The Assessment Handbook is based on regulations, policies and procedures agreed by relevant London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) committees including Senate and Senate Postgraduate Taught Committee (SPGTC).

The Assessment Handbook is aligned to the expectations contained within the UK Quality Code for Higher Education published by the Quality Assurance Agency, including the advice and guidance on Assessment.

This Handbook was last updated July 2019
This Document is aimed at all staff involved in assessment including:

- Markers
- Module Organisers
- Programme Directors
- Taught Programme Directors
- Administrative staff who support assessment processes
- Exam Board Chairs
- Exam Board members

LSHTM’s academic regulations are contained within the LSHTM Academic Manual. Additional policies and guidance can be found on the LSHTM’s Regulatory Documents webpage.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Scope

1.1.1 The Assessment Handbook compiles LSHTM’s formal guidance about assessment processes that happen prior to Board of Examiners’ consideration. This includes:

- setting assessment tasks, exam questions and marking schemes;
- grading work;
- reasonable adjustments for exam arrangements;
- internal moderation;
- resits.

1.1.1 It applies to assessment for all LSHTM’s taught programmes, at module and programme level, and whether award bearing or non-award bearing.

- **The focus is on face-to-face (F2F) Master’s programmes and modules:** However, it also applies to other provision within LSHTM including Continuing Professional Development short courses.
- **Distance learning (DL) Master’s programmes and modules:** LSHTM procedures are designed to meet the requirements of the University of London Worldwide Guidelines for Examinations.
- **Collaborative programmes:** This covers joint programmes with other institutions. The partner institution procedures will normally apply in respect of modules they lead, and/or where the Memorandum of Agreement for the programme specifies that their assessment model should apply at programme level.
- **Research Degrees:** This handbook does not cover research degrees, except where research degree students may take a taught programme or module as part of their studies.

1.1.2 In the event of any inconsistency between the information in this handbook and any other LSHTM document, advice should be sought in the first instance from the Head of Registry.
1.2  **Student Attendance**

1.2.1 The [Student Attendance Policy](#) provides guidance about attendance requirements and procedures for dealing with poor attendance.

1.2.2 Failure to attend or participate by students should be reported to the relevant Exam Board. The Exam Board may decide not to ratify credits or award the degree on the grounds that the student has failed to participate fully. No decision shall be taken by the Exam Board without considering any extenuating circumstances reported to it by the Extenuating Circumstances Committee.

1.3  **Extenuating Circumstances & Extensions**

1.3.1 Extenuating Circumstances are defined as **unforeseen, exceptional, short-term events, which are outside of a student's control and have a negative impact on their ability to prepare for or take an assessment**. These events will normally occur shortly before or during an assessment. All requests must be accompanied by appropriate evidence and submitted by the deadline in the Extenuating Circumstances Policy in [Chapter 7, General Academic Regulations of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#). The potential impact on assessment can be:

- attempted but performance has been affected;
- deferral of assessment to the next opportunity;
- extension to a coursework or project deadline.

1.3.2 The Extenuating Circumstances Policy can be found in [Chapter 7 of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#). The Extenuating Circumstances Form can be found on the web [here](#).

1.4  **Assessment Irregularities & Plagiarism**

1.4.1 The Assessment Irregularities Policy (which can be found in [Chapter 7 of the LSHTM Academic Manual](#)) sets out comprehensive procedures for identifying and acting on plagiarism, cheating or any other form of suspected assessment irregularity. [Academic writing handbook](#) provides students with general
guidance on how to write in the ‘academic style’ the School expects and how to reference and avoid plagiarism.

1.4.2 If a case of plagiarism or cheating is suspected, this should be dealt with before any student grades are presented to an Exam Board. If a case is still in progress, provisional confirmation of grades will be suspended until the outcome is known.

2. Module Assessments

2.1 Introduction

This section describes the standard practice for the assessment of individual modules (sometimes referred to as in-course assessment.) This may include coursework, unseen written exams or other forms of exams, group work, or other appropriate methods.

2.2 Objectives of Module Assessment

2.2.1 Module assessment tasks should aid the learning process and assess the achievement of the intended learning of that module. Assessment tasks must be integrated with the learning process and should not be just an add-on.

2.2.2 Where the understanding of new knowledge needs to be tested, this can be done during the programme (e.g. through untimed written answers to suitable questions) or through an unseen test at the end of the period.

2.2.3 Where the ability to do a complex task is an essential outcome, the achievement of this task must be assessed.

2.2.4 Where the ability to tackle a problem within a group is an appropriate outcome, then a group task that is integrated into the learning process may be assessed. However, all group work assessments must be integrated with an element of individual assessment, in order to distinguish the varying contributions of each student and assess their individual achievement.
2.3 **Amount of Module Assessment**

2.3.1 Assessment must not dominate the learning process. **The number of assessed assignments should not exceed two in any module**; normally one assessment will be sufficient.

2.3.2 The amount of time needed to complete assessment tasks must be calculated realistically; extra non-contact time may be needed for some tasks to prevent the total learning time from exceeding permitted limits.

2.3.3 Further guidance is given in the [Course & Module Design Code of Practice](#).

2.4 **Setting and Administering Module Assessments**

2.4.1 All aspects of module assessment are subject to the agreement and authority of the Exam Board responsible for moderating that module. Boards should normally delegate authority to the relevant Module Organiser(s) to coordinate module assessment arrangements as set out in the relevant module specification. Separate procedures are in place for agreeing any changes to the module specification; these procedures can be found in Chapter 3, *Programme & Module Management, Monitoring and Evaluation of the LSHTM Academic Manual*.

2.4.2 Module Organisers are required to set clear assessment criteria and marking guidance for modules. Marking guidance should facilitate equitable and transparent treatment of students. Note that penalties for late submissions and exceeding the word count are standard across LSHTM and outlined in Chapter 8a, *Face-to-face Postgraduate Taught Degree Academic Regulations* and Chapter 8b, *Distance Learning Postgraduate Taught Degree Academic Regulations* of the LSHTM Academic Manual and must be adhered to.

2.4.3 Students must have visibility of the module assessment criteria prior to assessment taking place, either via broad principles in the module specification, or more detailed guidance disseminated by the Module Organiser(s).
2.5 Guidance on Grading

Module assessments, examinations (both written exams and practicals) and project reports should all be marked using the standard grading system detailed in Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual and guidance detailed below.

2.5.1 Percentage or Numeric Marking

As set out in Chapter 8 of the LSHTM Academic Manual, percentage or numeric marking schemes may be used for certain assessments, e.g. mathematical questions, yes/no questions or multiple-choice questions (MCQs).

The percentage to grade point conversion scheme that fits the particular assignment or question should be agreed in advance by the relevant Exam Board, which fits the particular assignment or question. The approved conversion should appear in the marking pack for each assessment/question for which it is used. Table 1 gives examples of three percentage-to-grade point conversion charts.

**Table 1 – Percentage-to-grade point conversion charts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark (%)</th>
<th>Grade point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark (%)</th>
<th>Grade point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95-100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-94</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark (%)</th>
<th>Grade point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While individual assessments may use specific marking schemes in this way, all schemes must remain compatible with the School’s standard assessment framework as set out above (i.e. the six-point grading scale). Any deviations from this should be addressed by the relevant Board of Examiners.
2.5.2 Grade Distributions & Range of Marks

Markers are encouraged to use the full range of available marks, to reflect the full range of student achievement. Markers should not feel reluctant to award 5.0 grades provided work meets the appropriate standards. The following specific points should be noted:

i) excellent work does not have to be outstanding or exceptional by comparison with other students;

ii) since LSHTM uses criterion-referenced marking rather than banded marking, 5.0 grades should not be capped to a limited proportion of students per class;

iii) there is no standard cut-off for what constitutes ‘excellent’ work, different conversion schemes may be used to convert numeric scores or percentage marks into a grade point result on the 0-5 integer scale, in many cases where quantitatively scored assessments are used, a 5.0 grade may be awarded for work scoring above a particular threshold (for example 80%) of the possible marks, i.e. by no means perfect but of a sufficiently high standard;

iv) good assessment design should ensure that tasks have clear criteria to allow excellent students to achieve 5.0 grades.

Grades should not be forced into a standard distribution. Marking criteria should reflect LSHTM standards.

Group assessment tasks should be anticipated to produce higher standards than individuals would achieve alone.

Following the initial grading process, Module Organisers should look at the distribution of grades for the particular module. If this deviates significantly from past performance or appears to differ significantly from other grade distributions at Programme, Faculty or LSHTM level, grades should be considered to confirm that the marks given are in line with LSHTM criteria. Module Organisers should refer to regulations on ‘Internal Moderation’ Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual.
2.6 Double-Marking & Grade Reconciliation

2.6.1 All **summative work** must be double-marked, with any discrepancies between markers resolved. Neither marker should see the other’s comments or grade before assigning their grade. An agreed grade must be given to the student. **Formative assessments do not need to be double-marked.** However, clearly defined marking criteria and sampling of scripts should be used to help assure consistency in marking formative work.

