Module Leader/Programme Leader early if a delay is anticipated.
Internal Moderators	• Review samples of first marked work (10 scripts or 20%; all fails; all borderlines). • Confirm consistency, accuracy, and correct use of marking criteria. • Ensure quality and sufficiency of feedback. • Check arithmetic and transcription accuracy. • Review all work for cohorts of ≤10 students. • Record findings and recommended adjustments on the MMR Form. • Review all fails, bare passes, and EC submissions for resits.
Programme Leader	• Oversee compliance with marking deadlines and turnaround requirements. • Address delays reported by markers and agree mitigation plans. • Ensure students are notified promptly when grades/feedback are released. • Provide External Examiners with samples, briefs, rubrics, and MMR sheets. • Respond to external examiner actions and record responses in programme review. • Record approved exceptions to anonymous marking. • Inform students in advance where anonymity cannot be guaranteed and outline safeguards. Authorise and securely document any deanonymisation. • Ensure resit briefs and submission points are available on Moodle. • Apply Exceptional Circumstances (BSU)/Mitigating Circumstances (BBK) outcomes.
External Examiners (Partner University)	• Review sample scripts, briefs, rubrics, and MMR sheets. • Verify fairness, standards, and consistency.

© William College. All rights reserved

	• Report findings to the partner university and/or Programme Leaders.
Registry, Data and Compliance Team	• Manages EC process. • Make final decision on EC submission. • Inform SST of EC outcome.
Partner University	• Provides approved marking schemes and grade criteria. • Appoints External Examiners. • Receives final confirmed marks via Assessment Boards. Confirms marks post moderation and boards.

5.2 Marking Team

A Marking team is established for every module. If a module is delivered by more than one academic, the Marking team comprises the Module Leader and the Module Tutor(s). If the module is delivered by one academic, the Marking team comprises the Module Leader and an academic who will undertake standardisation and moderation for that module's assessments.

The Academic Administrator, in consultation with Programme Leaders, allocates first markers, second markers, and internal moderators. Allocations are issued in writing with deadlines and links to grade sheets and Marking and Moderation Review form.

5.3 Marking Scheme and Grade Criteria

To uphold the required academic standards and ensure that student achievement is measured accurately against the intended learning outcomes, both for individual assessment tasks and at module level, the partner university provides the approved marking schemes and grade criteria. Where feasible and appropriate, assessments are marked anonymously to promote fairness and impartiality.

All written assignments must include clear 'word limit' guidance in the Assessment Brief that appropriately reflects the study hours required to achieve the learning outcomes. Students are expected to work within these limits, as conciseness is often an assessed skill. William College applies a +10% tolerance above and below the stated limit, which is in line with partner regulations. Any content exceeding this threshold will not be marked. If a student's work is under the word limit, the full work will be marked on the extent to which the requirements of the assignment have been met. If a student's work is substantially under the word limit, it is likely to fall short of the requirements of the assignment. Abstracts, reference lists/bibliographies and appendices are excluded from any word limit requirements.

5.4 Feedback and Feed Forward

Feedback, at both formative and summative stages, is a critical developmental tool and should:

- relate directly to the learning outcomes, assessment criteria, and grading criteria;
- be clear, relevant, motivating, inclusive and constructive;
- include feed-forward guidance that supports improvement in future assessments;
- be developmental in tone, highlighting strengths, areas for enhancement, and next steps;
- be communicated concisely as an academic judgement rather than a personal opinion; and
- clearly demonstrate what has been achieved and what the feedback is intended to support.

Feedback should provide students with a clear understanding of what they did well, where improvements can be made, and how they can enhance their performance in subsequent work. All feedback must explicitly reference the marking criteria to promote transparency, learning, and progression.

Summative feedback must be provided through Grade mark and must relate to the Learning Outcomes and Marking Criteria for the module. Once completed, summative feedback must not be altered.

- Feedback and provisional marks are released only after internal moderation.
- Feedback is normally returned within 15 working days of the submission deadline together with the grade.
- Feedback is constructive, criterion referenced, and developmental.

© William College. All rights reserved

- Students are informed that all marks remain provisional until confirmed by the partner Assessment Board.

5.5 Anonymous Marking

Anonymous marking ensures that student identities are concealed during the assessment process in order to promote fairness, transparency, and impartial academic judgement. William College requires that all summative assessments be marked anonymously wherever this is operationally feasible.

Anonymous marking applies to all written, digital, or electronically submitted assessments where student identity can be hidden using student numbers or equivalent identifiers.

Exceptions

Anonymous marking may not be possible for certain assessment types, including but not limited to:

- Live assessments, such as oral examinations or presentations.
- Practical, studio based, or performance assessments.
- Group assessments or live tasks where the student's identity is inherent.

Where anonymity cannot be maintained, the College implements alternative safeguards—such as double marking, moderation, or detailed marking rubrics—to ensure fairness and to minimise bias. Any exception must be recorded in advance.

Breach of Anonymity

Any breach—accidental or otherwise—must be documented and reported to both the Programme Leader and the Academic Dean. Appropriate remedial actions will be taken and recorded.

De-anonymisation

De-anonymisation may occur only in specific circumstances:

- Safeguarding concerns
- Investigation of potential academic misconduct
- Application of EC outcomes

De-anonymisation for convenience is strictly prohibited. The Programme Leader must authorise and document every instance, stating the reason and ensuring secure record-keeping.

5.6 Marking Deadlines

Provisional grades and feedback may only be released once first marking and internal moderation have been completed, but before they are reviewed by the relevant partner university, the External Examiners and ratified by the assessment boards.

William College requires that both feedback and provisional grades are returned to students within twenty (20) working days of the submission deadline, unless a partner university specifies a different timeframe.

For Dissertations and major projects (normally at Level 6), the marking deadline is thirty (30) working days.

The Module Leader is responsible for ensuring marking is completed within this deadline and that students are notified promptly when grades and feedback become available. Programme Leaders oversee compliance with the marking turnaround requirement.

If a delay is anticipated, the marker must inform the Module Leader and Programme Leader at the earliest opportunity and agree an appropriate mitigation plan. Students must be informed via an announcement on Moodle.

All provisional grades and feedback must be issued through the VLE to maintain a consistent and auditable process.

5.7 Marking and Moderation

© William College. All rights reserved

Marking and moderation processes ensure that assessment decisions are fair, consistent, and aligned with approved marking criteria. All summative assessment is subject to standardisation, internal moderation, and external examiner oversight in accordance with partner university regulations.

Provisional grades are released only after internal moderation has been completed and remain subject to confirmation by the partner Assessment Board.

5.7.1 Standardisation of Marking
Standardisation ensures that all markers share a consistent understanding of the assessment criteria before any summative work is marked. It promotes fairness, accuracy, and comparability across a cohort. Standardisation must take place when:

- A module is marked by more than one member of staff.
- A module is being delivered for the first time.
- A marker is assessing the module for the first time at William College.

Standardisation Process
The standardisation process for first attempts normally includes:

- The marking team reviews a small selection of student submissions (typically 3–5) and evaluates them independently without disclosing provisional grades.
- The team meets to compare judgements, discuss interpretations of the criteria, and agree a shared standard of what constitutes each grade band.
- If consensus cannot be reached, the team may seek clarification from the partner university's link tutor or equivalent academic contact.
- The Module Leader documents the decisions, interpretations, and agreements reached. These records inform the Module Monitoring Report (MMR) and contribute to wider quality assurance.

Standardisation for reassessment tasks is only required when a marker has not previously assessed that assignment. Any standardisation activity undertaken for resits must also be formally logged by the Module Leader.

5.7.2 First Marking
First Markers may use the tools available within the VLE, such as intext comments, Quick Marks, or audio notes, where permitted. In all cases, they must provide structured narrative feedback that explains the overall judgement.

Grades just below a ground boundary (e.g 39 and 69) should not be awarded.

This feedback should clearly identify:
- Which elements of the marking criteria were fully achieved.
- Which were partially met.
- Which were not demonstrated.

The narrative must also include specific, actionable guidance to support improvement and may signpost students to resources, workshops, academic skills support, or staff office hours where relevant.

First markers evaluate each submission:
- Against the approved marking criteria and rubric.
- Ensuring alignment with the learning outcomes and the assessment brief.
- Providing clear, constructive feedback and feed-forward comments.
- Maintaining accuracy and consistency in the application of standards.

Module Leaders monitor compliance and follow up with markers where deadlines are at risk.