2.6.2 Markers may not record two grades for a piece of work which they feel is borderline between two grade bands. Markers must always agree one final grade for a piece of work which will be reported to students. However, below this level (i.e. if an assessment task has informal component elements), markers’ views may differ provided they can agree the overall grade.

2.6.3 Where two markers disagree about the overall grade then the difference must be reconciled by discussion between them, not averaged away. This is to ensure that grades awarded represent the quality of the work submitted:

- where initial grades differ, a note of the reasoning for the final agreed grade must be included on the marksheet;
- if marks (e.g. out of 20, or as a percentage) differ slightly but this does not affect the final grade (0-5) to be assigned to the work, the markers may report both an averaged mark and the agreed grade to the student;
- markers should be aware that all comments made in connection with marking, including grade reconciliation, may be disclosed to the student.

2.6.4 If discussion between two markers fails to reach agreement on the overall grade, it may be referred to a third marker.

- **Modules:** The Module Organiser or another appropriate senior marker should be asked to re-mark. If there is still any doubt, the Exam Board Chair (EBC) to which the module has been allocated will take the final decision.
- **MSc summer exams or projects:** If two examiners have been unable to reconcile a grade at major question or formal project component level or for a paper or project overall, a third appropriate examiner
(nominated by the Exam Board Chair) should be asked to re-mark. Particularly in the case of projects, the External Examiner may often serve as third marker. If there is still any doubt, the EBC will take the final decision.

2.6.5 Any grade divulged before the Exam Board meeting is provisional and subject to external review, and may be amended following moderation. **Grades must not be divulged to students by academic staff.** Grades are reported to students by the Teaching Support Office (Face-to-face-students) and the Distance Learning Office (DL students).

### 2.7 Combining Grades

2.7.1 Where more than one assessment component is specified in the module specification, these assessment components should be marked individually on the integer scale, and the grades combined into a GPA according to an agreed weighting set out in the module specification. Each assessment component must be individually double-marked and agreed by markers. Component-specific grades and feedback must be reported back to the student. The combined GPA should not be rounded to an integer.

2.7.2 Grades agreed by markers for individual pieces of work (i.e. module assignments, exam questions, projects or practical exams) should always be on the six-point integer grading scale. Where it is appropriate to give a more finely-detailed grade, the relevant marking scheme should define sub-components, marked with grade points, which are then combined to determine a Grade Point Average (GPA) on the standard grade scale, but with grades to two decimal places.

i) When combining such individual agreed grades, e.g. to calculate an overall module GPA or exam GPA, weighted averages should be used. Calculations should mathematically combine data without rounding.

ii) Rounding is permissible in the following circumstances:

- assigning an overall GPA to individual module assignments or exam questions which use a numeric marking scheme;
- reporting of final marks, e.g. on transcripts, which may be rounded to two decimal places.
2.7.3 Combined marks should always be reported as a numeric GPA, and not rounded back to an integer grade point. However, when feeding back to students it may be desirable to associate a qualitative descriptor with a GPA result. Table 2 below gives a recommended scheme for matching GPAs and descriptors (this is not intended to set rigid boundaries between different grades, or affect how integer grades are assigned).

**Table 2 – Matching GPAs and Descriptors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA range</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Associated integer GP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.50 – 5.00</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>~ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60 – 4.49</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>~ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.65 – 3.59</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>~ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.64</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>~ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 1.99</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory / poor (fail)</td>
<td>~ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 – 0.99</td>
<td>Very poor (fail)</td>
<td>~ 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Not submitted (null)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 **Moderation of Assessed Module Work**

2.8.1 After having been marked and provisional marks fed back to students along with written comments, module grades should be formally moderated.

2.8.2 This entails scrutiny of a sample of work (from across the top, middle and bottom of the grading range) by a designated Moderator from the Exam Board with authority over the module. This is described in the Module Moderation Policy in Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

2.9 **Feedback to Students**

2.9.1 The system of feedback should be made clear to students at the start of the module and before any module assessment takes place.

2.9.2 Whilst all marks should be reported to students as numeric grade points or GPAs, the standard descriptors set out Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the
LSHTM Academic Manual, such as very good or satisfactory, can be helpful in feedback to students about their assessed module work.

2.9.3 Markers must remain consistent with this standard scheme; e.g. it would not be appropriate to use the word ‘good’ throughout feedback for a piece of work then graded at 2.0, unless clearly indicating that a specific aspect had brought the mark down.

2.9.4 Two key assessment issues, which the School has been working hard to improve, relate to feedback on assessed work, and its quality and timeliness. It is important that deadlines are adhered to so that students can learn from early assessments to inform later ones, and so that Exam Boards have all the information they need in time.

2.9.5 General principles for giving feedback are as follows:

- student should receive full written comments and the integer grade;
- written comments should facilitate learning and enable the student to understand why they have been awarded that grade (with clear reference to the criteria for that assessment task);
- feedback of only a few sentences in length is likely to be inadequate;
- written comments need be given by one assessor only, comments from the second assessor should be incorporated where appropriate;
- if two markers initially give different grades, it is important that an agreed final grade is reached and the written comments reflect that grade, a brief comment is also required to explain the agreed grade;
- general comments should be supported by specific examples and suggestions about how to achieve the desired improvements;
- it is all too easy to concentrate on the negatives, but positive feedback is equally important;
- comments in the form of dialogue can be helpful, e.g. seeking clarification or further details, or drawing the student's attention to errors or inconsistencies;
- offering additional information or references, or drawing parallels with other situations can also stretch a student's thinking.
3. **Unseen Written Examinations**

3.1 **Introduction**

3.1.1 The exam component of most of the F2F MSs consists of two 3-hour written examination papers taken in Term 3 after all taught modules have finished.

3.1.2 Paper 1 examines the content of Term 1 modules and it usually comprises questions relating to each of the modules, which may be core to multiple programmes. The same questions (for individual modules) may be shared across Paper 1 exams for different MSc programmes.

3.1.3 Paper 2 tests candidates' ability to integrate the knowledge and skills acquired across the whole of the MSc programme. Paper 2 should examine the key knowledge and skills, which a candidate graduating with that particular MSc is expected to possess. Questions should require integration of knowledge/skills acquired in different parts of the MSc, and should generally be focused on material from compulsory modules, rather than optional ones, which only some of the class may have taken. **Where a module is considered central to the award of an MSc, questions about material in that module may be included in the final examination if students are specifically informed of this.**

3.2 **Marking Written Examinations**

3.2.1 When setting exams using shared questions, MSc Exam Boards must decide which of the following options to follow:

i) Relevant questions marked by module staff (who are likely to mark across multiple MScs). The grades for the questions should be moderated by the External Examiner from the Exam Board with authority over the relevant module.

ii) Relevant questions marked by Exam Board staff (in which case the Board may also choose to modify the questions). Exam scripts for the MSc should be moderated by the External Examiner for that MSc.
3.2.2 Paper 2 is specific to each MSc and always moderated by the External Examiner for that MSc.

3.2.3 If a pair of markers considers a student's exam script to be illegible, they should refer it to the relevant Exam Board Chair. If the Chair agrees the script is illegible, the script, or that part of the script, should be counted as a fail and assigned a grade of zero.

3.2.4 If a student answers more than the required number of questions in an exam, all answers should be marked and the best grades counted towards the overall mark.

3.3 **Combining Grades for Written Examinations**

3.3.1 In most cases, individual exam questions should be marked on the integer grading scale, and combined to give an overall paper GPA. Paper 1 & 2 GPAs should normally be averaged to give an overall exam component GPA.

3.3.2 Exam questions based on numeric marking schemes should convert the numeric result to an integer grade point, using an appropriate specific conversion scheme. This may entail rounding at question-result level. Alternatively, at the discretion of responsible Exam Boards (who must have approved a precisely-specified scheme in advance), individual exam questions may be marked numerically with scores combined into a numeric result for the overall paper, which is then converted to an integer grade for the paper. Rounding should not take place in such cases, as the mark will have been based on a significant weight and depth of questions.

3.3.3 Where exam questions have subcomponents which need to be individually graded and double-marked by different sets of markers, these should be marked with individual integer grades and combined into an overall GPA for the question (not rounding to an integer grade point) according to an agreed weighting clearly specified on the exam paper. Alternatively, the exam board may decide that these separate components are marked numerically (with the marks agreed by relevant pairs of markers) and combined into a single numeric mark for the question, which is then converted to an integer grade.
3.4  **Moderation of Exam Scripts**

3.4.1  Exam scripts should be formally moderated by External Examiners from the Exam Boards responsible for specific papers or questions that are shared across several programmes. This process is described further in the Board of Examiner Guidance.

3.4.2  Note that for questions shared across several programmes, Moderation is expected to be completed before the final Exam Board meetings of any programmes which have used these questions, and Exam Boards cannot subsequently change grades.

3.5  **Feedback on Exam Performance**

Students should not expect individual feedback on their exam performance, or to have copies of their exam scripts returned to them.

4.  **Exam Paper Setting**

4.1  **Security of Exam Questions**

4.1.1  All staff must ensure material for inclusion in exam papers is kept highly secure and confidential at all times.

4.1.2  Exam Board Chairs have authority and ultimate responsibility for how this is done. Staff in the Teaching Support Office are also closely involved in these processes and can provide further guidance.

- All files should be password-protected and kept in a secure network directory.
- Material should not be sent by email between staff members unless absolutely unavoidable (e.g. if the staff member is currently based abroad and cannot access secure network directories).
• If any material is sent by email, **passwords should be communicated by a different and separate means**, e.g. a personal phone call. Passwords should never be given in an email.

• **Hardcopy material** should ideally be hand-delivered, or at minimum sealed and marked as strictly confidential to the named recipient – never sent in unsealed internal envelopes.

• **Do not** leave material behind in rooms after question-setting discussions.

• **Information sent to External Examiners** should be sent using equally secure methods. While email may often be the most time-efficient means of communicating with External Examiners, as above, it is vital that files are protected and passwords communicated separately.

---

### 4.2 Responsibility for Exam Question Setting

4.2.1 Each Exam Board is responsible for setting summer exam questions for the programmes and modules under their authority. This should be coordinated by Exam Board Chairs, with all Internal Examiners being involved in writing questions and External Examiners involved in reviewing final drafts and marking schemes.

4.2.2 The responsibilities of face-to-face Exam Boards differ with respect to material for Exam Paper 1 and Exam Paper 2:

- **Paper 1 questions** are often shared across MScs, and are based on core material taught in term 1 modules that may be taken by multiple MSc programmes;

- **Paper 2 questions** are MSc-specific, and are based on synthesis of material from across the programme curriculum.

4.2.3 Setting questions includes preparing both the questions and associated marking guidelines (describing the expected content of answers, and setting clear criteria against which markers should judge each answer's merit). Questions for which numerical marking schemes are proposed must include a mark-to-grade point conversion table.
4.3 Procedure and Deadlines

4.3.1 Setting up secure shared Directories
[Deadline: End November]

i) A Directory is created by the Teaching Support Office (TSO) on a secure drive for each Term 1 Module. The Directory is created by the programme administrator for each Term 1 Module and for each MSc Paper 2. Some MSc Programmes (i.e. Medical Statistics) may not need a separate directory for each Term 1 module because they are not shared. Instead they have one directory for all of their Paper 1 questions.

ii) Within each Directory two further sub-directories are created: (i) “Current Draft” and (ii) “Comments”. The “Current Draft” sub-directory holds the most recent version of the question(s). Within each “Comments” sub-directory, the programme administrator, in liaison with the Taught Programme Director (TPD), creates a “Permissions” file that lists the MScs (and their respective Exam Board chairs and members) that will be including the particular question(s) in their exam papers. For Paper 2 questions this will be one MSc only.

4.3.2 Assigning responsibilities
[Deadline: End November]

i) A Chief Examiner is designated as follows – for Term 1 Module questions this will be the Module Organiser or other person designated by the respective Taught Programme Director. For Paper 2 questions this will be the Exam Board Chair. The Chief Examiner, in liaison with the TPD, will identify question setters and have an ongoing overview of the process.

ii) A Chief External Examiner is designated as follows:
Term 1 Module questions - External Examiner for the Board assigned responsibility for that Module. Paper 2 questions - External Examiner for that MSc Exam Board.

iii) The Programme Administrator will assign the trustee rights of each Directory to the Chief Examiner. Only the Chief Examiner has ‘write
access’ to the “Current Draft” directory, although he/she may decide to grant ‘write access’ to the other question setters also.

iv) The **Programme Administrator** will assign ‘read access’ to the “Current Draft” directory, and ‘read and write’ access to the “Comments” Directory, to all staff listed in the respective “permissions” file. Log-in IDs are selected from a drop-down menu. Another person should check that the correct individuals have been granted permission.

**4.3.3 Issuing guidance on drafting requirements**  
**[Deadline: End November]**

i) Guidance should be provided to question setters by the Chief Examiner so that they know what types of questions and marking guideline are required, how to supply drafts, etc.

ii) The number of questions to be set should normally be at least one more than the total number needed to give some choice to Exam Boards. Chief Examiners should review the number of questions to be set to ensure that this is appropriate.

iii) The Chief Examiner, or TSO, should also provide guidance on how question-setters should deposit drafts of exam questions and marking guidelines into the “Current Draft” directory.

**4.3.4 Drafting and reviewing questions**  
**[Deadline: End February]**

i) Work to draft exam questions is expected to be ongoing into the spring – typically aiming to have first drafts completed by the end of January. Once questions have been deposited in the “Current Draft” directory and are ready for review (esp. for Term 1 modules), the Chief Examiner should send a notification email to relevant Exam Board Chairs to prompt review.

ii) Questions and marking guidelines should then be scrutinised by Exam Board members, including External Examiners. Comments and edits of questions and marking guidelines should be deposited in the
“Comments” directory prior to integration. If emailing questions to an External Examiner, appropriate password security measures must be used.

iii) Where an Exam Board has more than one External Examiner, questions should be divided between them according to their area of expertise.

iv) Exam Boards should have previously decided whether or not to meet to discuss the questions, or whether the Exam Board Chair should approve questions without needing to consult the wider Board.

v) All Exam Board feedback should be provided by the end of February.

4.3.5 Finalising questions
[Deadline: End March]

i) Once comments/edits have been made by Boards, the Chief Examiner should be notified. For Term 1 Module questions, Exam Board Chairs must also send an email to the Taught Programme Director informing him/her which specific questions they have decided to include. This information is used to plan the marking.

ii) The Chief Examiner should provide final or revised questions to the Chief External Examiner for their review and approval (directly or via the Chair of the Exam Board that has been assigned responsibility for that module).

iii) The Chief Examiner has the final say about finalising the content of questions and marking guidelines after the Chief External Examiner has seen them.

iv) The Chief Examiner has discretion as to how to resolve any differences of opinion and whether to act upon suggested changes. If they decide not to act upon suggested changes they should however explain the reasons why with the person who suggested them.

v) In some cases, it may be helpful to hold a further informal Exam Board meeting to help finalise questions and resolve any issues.
vi) In finalising questions, the Chief Examiner should endeavour to apply as much scrutiny as possible, mock sitting of the questions is advisable. Also, where applicable, formulae sheets should be checked for content and accuracy.

4.3.6 Finalising papers for printing
[Deadline: Mid-April]

i) Converting approved questions into required format is undertaken by administrators – extracting them from the “Current draft” directory. Tight final deadlines apply.

ii) Pagination and layout are important part of the exam setting process. Standard font, page layout, margins and formatting are set out in the ‘Format of Examination Papers’ section.

iii) The Chief Examiner(s) for Paper 1 and Paper 2 will be responsible for final checks – e.g. ensuring that resolution is sufficient for questions to be legible when printed in black and white.

iv) Exam papers are then securely printed by the Teaching Support Office in good time prior to the exams taking place in June.

4.4 Writing Good Exam Questions

4.4.1 Please refer to LSHTM's main guidance on Writing Good Exam Questions. It provides guidance on preparing questions and marking criteria at an appropriate Master's level, along with examples and exercises.

4.4.2 The following provides a summary of good practice to apply.

Overall
Prepare the exam question, and the marking guidelines together, in order to judge whether a question is good.
Questions
- use the intended learning outcomes of the module or MSc to decide what to assess;
- work out what each draft question is really assessing (repeating a definition, applying a method, etc.);
- don’t assess or measure the same things repeatedly;
- include data or information in questions, to reduce the emphasis on memory and increase the emphasis on critical thinking;
- keep sentences short, using precise and non-ambiguous language;
- make the question layout easy to follow;
- check the standard is appropriate;
- proof-read carefully.

Model answers
- write a model answer for each question;
- check the question clearly states what you expect as portrayed by the model answer;
- allocate times to question sections, estimate how long student should take to complete each.

Marking scheme & criteria
- write a clear marking scheme for co-markers;
- it should address format (e.g. structure, analytical level, originality etc.) as well as content (which need not be absolutely prescribed for interpretative discussion-based types of question);
- decide what the criteria for assessment are;
- indicate the weight to be given to different sections of a question.

Evaluating the question
When you have the question, model answer and marking scheme, ask someone else to write an answer to the question, timing each part of the question. Compare with your model answer and timings. Modify the question, and timings and marking scheme based on any potential misunderstandings identified.

4.4.3 Question-setters for formal summer exam papers should review exam questions from past academic years, for the relevant programme and possibly from other related programmes at LSHTM, to get ideas on the types and styles
of questions which have been used as well as the content covered. F2F past papers are available via the Teaching Support Office.

4.4.4 This Assessment Handbook gives general guidance about what summer exams are expected to address. However, specific requirements on what elements of curriculum to assess will always be determined at programme level, in line with the intended learning outcomes set out in the Programme Specification. Not all intended learning outcomes will necessarily be assessed through exams, as some may be assessed separately e.g. through the project or practical exams.