Where a marker is new or less experienced, paired or team marking may be used to ensure quality and support professional development. When multiple staff members are marking a cohort, the Module Leader is responsible for ensuring consistency across all markers.

© William College. All rights reserved

5.7.3 Internal Moderation

Internal moderation is conducted once first marking is completed to ensure that assessment decisions are fair, consistent, and accurately reflect the learning outcomes and marking criteria. Its purpose is to confirm that academic standards have been applied appropriately across all markers and locations.

Internal moderators are responsible for reviewing whether:

- Marking is consistent across the cohort and between markers.
- Criteria and rubrics have been applied correctly.
- Feedback is clear, constructive, and sufficient in detail.
- Arithmetic and transcription of marks are accurate.
- Marks awarded are comparable across markers, sites, or modes of delivery.

Internal Moderation process

The internal moderator reviews a representative sample of first marked assessments. The standard sample normally consists of:

- 10 scripts or 20% of the cohort (whichever is greater).
- A spread across all grade bands.
- All fails.
- Borderline cases around key thresholds (bare pass mark and 70%).

For cohorts of 10 or fewer submissions, all work must be moderated.

All Principal Modules (including dissertations, theses, and major research projects) are fully second marked as standard and may be blind double marked where required by partner university regulations.

Findings from internal moderation must be captured on the Marking and Moderation Review (MMR) Form. This record includes:

- details of the sample reviewed,
- commentary on consistency and application of criteria,
- identification of issues or discrepancies, and
- recommended adjustments (where required).

MRF outcomes inform the Module Reporting Forms (MRF), Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (AMER), and broader quality assurance processes.

Internal Moderation for Resubmissions/Resit

For reassessment work (resits), moderation must include:

- all Fail (0–39%) grades,
- all bare pass (40%) grades, and
- any submissions completed under approved Extenuating Circumstances at first sit (i.e., uncapped reassessments).

Any moderation undertaken for resubmissions must be documented by the Module Leader.

Discrepancies in grades

Normally, the grade awarded by the first marker will stand. However, further review or adjustment may be required when moderation identifies:

- inconsistent application of the marking criteria,
- significant deviation between one marker's judgements and those of the wider marking team,
- a recurring difference of 5 percentage points or more between first and second marker judgements, or

Where moderation identifies a discrepancy, additional checks may be required. If a moderator's grades differ from the first marker's by more than 10 percentage points, it is recommended that all work marked by the first marker is reviewed to ensure standards have been applied consistently.

Resolution Process

© William College. All rights reserved

- The internal moderator and the first marker should discuss their judgements and attempt to reach agreement any changes that might be required.
- Where agreement cannot be reached and the discrepancy is more than 5 percentage points or crosses a classification boundary, a third marker must adjudicate.
- Where the difference is 5 percentage points or less, an average of the two marks may be used, unless partner university regulations specify otherwise.
- If disagreement persists after moderation and/or third marking, the matter is referred to the Programme Managers or Year Leaders for adjudication. Internal moderators do not have authority to unilaterally change individual marks.

If moderation reveals a pattern indicating that marking standards have not been applied consistently across the cohort, adjustments may be made. Any such changes must be:

- supported by clear evidence,
- justified and documented in writing, and
- recorded on the Marking and Moderation Review (MMR) Form.

5.7.4 Live Assessment

Live assessments—such as presentations, moots, practical demonstrations, and viva voce examinations—may be moderated either synchronously or asynchronously.

All live assessments must be recorded to ensure transparency and to support moderation and quality assurance processes.

- Synchronous moderation takes place when both the first marker and the internal moderator attend the assessment at the same time. Each marker:
  - Records an independent provisional mark.
  - Provides their own commentary based on the published criteria.

  After the assessment, the markers discuss their judgements and agree a final mark. This discussion typically occurs immediately following the live activity.

- Asynchronous moderation is used when it is not practical or necessary for both markers to be present during the live assessment. In these cases:
  - The first marker records each assessment in full.
  - The moderator reviews a sample of the recordings to confirm the accuracy and consistency of marking.

5.7.5 External Moderation

External examiners are appointed by university partners to provide independent academic assurance of the quality, standards and fairness of assessment.

Programme/Year Leaders provide External Examiners with samples, briefs, rubrics, and MMR sheets. Examiners confirm standards and report findings. Programme/Year Leaders respond to any actions and record them in programme review.