4.5 Reviewing Draft Exam Questions

The following checklist can be used to help evaluate and improve draft questions. Working through this with a small group of fellow-examiners can be valuable.

i) What is the question intended to measure? E.g. factual recall, data processing/analysis skills, problem-solving skills, policy analysis skills, critical analysis skills.

ii) What else does it actually measure? E.g. does it rely too much on factual recall?

iii) How well does the question relate to intended learning outcomes of the module or MSc?

iv) Is the language simple, clear, unambiguous and straightforward?

v) What are the key words/verbs describing the task, and are they sufficiently clear? E.g. ‘distinguish’, ‘estimate’, ‘propose’.

vi) Is the language used easy to understand, including by candidates for whom English is not their first language (e.g. does it use colloquial phrases)?

vii) Check punctuation and grammar as this can markedly change the meaning of sentences.

viii) Does the question give an advantage or disadvantage to those candidates with particular professional backgrounds, e.g. medics?

ix) How reliably and consistently can the answers be marked?

x) If the question is in sections, is the proportional split of marks between sections appropriate? Are there consequences for later sections if a
candidate makes an error in an early section? If yes, how will the marking cope with this possibility?

xi) Can the question be completed in the time available (including reading, thinking and reviewing time), including those for whom English is not their first language?

xii) Does the question lead to answers which will distinguish between weak and strong candidates, i.e. are there opportunities for candidates to demonstrate distinction-level skills and knowledge?

5. Format of Examination Papers

5.1 General Formatting of Exam Paper

- **Margins**: to be set at 2.5 cm all round;
- **Font**: Times New Roman 12 (mandatory for University-based exams), or Arial 11;
- **Line Spacing**: Single.

5.2 Rubric for Front Page

5.2.1 The rubric on the front page should give clear and accurate instructions about:

- the number of questions on the paper, and the number of questions to be answered;
- whether formulae sheets etc. are attached to the question paper;
- what materials are provided with the question paper (e.g. the number of answer books, graph paper, etc.);
- the use of calculators (please use the standard text shown overleaf, after the instructions).

5.2.2 The rubric is used by invigilators to determine what should be provided on each exam desk. Please note:

- **Attached** - means stapled to the exam question paper;
- **Provided** - means placed separately on the candidates’ desks.
5.2.3 Instructions to Candidates will need to be amended according to the requirements of each exam.

- Each distinct instruction should be clearly numbered.
- Leading words, including the number of questions to be answered, should be in capitals and **UNDERLINED** or typed **BOLD** for emphasis.

For example:

| 1. Answer **ONE** question from **EACH** section. |
| 2. Each answer carries the same number of marks. |
| 3. Write your answers in the answer books provided **NOT** on the question paper. |

Or

| 1. Answer **FOUR** of the following **TEN** questions. |
| 2. You must answer: |
| **TWO** questions from **SECTION A** **and** |
| **ONE** question from **SECTION B** **and** |
| **ONE** question from **SECTION C** |
| 3. Sections A and B are worth 25 marks each. Section C is worth 50 marks. |

5.2.4 If questions are to be answered on the question paper, there must be space for students to write their candidate number on the front of the paper, together with instructions.

### 5.3 Front Page Template

**UNIVERSITY OF LONDON**

Exam No.

**MSc Examination**

for Internal Students of the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine

**MSc <PROGRAMME>**

**PAPER <1 or 2>**
INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

DO NOT REMOVE THIS EXAMINATION PAPER FROM THE EXAM HALL

1. Candidates should answer [NUMBER] of the following [NUMBER] questions.

2. All questions carry an equal number of marks.

3. Write your answers in the answer books provided and NOT on the question paper.

4. Answer each question in a SEPARATE answer book.

5. It is strongly recommended that you write legibly in BLACK ink.

6. Statistical Formulae Sheets are attached at the end of this paper.

7. If a calculator is used, the make and type of machine must be stated clearly on the front cover of the answer book.

Students may use their own electronic calculators in the examination where specified in the admission notice. Any calculator must be of the hand-held type, quiet in operation and compact, and must have its own power supply. Programmable calculators may be used. Personal digital assistants (PDAs), mobile phones or other devices which may have a wireless or internet connection are strictly forbidden. Students are entirely responsible for ensuring that their calculators are in working order for the examination and for providing in advance for alternative means of calculation in the event of the calculator failing during the examination.

© University of London <Year>

PLEASE TURN OVER
5.4 Exam Paper Content

5.4.1 The following instructions cover pages after the front page. Questions should never begin on the front page.

5.4.2 Pagination

- **Page numbering** should be continuous from the first page and should indicate the total number of pages, e.g. “2 of 8”.
- The words ‘PLEASE TURN OVER’ should be printed all relevant pages.
- The words ‘END OF PAPER’ must be printed immediately after the final question.

5.4.3 Format of questions

- Questions should be numbered consecutively throughout and should not revert to ‘Question 1’ at the start of a new section.
- ONE line space should be inserted between sections and sub sections and FOUR line spaces between questions.
- Questions should be presented in the following format:

1. This is question 1. The indent tab should be set at 1.27 cm. The question starts at the indent. The marks should be aligned at the right-hand margin on a new line below the end of the question or section to which they relate. The marks should be bold and italicised to make them stand out from the remainder of the text. [Marks]

   a) This is a section of a question. The section letter is aligned with the body of the question at 1.27 cm and the question starts at 2.5 cm.
      [Marks]

   i) This is a question sub-section. The sub-section number is aligned with the section at 2.5 cm and the question starts at 3.5 cm.
      [Marks]
5.4.4 **Splitting questions across pages**

The splitting of questions between pages should be avoided if at all possible. If a small reduction in the margins would allow the question to fit on the page, margins can be changed for that page only. Where necessary, a question should be started on a new page to avoid unnecessary splitting.

5.4.5 **Diagrams and tables**

- Diagram/table numbers and the legend should be centred under the diagram/table.
- Diagrams and graphics should NOT be in colour and must be sufficiently dark and clear to produce good quality photocopies, particularly when scanned from another source.

5.4.6 **Quotations, sources and lists**

- **Quotations**: Use single quote marks with double quotes within the sentence where necessary.
- **Sources**: Should be at the end of long quotes and flush with the right-hand margin.
- **Lists**: Should be indented and separated from the question.

6. **Exam Support for Students**

6.1 **Supporting Students’ Exam Preparations**

6.1.1 Staff should support students in preparation for revision and examinations. Many of LSHTM's students are well-versed in the skills required to revise and perform in exams. However, others, particularly international students, may find this stressful.

6.1.2 LSHTM provides a range of support to help students to prepare for revision and examinations. Some of this is available throughout the academic year, and students are encouraged to gain the assessment skills as early as
possible. A number of activities are arranged in Term 3 to provide additional support for students who need it.

6.2 **Access to Previous Exam Papers**

6.2.1 The availability of past exam papers is a key aid to exam preparation and revision. Programme Directors should strongly emphasise to students how important it is to use sample papers in their preparation.

6.2.2 Every programme should ensure that past papers and specimen answers (Paper 1 and Paper 2 for F2F MScs) are made available via Moodle. Past papers and specimen answers should be provided for between one and three academic years.

6.3 **Revision Sessions**

Programme Directors for all F2F MScs are expected to arrange specific exam preparation sessions for their students during Term 3 – noting curriculum areas to be covered, general structural approach of papers (e.g. answering three major essay-type questions from four offered), and general good practice and advice including what is expected from pass-standard, good or excellent answers.

6.4 **Other Sources of Support**

6.4.1 **Skills resources available on-line:** Extensive useful resources are available via LSHTM’s [Study Skills](#) webpage.

6.4.2 **English for Academic Purposes:** LSHTM’s [English for Academic Purposes (EAP)](#) support programme is aimed at students from across LSHTM’s F2F programmes whose first language is not English. Sessions place a strong emphasis on the need for students to communicate clearly in any assessed work they write or present.

6.4.3 **Personal tutors:** F2F MSc students are encouraged to discuss any general concerns about revision and examination techniques with their personal tutor.
PASS programme: The PASS Programme (Personalised Additional Student Support) is available throughout the academic year, as a means to provide further small-group academic support to identified students, including those who may be struggling with their studies. Referral to the programme is by Programme Directors, with approval being given by Faculty Taught Programme Directors.

Student Advice & Counselling Service: Students who are feeling anxious about revision and examinations may be referred, or may refer themselves to one of the Student Advisors, who can give one-to-one support and advice. Students with particular anxieties or stress may be referred, or may refer themselves, direct to the Student Counsellors, who can give more extensive one-to-one support and advice. Further information can be found on the Student Advice & Counselling Service webpage.

7. Project Reports

7.1 Project Criteria & Requirements

7.1.1 This section describes the standard practice and guidance for assessing project reports. This is mainly focused on MScs, although principles may be applicable for similar types of extended research coursework conducted for other types of programme.

7.1.2 Formal criteria and assessment requirements are set out in a Project Handbook available via Moodle. Each handbook comprises:

Part 1 with LSHTM-wide guidance and requirements:

- project length (i.e. word count and which sections are counted);
- deadlines and extensions;
- penalties for breach of criteria;
- ethics approval requirements;
- administrative matters such as submission format;
and Part 2 with programme-specific guidance and requirements that will give further details on the academic content of projects and more specific marking criteria.

### 7.2 Project Marking Schemes

7.2.1 Specific project criteria and marking schemes for each programme will be agreed in advance by Exam Boards. These should expand on standard LSHTM-wide project marking criteria outlined in the Project Handbook.

7.2.2 The standard scheme will be for markers to agree an integer grade point mark based on the LSHTM’s standard grading scale (from 0 to 5). Alternatively, schemes may define specific project components to be marked, such as that the component marks can be combined into a non-integer project GPA.

7.2.3 Different types of project (e.g. literature reviews versus primary research) may require different marking schemes. It is important for marking schemes to define:

- the different types of project protocol to be marked;
- the distinct components that markers should be looking for in these;
- how components should be marked in line with standard LSHTM criteria;
- any mathematical weightings or calculations to be applied in order to set and agree the overall mark.

7.2.4 Where boards wish to define a **component-based marking scheme** to generate an overall project GPA:

- a typical model will be to define three distinct equally-weighted components to be marked with grade points on the standard integer grading scale - these component marks will then be averaged into a GPA;
- the number and weighting of components may differ between types of projects and components may be broad and conceptual or more prescriptive;
- if the scheme is designed to produce a precise GPA (rather than an integer grade point), the GPA should be clearly justifiable as being calculated from distinct and specifically sub-marked elements;
- it may be desirable to have markers grade individual defined components of projects, but then agree and award an overall (integer) grade that is ‘holistic’, rather than mathematically calculated from component marks.

7.2.5 Both markers must agree the final project mark awarded and any differences must be reconciled by discussion, rather than averaged away. Where formal components have been set, allowing an overall GPA to be awarded based on individual component grades (which would be reported back to students), project markers must likewise reconcile their grades for components.

7.2.6 The general outline of the agreed project marking scheme must be published to students, normally via each programme’s project handbook, prior to students commencing project work. It should give a fair and reasonable view of how they are expected to achieve the best marks.

7.3 Operation of Project Marking

7.3.1 Anonymity: Appropriate steps should be taken to keep project reports anonymous during initial marking, using candidate numbers only. Some specialist programmes may require project supervisors to act as second markers.

7.3.2 Moderation: Projects should be formally moderated by External Examiners.

7.4 Feedback to Students

Students must be given written feedback on their project report. Where Exam Boards define formal project components to be individually marked, it is good practice to structure feedback to students along the same headings. These component marks should also be fed back to students.
8. **Resit Assessments**

8.1 **Scope**

This section sets out LSHTM guidance for resits of assessed work. The Resists Policy can be found in Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

8.2 **Planning and Design of Resits**

For module Resits, the design of any resit assessment will usually be delegated to the relevant Module Organiser(s) by the Exam Board. The following key principles apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity of resit task to original</th>
<th>Resits should not be so similar to original assessments so that any model answers or feedback given previously would provide an undue advantage to resit students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where the original task was a timed assessment (e.g. exam or practical), the resit task may be either a similar-style exam with different questions, or a different type of task (e.g. coursework, for students who cannot come back to LSHTM to take the resit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past papers</td>
<td>Details about Resit tasks should not be included in standard sets of past papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timed assessment resit tasks with specially-set questions (e.g. exams)</td>
<td>Staff can specify that resit students may not take the question papers away – to aid adaptation or re-use of these questions in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resit design good practice</td>
<td>Resit coursework tasks should be designed in a way that encourages good academic practice, e.g. asking students to build on previous work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revising &amp; resubmitting coursework</strong></td>
<td>It is possible to resit by revising and resubmitting coursework if this has been approved by the Exam Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group work</strong></td>
<td>The resit should be a different individual task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical Exams</strong></td>
<td>Where practical exams from a Term 1 module contribute towards summative assessment of a F2F programme, the Exam Board responsible for the module should agree resit requirements in advance, either requiring that they be resat the following year, on the same basis as that year’s cohort or setting a separate specific resit task (on a similar basis to module resits), which may be held in the same academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
<td>Students who fail the project must resit. Exam Boards will agree one of three options, taking into account the views of the project markers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.3 Providing Resit Information

#### 8.3.1 Publication of Resit Information

i) Programme handbooks, module specifications and other key student-facing documents must summarise how any resits will operate i.e. type and timing of task. This must be clear to students before they take the assessment the first time.

ii) The Programme Handbook must contain details as to how any non-module exam resits (including practical exam resits) and/or project resits will operate.

iii) Guidance must indicate if the resit task will be different from the original assessment. Such tasks will also apply to students taking a deferred assessment.

#### 8.3.2 Agreement of Resit Requirements

Exam Boards will review student grades to determine where resits may be required or permissible. The Exam Board will look at wider sets of grades to determine whether any compensation may apply.
8.3.3 Communicating Resit Decisions to Students

i) Students will be notified of resit arrangement by the Registry.

ii) To inform students’ decisions, Exam Board recommendations should outline any options available about which assessments may be taken, and when.

iii) F2F students are automatically entered for resit at the next available opportunity. If they do not intend to take it, they are required to inform Registry accordingly. Failure to take the resit without prior notification will result in a zero grade.

8.4 Compensation

8.4.1 Exam Boards can identify optional resits where a second attempt may rather than must be taken, pending further results being confirmed. This applies in cases where a module has been failed but may be compensatable. Students should be permitted to choose either: resit at the next available assessment opportunity or defer the resit pending completion of other remaining modules - at which point it can be determined whether the failed module is compensatable (and no resit allowed), or not (and a resit is required).

8.4.2 Module Resits should always be labelled as required in cases where grades calculated do not compensate failed assessments. This includes cases where students have failed more than one module. In such cases, a student may choose to defer one resit, in the hope that doing the other(s) first will allow the deferred module to be compensated.

8.5 Record of Resit Decisions

8.5.1 Exam Board minutes should give an accurate and complete summary of the agreed status for each candidate.

8.5.2 Records should normally include the following:
• all credit-bearing elements for which a resit may be required;
• any specific assessment components to be resat;
• the original grades achieved for each element and component to be resat;
• whether the resit is required or optional;
• resit date(s) and deadline(s).

8.6 Grading and Feedback

8.6.1 Resits must be double-marked and grades reconciled in the normal manner, within the standard timescales and using comparable grading criteria to the original assessment.

8.6.2 At least one marker from each involved pair should have had experience of marking work for the corresponding task earlier in the year, for F2F module Resits and both F2F and DL project resits; or be marking original (non-resit) work at the same time, for ‘one-year-later’ F2F exam resits and DL exam and coursework resits. The Module Organiser acts as second marker. If it has not been possible to assign a such a marker, then relevant work should be reviewed by the relevant Exam Board Chair, Moderator, External Examiner or another Exam Board member (as the Chair determines) to confirm the appropriateness of the grades given.

8.6.3 Exam Board Chairs or External Examiners may request to see all or a sample of resit work if desired, to help provide confidence in the consistency and appropriateness of resit marking.

8.6.4 Resit work must be marked anonymously. For resit work marked outside of the standard schedule, markers will know that they are marking resits; this will not impact on the treatment of the work.

8.6.5 All resit grades will be capped to a maximum GPA of 3 at the level of the credit-bearing element. This will happen after marking has taken place. This process is not undertaken by markers it happens automatically on the SITS database.
| **Module with a coursework assessment and an exam** | If a student resits the exam, this will be marked as standard with no grade capping applied and the new exam grade reported back to the student. However, the overall module grade will be capped at 3 and carried forward to the calculation of degree GPA. |
| **F2F summer exams** | If one paper is re-sat it will be graded without capping, but the overall exams grade (across both papers plus any practical) will be capped to a maximum GPA of 3. The uncapped paper grade and capped overall grade will both be reported back to the student. |
| **Assessment Irregularity** | A resit might be capped at a grade other than 3 where the resit is due to an assessment irregularity, and a recommendation had been made for the resit to be capped at a lower maximum level. |

8.6.6 If students were given feedback on their original work, they must also be given feedback on the resit work. However, comments can be much briefer than for original assessments and just summarise the main reasons for the grade awarded.

8.6.7 Students who fail a resit, and consequently withdrawn from their programme of study, are not permitted to re-register for the same programme at a later date. They may, however, apply for a different LSHTM programme. A full standard application will be required and may include an application to consider Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) in accordance with the policy.

8.7 **F2F Exam Resits**

8.7.1 **Exam Board Consideration for F2F Exam Resits**

  i) Resits of F2F MSc exams will be determined at Final Exam Boards. The rules to be followed are set out in [Chapter 8a](#) (for face-to-face programmes) and [Chapter 8b](#) (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual.
ii) If any queries of interpretation arise, Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual set the definitive regulations to be applied. Note that the resit regulations are automatic. Exam Boards are asked to ratify resit requirements arising, but there are no options in what should be required of students based on their results.

iii) F2F summer exam resit grades will be considered by the following year’s final Exam Board meetings.