5.8 Late Submission and Capping

Late submissions are processed in accordance with partner university regulations. Where penalties apply, they must be implemented consistently and recorded appropriately.

BBK standard penalty for late submission:

- Work submitted up to 7 calendar days after the published deadline will receive a 10% deduction from the original (uncorrected) mark, unless the student has approved mitigating/extenuating circumstances.
- Work submitted more than 7 calendar days late will be capped at the pass mark, unless mitigating/exceptional circumstances have been formally approved.

BSU standard penalty for late submission:

© William College. All rights reserved

- Work submitted up to 5 calendar days after the published deadline is capped at the pass mark.
- Work submitted more than 5 working days after the deadline will be assigned a mark of 0.

5.9 Resubmission/Referral

Student Success Teams notify students of resit opportunities, deadlines and available support.

Programme Leaders ensure resit briefs and submission points are available on Moodle. Resit tasks are equivalent in learning outcomes but not identical to first-attempt tasks where academic integrity requires this.

A resubmission (sometimes referred to as a *referral*) is an opportunity to complete an assessment component that has been failed or deferred. Resubmissions are normally capped at the minimum pass mark, in line with partner university regulations.

Failure to submit a resubmission by the published deadline will normally result in the assessment being recorded as a fail, with progression consequences determined by the Assessment Board.

5.10 Exceptional Circumstances

Registry manages EC processes and record outcomes in the central tracker. Outcomes are applied by Programme Leaders and communicated to students confidentially by the Registry Team.

Approved Exceptional Circumstances may result in:

- An extension to a submission deadline.
- A deferral of assessment to the next assessment period.
- A resubmission opportunity without academic penalty, where permitted by partner regulations.

Exceptional Circumstances do not guarantee a pass and do not remove the requirement to meet the learning outcomes of a module.

For full guidance on eligibility, submission, and assessment impact, refer to the Exceptional Circumstances Policy and Procedures.

5.11 Academic Misconduct

All suspected instances of academic misconduct or malpractice will be investigated in accordance with William College's and the partner university's established procedures to ensure fairness, transparency, and consistency across all programmes.
While an investigation is ongoing, a holding grade may be recorded on Moodle for administrative purposes, in line with partner university regulations.

Confirmed academic misconduct may result in penalties including:

- A mark of zero for the assessment.
- A capped resubmission.
- Failure of the module.
- Further disciplinary action, depending on severity and prior history.

For further guidance, staff and students should refer to the Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures.

5.12 Grade Distribution Reports

Following completion of the marking process, a Grade Distribution Report (i.e. a marks' matrix) is provided for each module cohort indicating:

- student grade scores .
- aggregate scores including average and standard deviation statistics.
- year-on-year comparison statistics.

© William College. All rights reserved

The Grade Distribution Report informs completion of the Module Monitoring Report (MMR) and the subsequent Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report (AMER) as well as supports the monitoring of the student outcomes.

6. Assessment Boards and Outcomes Procedures

6.1 Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Provost	• Chairs the Internal Pre-Assessment Board. • Ensures all module and programme marks are accurate, complete, and compliant with partner regulations. • Confirms EC, Academic Misconduct, resit and referral outcomes are applied correctly. • Oversees the resolution of discrepancies prior to submission. • Ensures academic standards and quality assurance requirements are met.
Registry, Data and Compliance Team	• Review student records and confirm the accuracy of all grade entries. • Verify alignment of marks with internal policies and partner university regulations. • Ensure student records are consistent across all systems. • Submit verified marks to partner university systems or Link Tutors. • Attend Partner Assessment Boards as required. • Communicate confirmed grades and progression outcomes to students. • Retain all assessment and progression documentation in line with retention requirements.
Module Leader	• Confirm accuracy of module level marks and moderation outcomes. • Ensure all assessments have been marked, standardised, and moderated. • Verify any outstanding assessment requirements (e.g., deferrals) before submission. • Support Registry and Quality teams during Pre-Assessment Board checks.
Programme Leader	• Provide academic oversight for programme level results. • Ensure completeness and accuracy of marks and assessment outcomes. • Attend Partner University Assessment Boards as presenting officers. • Communicate confirmed results, progression decisions, and award outcomes to students (alongside Registry).
Partner University Assessment Boards	• Formally ratify all marks submitted by William College. • Confirm progression decisions, reassessment eligibility, and award classifications. • Review EC, misconduct, and reassessment arrangements. • Ensure compliance with the university's academic regulations. • Issue the official, final record of credit, progression, and awards. • Determine compensation or trailing (as permitted by awarding body).