8.7.2 Determination of F2F Resit Requirements

i) Ratification of F2F summer exam grades and determination of resit requirements are carried out by final Exam Board meetings and not interim Exam Board meetings.

ii) For programmes with a summative Term 1 practical, the Postgraduate Taught Degree Academic Regulations in Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual do not require failed practicals to be resat provided the overall examination GPA (practical plus summer exams) is 2.00 or above. If a student fails the practical in Term 1, it will not be possible to confirm whether they need to resit until Term 3. As above, summer exam results cannot be ratified until final Exam Board meetings. However, in order to allow students to resit failed practicals, Exam Board Chairs for programmes with a summative practical should review provisional F2F summer exam grades and practical grades once they are available in the summer, and agree ‘practical resit recommendations’ accordingly. This is expected to happen outside of formal Exam Board meetings. A list of students to resit practicals should be given to Registry by the same deadline as for module resits.

8.7.3 Operation of F2F Exam Resits

i) Students who are required to resit (or make a new attempt at) a F2F summer exam should do so at the next opportunity, i.e. taking the next summer’s standard exam alongside students from that year’s cohort.
ii) If a student needs to resit more than one of the two summer exams then they may be permitted to defer taking an exam until after the next opportunity. Exam Boards may wish to recommend this where it is likely that a resit of one paper will render the other paper or practical compensatable.

iii) If a part-time student takes and fails summer exam Paper 1 in Year 1, then this must be resat if the GPA is below 1.0, and may be resat if the GPA is below 2.0. Students may be offered the opportunity to either take the resit, or the other paper, or both, in Year 2 of their registration; and may defer taking one paper until the year following Year 2 of their registration.

8.7.4 Operation of F2F MSc Practical Exam Resits

i) Students who are required to resit a F2F MSc practical exam should do so at the next available opportunity. Alternatively, programmes may choose to set a separate resit task for practicals, to be undertaken on a similar basis to module resits. Such tasks might be timed for September alongside module resits, or take place earlier in the academic year.

ii) Alternative tasks do not have to be a practical and could be a test or a piece of coursework to be completed remotely, set under the authority of the Exam Board Chair. This is particularly recommended for students who cannot come back to LSHTM to do an exam. If the student took a progress test after their original failed practical and has demonstrated appropriate practical competencies in that way, then it is less critical for the resit task to assess exactly the same learning outcomes as the original practical.

iii) To allow in-year practical resits to take place, Exam Board Chairs are authorised to make resit recommendations based on practical grades only, i.e. not necessarily waiting until students’ summer exams are marked and requirements to resit can be definitively determined. There is no need to hold an interim Exam Board to make such recommendations.
### 8.8 Project Resits

#### 8.8.1 Recommendations from Markers

i) Whenever a pair of markers agree a fail grade for a project they should also agree what type of resit to recommend for approval by the Exam Board, in line with the following three options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resit Type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision &amp; re-submission</strong></td>
<td>Make corrections to the core material and submit a revised project. Deadline: A two-month timescale, from the point of the student being notified. This applies irrespective of mode of study; but students may ask for an extension or deferral if they have valid extenuating circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further data collection</strong></td>
<td>Collect new data and revise/update the basic project topic. This is an option where the student appears capable of succeeding but the data previously collected has been insufficient or flawed. Deadline: This should be submitted for the following year's deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New project</strong></td>
<td>Complete a new project on an entirely new topic. This will be required where there are fundamental problems in the original project that cannot simply be revised. Deadline: This should be submitted for the following year's deadline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) The first marker should prepare draft feedback linked to the resit recommendation, e.g. indicating the kind of corrections that may be
necessary, and/or how an entirely new project might be better approached.

iii) The student’s supervisor should be told the student has failed, made aware of the markers’ recommendation, and asked to provide any further comments about the student’s performance, background to the project, and the relative desirability of making corrections versus doing a whole new project. Note that the supervisor may sometimes be a marker.

iv) Recommendations and comments from markers and supervisors should be made available to the Exam Board to inform Resit decisions. The student must not be given any hint of their grade or related recommendations in the meantime.

8.8.2 Exam Board Consideration

i) Any project graded below the pass threshold of 2 must be resat with no allowance for compensation. Final Exam Board meetings must set explicit requirements for the type of resit required.

ii) Exam Boards should draw on the individual recommendations of markers of failed projects to decide which type of resit to recommend. Normally Boards should be expected to accept the recommendations of markers, but may set a different requirement based on review of the material by Exam Board members, especially External Examiners.

iii) After Board decisions have been made, the Exam Board Chair should follow up with the Programme Director to confirm or adjust the feedback prepared by markers, to ensure it best reflects the agreed resit requirements.

iv) The Registry will notify the student of their final project grade and resit requirements. Exam Board Chairs and Programme Directors may also wish to liaise with the student to ensure that they are aware of the resit requirements and associated feedback of their project.
8.8.3 Revision and Re-submission

i) Written feedback on the student's original submission should provide guidance on making corrections.

ii) F2F students may be allowed one meeting with either their supervisor or Programme Director to help clarify guidance or alternatively, further written guidance and clarification may be provided by email.

iii) Students who are revising a project for resubmission are not entitled to have staff read or comment on a draft prior to final submission.

iv) Submission arrangements and criteria should operate broadly as per the original submission. However, alongside the revised final report, the student should submit a track changes version showing modifications from the original version or provide a summary sheet describing the specific changes made.

8.8.4 Further Data Collection and New Project

i) Written feedback on the student's original submission should provide initial guidance on the direction the Resit project should take.

ii) LSHTM will endeavour to provide the same level of supervision for further data collection and new projects as for original projects outlined in the MSc Project Handbook. The period must be agreed in advance through correspondence between the supervisor and student (this does not count in the total period of supervision).

iii) LSHTM will ensure that a supervisor is appointed for each such resit student. Usually this will be the same supervisor as for the original project but if they are not available, or the student requests a different supervisor, or the Exam Board Chair recommends a different supervisor, they may change. As for standard projects, external associate supervisors or technical advisors may provide input.

iv) The student can start work on the resit project at any point after being notified of the requirement to resit, but must get a CARE form approved (incorporating relevant academic, risk assessment and ethics
approvals from LSHTM) and obtain any necessary local approvals before commencing substantive new data collection or other work that is not still covered by their original CARE form.

v) For ‘further data collection’ projects, if it transpires that it will not now be possible to collect further data or material to supplement the original project, it may be necessary for the student to undertake a new project instead. This may be agreed by the project supervisor via CARE form approval.

vi) The student may submit the project ahead of the deadline they have been set, but they should not expect it to be marked or the award to be confirmed ahead of the final Exam Board schedule.

vii) Students are entitled to have their supervisor read or comment on a full draft of their resit project prior to final submission. However, feedback may be much briefer for further data collection projects than for entirely new projects.

8.8.5 Grading of Project Resits

i) Revised, further-updated or new projects should be marked in line with standard timescales and against the same criteria used for original work. Feedback should be prepared, summarising the main reasons for the grade awarded. If different markers are used to those who marked the work originally, then they should have access to the original markers’ feedback as well as details about the changes made by the student.

ii) Once agreed by markers, grades should be ratified through either Chair’s Action by the Exam Board Chair (for revise and resubmit projects, where timing will fall outside the standard schedule of Board meetings), or at the next year’s final Exam Board (for further data collection or new projects). Any final awards to students may be determined at the same time.

iii) Outcomes should then be reported to students within an academic transcript via Registry. Teaching Support Office should provide project feedback.
8.9  F2F Students Resitting DL Modules

i)  The assessment task for these students consists of the coursework component of the module only (since F2F students take F2F rather than DL exams). Standard DL procedures should be varied to allow these resits to be marked in line with F2F schedules, so these students can graduate with the rest of their class.

ii) The resit task should either require a new piece of coursework, or revision and re-submission of the original, in line with the standard approach agreed for the module.

iii) A September deadline should be set in line with F2F schedules, and work will need to be marked specially, ahead of going to the relevant F2F Exam Board.

9.  Board of Examiner Roles

Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual give information about:

- Membership of the Board of Examiners;
- General Appointment Criteria;
- Conflicts of Interest;
- Periods of Appointment;
- Appointment and Approval Procedure;
- Updates to Exam Board Membership in-year.

For the Role and Duties of External Examiners see Chapter 5, External Expertise of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

This section provides information on the School's procedures and has been designed to provide staff with guidance in relation to Exam Boards.


9.1 Role and Duties of Exam Board Chairs & Deputies

9.1.1 The overall role of the Chair of each Board of Examiners is to:

- oversee the assessment of students taking the programme, or taking modules under the authority of the Exam Board, in line with LSHTM policy and procedures;
- Chair Exam Board meetings, to confirm grades and determine degree award outcomes or progression status for each student.

Across all their actions and decisions, and within the boundaries set by LSHTM policies and regulations, Exam Board Chairs should regard the views of External Examiners as particularly influential.

9.1.2 The role of the Deputy Chair is to deputise for the Chair in any and all duties, including chairing Exam Board meetings and taking Chair’s Action, during any defined period when the Chair is absent.

9.1.3 Chairs will be supported in their duties by an Exam Board Secretary.

9.1.4 The duties of F2F MSc Exam Board Chairs (in roughly the order they are likely to arise during the year, and with key items in bold) include:

i) Advise the Head of Registry of any connections with any candidate(s) on the relevant programme that might constitute a conflict of interest.

ii) Keep Registry informed of any changes to Exam Board membership during the year, and of nominations for the following year’s Exam Board proposed at the end of the year.

iii) Set a date for the final Exam Board meeting well in advance, notifying all members.

iv) Invite the External Examiner(s) to attend relevant Exam Board meetings each year, as soon as these are scheduled. External Examiners should be given as much notice as possible of the date of the final meeting of the Board.

v) Provide any appropriate personal induction for new External Examiners, including arranging additional training or support for first-time External examiners where necessary.
vi) **Co-ordinate question-setting activities and sign-off** during the year, in line with LSHTM procedures and deadlines, and ensuring strict information security and confidentiality.

vii) Determine the distribution of duties between External Examiners where more than one are appointed to a Board.

viii) **Liaise with External Examiners at appropriate points during the year**, including reminding them of their key duties, and responding to any queries or concerns they may have.

ix) **Ensure External Examiners are given all necessary documentation** in a timely fashion to enable them to carry out their duties during the year and ahead of Board meetings.

x) **Undertake or delegate moderation of modules** according to LSHTM procedures and deadlines.

xi) Participate in the marking of exam scripts and project reports including providing advice or decisions in cases where two markers have a query or are unable to reconcile grades (it is not normally appropriate for Exam Board Chairs to mark in-course module work, unless that module comes under the authority of another Board or the Chair will later be delegating moderation to other Board members).

xii) Oversee production of a grades sheet by the Programme Administrator, based on a standard template supplied by the Registry, to be tabled at final Exam Board meetings.

xiii) **Chair interim and final meetings of the Exam Board.** An interim meeting should be held in mid-summer to determine F2F module resit requirements, and a final meeting in early autumn to determine degree awards.

xiv) Ensure the final Exam Board meeting takes place in the required Exam Board period.

xv) **Review and confirm grades** for all candidates, using a standard ‘Exam Board spreadsheet’ based on a template sent to the Teaching Support Office each year by the Registry.

xvi) **Ratify awards** using the approved Taught Programme Regulations.

xvii) Make the final decisions on prize winners.

xviii) Confirm the progression status of any students who have not qualified for the award they are registered for, making decisions about resit requirements, de-registration, etc.

xix) **Ensure result sheets are signed by both the Chair and the External Examiner(s)** and securely delivered to the Registry immediately following the final Exam Board meeting.
xx) Ensure that minutes are taken at all Exam Board meetings and sent to the Registry within one month.
xxi) Inform prize winners of their award.
xxii) Coordinate with the Registry regarding any candidates to be offered opportunities to resit. The Registry will write to informing them about resit options; Chairs should be prepared to provide advice on which components to prioritise resitting if applicable.
xxiii) **Submit comments and action plan** responding to any points raised in the External Examiners report(s), after the final Exam Board and in line with LSHTM procedures and deadlines.
xxiv) Submit a Fee Allocation form to allow External Examiners for MSc programmes to be paid appropriate fees and expenses.

### 9.2 Role of the Exam Board Secretary

#### 9.2.1
A Secretary will be appointed for each Exam Board. The key duties of the Secretary are to prepare for and support Board meetings, and record and follow-up on outcomes from those meetings.

#### 9.2.2
As part of their in-year duties and separate from Exam Board meetings, the Secretary will:

i) Circulate advance information to Board members about the date, time and place of each Board meeting.

ii) Prepare samples of work for the External Examiner to review ahead of final Exam Board meetings, as directed by the Exam Board Chair.

#### 9.2.3
Prior to the meeting of the Board, the Secretary will:

- Book a room and catering for the meeting.
- In conjunction with the Chair of the Board, prepare the agenda and associated papers and distribute them electronically to members in advance of the meeting.
- Ensure that spare printed copies of papers are available at the meeting.
- Facilitate the production and checking of the marksheets considered by the Board, based on the latest standard template provided by the Registry, and ensure that sufficient anonymised copies are provided
for the Board members and a copy including the names of candidates is provided for the Registry representative.

9.2.4 During the meeting of the Board, the Secretary will:

- Record the decisions of the Board on each candidate.
- Act as minute taker.
- Assist the Chair as directed.

9.2.5 After the meeting of the Board, the Secretary will:

- Transcribe the minutes of the meeting within one month of the date of the meeting for approval by the Chair.
- Ensure a copy of the minutes is sent to the Assessments Manager in Registry.
- Retain record copies of all minutes and papers, in line with LSHTM's retention policy.

9.2.6 The Secretary is not a member of the Board and plays no part in the decision-making regarding, and is not eligible to vote. The Secretary should draw the Board's attention to pertinent information that has not otherwise been highlighted.

9.3 Role and Appointment of Assessors

Role of assessors

9.3.1 Assessors may be appointed to assist Exam Boards in the setting of papers, the marking of scripts/essays/reports, and to attend practical examinations.

9.3.2 Assessors are not members of Exam Boards and shall not be entitled, unless invited, to attend meetings of Exam Boards.

9.3.3 If present, assessors do not have the right to vote at meetings of Exam Boards.
Appointment of assessors

9.3.4 All academic staff, honorary and emeritus staff, professional support staff and research degree students of LSHTM shall automatically be assessors of LSHTM. Their appointment as such shall be valid whilst they are bound by a contract of employment with LSHTM (including during any periods of sabbatical leave), hold a current honorary appointment or emeritus position, or are currently registered for a research degree (including during any interruption of studies); and for a three-month period thereafter.

9.3.5 Assessors are required to advise the Head of Registry or the Pro-Director of Education if their exercise of the role might entail any conflict of interest. The Registry will send an annual reminder about this to all assessors.

9.3.6 Persons from outside LSHTM may be individually appointed as assessors.

- Nominations may be made by Exam Board members (typically for marking programme-level exams or projects), or Module Organisers (for marking work from a specific module), who should send the nominee a copy of the Conflict of Interest guidance and ask them to declare any such conflicts. Nominations must be scrutinised for appropriateness and approved by the relevant Exam Board Chair, then reported to the Assessments Manager in the Registry who will maintain a central list. No further specific approval is required beyond that of the Exam Board Chair. External assessor appointments may be made and reported to the Registry throughout the year.
- Once approved as an assessor for one LSHTM Exam Board, external persons may act as assessors for other Boards without a further nomination/appointment process. LSHTM staff allocating any work to external assessors must check with the Registry to confirm whether an individual has been formally appointed and is on the Registry list.
- Appointments of external assessors shall be valid for a period of four years, after which they must be re-approved by a relevant Exam Board Chair. The Registry will contact Exam Board Chairs after the start of each academic year to advise them of any appointments detailed on their list that have expired since the previous year.
Allocation of work to assessors

9.3.7 Individual Exam Board Chairs agree who should act as assessors for work under their Board's remit. Taught Programme Directors and/or Module Organisers may typically be delegated substantial authority to determine this; but Exam Board Chairs may scrutinise and ask for a change in the allocation of work to specific assessors.

- The allocation of work to Assessors who are research degree students should always be particularly scrutinised to ensure appropriateness.
- Before any specific work is allocated to an external assessor, the relevant member of staff allocating the work must ensure that corresponding payment arrangements have been approved through the appropriate Faculty procedures.

9.4 Role and Appointment of Internal Examiners

9.4.1. The role of Exam Board members other than the Chair/Deputy Chair and External Examiner (known as ‘ordinary Exam Board members’ or ‘Internal Examiners’) shall be to:

- Participate in the assessment of students taking the programme, or taking modules under the authority of the Exam Board, in line with LSHTM policy and procedures.
- Participate in the business of Exam Board meetings, to help confirm grades and determine degree award outcomes or progression status for each registered student.

9.4.2. Duties as an Examiner will be allocated by the relevant Exam Board Chair or their nominated representative (e.g. Chief Examiner of a shared module, or the PD), or by the Faculty TPD.

9.4.3. Outside of Exam Board meetings, these duties should include:

- To prepare exam questions and associated marking schemes for the summer examinations. Each examiner is expected to contribute at least one question.
- To review, and confirm the appropriateness of, exam questions and marking schemes drafted by other Exam Board members.
- To moderate module grades at the request of the Exam Board Chair.
- To mark in-course (module) assessments, exam scripts, and project reports.
- To take part in assessment of practical examinations where required.
• To attend all Exam Board meetings.

9.4.4. In their actions and decisions as Exam Board members, and within the boundaries set by LSHTM policies and regulations, Internal Examiners should regard the views of External Examiners as particularly influential – particularly regarding assessment standards and the award of degrees.

10. Authority of Boards

Determination of awards for LSHTM taught programmes (including Master's Degrees, Diplomas, Certificates and the taught element of the DrPH) will come under the authority of a designated Board of Examiners for each programme, acting on behalf of the Senate.