6.2 Internal Pre-Module Boards

William College manages and oversees the verification of all student assessment outcomes through a formal Internal Pre-Assessment Board, convened prior to submitting marks to the partner university's Assessment Board.

The purpose of the Pre-Assessment Board is to ensure that all results are accurate, complete, and compliant with institutional and partner university requirements before they enter the formal award and progression process.

The Internal Pre-Assessment Board is responsible for ensuring that:

- All grades for summative assessments are accurate, complete, and correctly recorded.
- Assessments have been properly marked, standardised, and moderated in line with the Marking and Moderation Procedures.

© William College. All rights reserved

- Exceptional Circumstances, Academic Misconduct outcomes have been correctly applied.
- Any discrepancies, irregularities, or omissions are identified and resolved prior to submission.
- Student records are consistent across all systems.

This process ensures that William College provides a verified, accurate, and quality assured dataset to each partner university.

Composition of the Internal Pre-Assessment Board

To ensure robust oversight and academic integrity, the Internal Pre-Assessment Board includes representatives from all relevant operational and academic teams:

- **Provost** – act as a chair of the meeting, oversee academic accuracy and completeness of programme/module marks, and ensure all outcomes (ECs, misconduct, referrals) have been applied correctly.
- **Registry and Data Team Representatives –** review student records, confirm correct data entry, verify alignment with internal policies, partner university regulations, and quality assurance standards.
- **Programme Managers and Year Leads** – confirm accuracy of module level marks, moderation outcomes, and any outstanding assessment requirements.

Academic Team submits marks to the relevant partner university systems/link tutor accurate and attend Subject or Programme Assessment Boards as required.

6.3 Partner University Assessment Boards

Partner universities operate formal Assessment Boards (also referred to as Subject Boards, Programme Boards, or Award Boards) that hold full authority for confirming all student results for programmes delivered in partnership with William College.

These Boards function under the academic regulations of the awarding university, and their decisions are final. Through these Boards, partner universities provide independent assurance of academic standards and ensure consistency across all delivery locations and collaborative partners.

The partner university's Assessment Boards are responsible for:

- Formally ratifying all module marks submitted by William College.
- Confirming progression decisions, reassessment eligibility, and award classifications.
- Ensuring all marking, moderation, standardisation, and internal verification processes comply with university regulations.
- Reviewing the application of Exceptional Circumstances outcomes, Academic Misconduct decisions, and any reassessment arrangements.
- Maintaining consistency and comparability of academic standards across programmes and partners.
- Issuing the final official record of credit, progression, reassessment outcomes, and awards.

Partner Assessment Boards may determine:

- Confirmation of module marks.
- Eligibility for reassessment, resubmission, or referral.
- Student progression to the next academic level.
- Application of compensation or trailing, where permitted by awarding body regulations.
- Deferral of assessments due to approved Exceptional Circumstances.
- Conferment of qualifications, classifications, and exit awards.
- Termination of studies where progression requirements are not met.

Decisions of the Assessment Board are final and are communicated to William College staff and students following confirmation.

6.4 Passing a Module

A student passes a module by achieving an overall mark of at least 40%, which applies across all undergraduate programmes.

© William College. All rights reserved

Each module's assessment components and their respective weightings are detailed in the Assessment Brief. These weightings indicate the relative contribution of each assessment component to the final module mark.

Students are strongly encouraged to attempt and submit all assessment components, as failure to engage may result in withdrawal for non-engagement by the partner university's Assessment Board.

Students should seek support from the Academic Team and SSTs to help them engage fully with their assessments.

To calculate the overall module grade:

- The percentage mark for each assessment component is multiplied by its weighting.
- The weighted values are added together to produce the final module mark.

A student may achieve an overall pass for the module while still having an outstanding assessment opportunity for a specific component (for example, where an item was deferred due to Exceptional Circumstances). In such cases, the student may be permitted to complete the outstanding assessment in line with partner regulations.

Where a resubmission or resit is undertaken, the final grade awarded will be determined in accordance with the relevant partner university's assessment regulations.

6.5 Module Failure

A module is considered failed if a student does not achieve the minimum pass mark after the permitted assessment attempts. Outcomes following module failure depend on the number of credits failed and partner university regulations.

6.6 Repetition

If a student has exhausted reassessment opportunities or has failed a significant volume of credit, they may be required to repeat a module with attendance.

Repeating a module involves:

- Re-enrolment on the module.
- Re-engagement with teaching and learning activities.
- Completion of all assessment components anew.

Repeats may be undertaken on a full-time or part-time basis, depending on the student's overall credit position and partner university regulations.
Failure to pass repeated modules may result in termination of studies.

6.7 Compensation

For students studying a programme awarded by Bath Spa University:
Compensation is not normally applied. Students must either pass the module through reassessment or retake the module, depending on the Assessment Board decision.

For students studying a programme awarded by Birkbeck, University of London:
Compensation may be applied at the discretion of the Assessment Board where a student narrowly fails a module (normally within a defined mark range below the pass mark) and has demonstrated satisfactory overall performance at the level. Compensated modules are awarded credit without the student having to pass the assessment, subject to limits and exclusions (e.g. core modules cannot be compensated).

6.8 Trailing

For students studying a programme awarded by Bath Spa University:

© William College. All rights reserved

Students may be permitted to progress to the next academic level while carrying a limited number of outstanding referred or deferred credits (commonly 20–40 credits). These outstanding assessments must be completed by specified deadlines alongside new-level study.
Students with larger volumes of outstanding credit may be required to take a Progression Break or repeat study before progressing.

For students studying a programme awarded by Birkbeck, University of London:
Students may be permitted to progress while carrying a small number of failed or reassessed credits, subject to credit limits and workload regulations. Trailed credits must be resolved within the permitted timeframe set by the Assessment Board.

6.9 Outcomes and Reporting

Once results are confirmed by the partner university, the Registry and Data Team communicate final grades and progression decisions to students.

All assessment and progression evidence is retained in line with William College and partner university record-keeping and retention requirements.

7. Document Review

This document is reviewed by the Academic Board and/or its sub-committees annually or earlier if there are changes in partners' policies or the regulatory framework and approved by the Academic Board.

8. Related Policies and Documents

- Examination and Invigilation Procedures.
- Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.
- Exceptional Circumstances Policy and Procedures.
- Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy.
- Annual Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures.
- BSU Undergraduate Academic Framework.
- BSU Assessment and Feedback Policy.
- BBK Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study 2025-26.
- BBK Marking and Moderation Policy.

© William College. All rights reserved

9. Appendix A

Definitions

Term	Definition
Assessment	The range of methods used to evaluate students' learning and performance. Assessment formats will vary depending on the module's aims, content, level of study, and intended learning outcomes.
Formative assessment	Feedback focused activities that support learning and help students measure their progress. These activities do not contribute to the final module grade. Their purpose is developmental, helping students understand their strengths and areas for improvement.
Summative assessment	Formal assessment tasks that measure the extent to which students have met the learning outcomes and assessment criteria of a module or programme. Summative assessments contribute to the overall grade awarded for the module.
Standardisation	A preparatory activity undertaken by the teaching team to ensure a shared understanding of assessment criteria and grading expectations. Standardisation promotes consistency before any marking begins.
Marking	The process through which a student's work is evaluated against the published learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Staff apply an appropriate grade using the marking scheme provided by the partner university, which explain levels of achievement and clarify how standards are applied.
Moderation	is a process intended to assure that an assessment outcome is fair and reliable and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently across a cohort of students.
Second Marking	A process where a full set of student assessments is marked independently for a second time. Second marking may be: • Blind – the second marker does not see the original mark; or • Seen – the second marker is aware of the initial mark. Once second marking is complete, the markers agree a final grade before results are released to students. In cases where the markers disagree, a third marker (not the External Examiner) should be asked to adjudicate. Second marking is recommended for all substantial summative assignments such as dissertations and final projects.
Feedback	Constructive written or verbal comments provided to students to explain grades and guide improvement.
External Moderation	A review conducted by an independent external examiner or moderator who confirms that assessment processes are appropriate, consistent, and aligned with sector expectations and benchmark standards.

© William College. All rights reserved