Individual Exam Boards:

• Will be set up in parallel to Programme Committees (which are responsible for matters concerning teaching, curriculum, student support etc.).
• Will act for both full and part-time students on the same programme.
• Will have responsibility for the award types specified in the Programme Specification, e.g. where a programme offers PGCert, PGDip and MSc options.

Each Board's membership shall be established as per standard Constitution and Appointment procedures.

Exam Board Chairs (or Deputies) and External Examiners are expected to undertake further specific duties outside meetings as outlined in Chapter 5 of the LSHTM Academic Manual and Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

10.1 Final Exam Board meetings

10.1.1 Final Exam Boards confirm grades and/or degree awards. They cover the following:
i) **Review and confirm all grades** relevant to making final awards to students, having noted (a) any module grades previously confirmed through moderation, (b) moderation of sample exams, projects and other assessed work by the External Examiner(s), and (c) any relevant data on grade distributions.

ii) **Review and ratify final degree awards** to students. This should include discussion of and decision on any borderline classifications and the award of prizes.

iii) **Agree progression decisions**, including resit requirements, termination of studies, or exit awards in line with the Taught Programme Regulations.

10.1.2 **At meetings where student awards are ratified, the quorum will be the Chair or Deputy Chair, an External Examiner and at least two internal examiners (normally including Programme Director(s)).** In exceptional circumstances attendance may be by remote access, e.g. by conference call or video call. This needs to be agreed in advance by the Associate Dean (Quality & Academic Standards).

10.1.3 If the External Examiner cannot attend the meeting in person they must have the opportunity review the spread of results and to send comments to the board. The Chair must brief the External Examiner after the meeting on discussions and decisions taken, prior to the external examiner co-signing results sheets.

10.1.4 If an External Examiner is unable to attend or participate in the final Board of Examiners meeting through illness or another unavoidable cause, the meeting should be postponed.

**10.2 Interim Exam Board meetings**

10.2.1 The Chair may convene Interim Exam Boards to discuss exam question-setting, data on the distribution of provisional grades following exams, student progression, resit recommendations, etc.

10.2.2 The quorum must be four members, including the Chair or Deputy Chair and Programme Director(s). External Examiners need not attend but should be invited or notified about the meeting as a courtesy, and given the opportunity to provide input (e.g. by email, phone, Skype or similar) if
desired. The Secretary will attend to take minutes, and the Faculty Taught Programme Director and a Registry observer should be invited to attend.

10.2.3 Interim Exam Boards may be held through correspondence (email) rather than face-to-face, provided a quorum of at least four members are involved, with observers copied into correspondence.

10.2.4 Interim Exam Boards to make module resit recommendations for F2F MSc students are guided by the LSHTM Resit regulations in Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

10.3 Duties of the Secretary

Every Exam Board will be supported by a Secretary from the Teaching Support Office who will be responsible for:

- circulation of information to Board members about the date, time and place of the meeting;
- producing the agenda (in consultation with the Chair);
- assisting the Chair in the preparation of a grades sheet to table at the meeting;
- assisting the Chair during the meeting;
- writing the minutes (to be confirmed by the Chair prior to circulation);
- retaining record copies of all minutes and papers, in line with LSHTM’s retention policy.

10.4 Calendar of duties for Exam Board Chairs

The following calendar sets out dates and deadlines for F2F award-bearing LSHTM programmes, it runs from January to December, to reflect Exam Boards’ appointment periods.

Dates and deadlines relating to resits have been shaded, to distinguish them from the main run of marking and Exam Board consideration.

- EBC = Exam Board Chair
- TSO = Teaching Support Office
- PDs = Programme Directors
- MOs = Module Organisers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/deadline</th>
<th>Action by</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| January      | PDs       | • Respond to External Examiners report (if not yet done).  
             |            | • Ensure exam question-setting is underway – including Exam Board members all reviewing paper 1 and paper 2 questions. |
| February     | EBC       | • Hold an informal interim Exam Board meeting (either face-to-face or by email) to discuss composition of paper 1 and 2 summer exams, and review and finalise selection questions and marking guidelines.  
             |            | • Ensure that all modules have been assigned to a Moderator from the Exam Board. |
| March        | EBC       | • Confirm Final Exam Board date with External Examiner. |
| April        | EBC       | • Moderate C1 and C2 modules.  
             |            | • Ensure that External Examiner has seen and approved exam questions and marking guidelines.  
             |            | • If necessary, hold a further interim Exam Board meeting (again either F2F or by email) to finalise Paper 1 and Paper 2 exam questions and marking guidelines. |
| Late April   | EBC       | • Deadline to submit agreed exam questions to TSO for formatting as print-ready Paper 1 and Paper 2. |
| Late April   | TSO       | • Deadline to return formatted print-ready Paper 1 and Paper 2 to Exam Board Chair for last check and approval. |
| Early May    | EBC       | • Deadline to confirm/approve formatted print-ready Paper 1 and Paper 2 produced by TSO. |
| Early May    | TSO       | • Deadline to provide formatted print-ready Paper 1 and Paper 2 to the University of London Exams Office, for printing. |
| May          | EBC       | • Moderate D1 and D2 modules.  
<pre><code>         |            | • If not already arranged, in liaison with PD and TPD, ensure sufficient markers are available to mark exam papers. |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/deadline</th>
<th>Action by</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>May</strong></td>
<td>PDs / MOs</td>
<td>• Arrange exam revision sessions (especially for Term 1 modules) during the E-slot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>End May</strong></td>
<td>Markers</td>
<td>• Deadline for E-module assessment grades to be provided to TSO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early June</strong></td>
<td>PDs / EBC</td>
<td>• <strong>Summer exams take place</strong> – Programme Directors and/or Exam Board Chairs to attend start of exams to respond to any queries or issues arising from students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-June</strong></td>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>• Deadline for TSO to ensure all module assessment grades are entered on SITS (including results for DL modules taken by blended learning, based on DL coursework only).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>June</strong></td>
<td>EBC</td>
<td>• Moderate E modules, and ensure all earlier modules have been moderated ahead of final LSHTM-wide deadline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late June</strong></td>
<td>Markers / EBC</td>
<td>• Deadline for MSc summer exam marks to be provided to TSO – Exam Board Chair to help monitor and chase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late June</strong></td>
<td>EBC</td>
<td>• <strong>Absolute deadline for the completion of moderation</strong> for all Face-to-face modules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early July</strong></td>
<td>Registry</td>
<td>• Circulate module results sheets for consideration at interim Exam Boards determining resits. Follows on from TSO entering all grades on SITS by mid-June, and moderation being completed by end June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July (3-weeks)</strong></td>
<td>EBC</td>
<td>• Hold an interim Exam Board meeting during the 3-week period for Exam Boards to be held, to agree module resit recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid July</strong></td>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>• Ensure all MSc summer exam marks are entered on SITS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
<td>Registry</td>
<td>• Circulate exam results spreadsheets on request following on from TSO entering marks on SITS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **July**     | EBC       | • Review exam results spreadsheet.  
• Inform students of provisional exam results (unless done by TSO or SITS).  
• See failing students as appropriate (unless done by PD). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Deadline</th>
<th>Action by</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late July</td>
<td>TSO, EBC</td>
<td>- Resit recommendations arising from interim Exam Board meeting to be confirmed and passed to Registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early August</td>
<td>Registry / TSO</td>
<td>- Deadline for issuing module resit notification letters and entry forms to MSc students – also informing relevant Module Organisers of how many students must or may attempt their modules in September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>PDs</td>
<td>- Assign project markers in advance of submission (Exam Board Chair and Faculty Taught Programme Director may also be involved).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>EBC / MOs</td>
<td>- Sign off any module resit tasks (coursework/exams) for September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late August</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>- Deadline for submitting September module resit entry forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early September</td>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>- <strong>MSc project submission deadline</strong> – TSO to receive, process and send out for marking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early September</td>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>- TSO to release task details and guidance for all September resits (including coursework) to relevant students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-September</td>
<td>Markers / EBC</td>
<td>- Deadline for MSc project grades to be provided to TSO – Exam Board Chair to help monitor and chase to ensure all projects are marked in time for Final Exam Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>- Deadline for all September resit coursework assessments to be submitted – TSO to receive, process and send out for marking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>TSO</td>
<td>- Deadline for TSO to ensure all MSc project grades are entered on SITS. Marks submitted later than this will not be included in Final Exam Board spreadsheets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>Registry / TSO</td>
<td>- Final Exam Board spreadsheets to be available at least 5 working days prior to Final Exam Board meetings. Note – these will not include September module resit grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- TSO to send appropriate paperwork (sample exam and project work) to External Examiner in good time before Final Exam Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date/deadline</td>
<td>Action by</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| October      | Exam Boards | - **Final Exam Board meeting** to be held in the 3-week window. Confirm and ratify final student grades and awards or progress status, signing REP5 or ER1 form with External Examiner.  
- Inform Registry of Exam Board nominations for the following year. |
| Mid October  | Markers / EBC | - Deadline for September module resit grades to be provided to TSO – Exam Board Chair to help monitor and chase. Two-week turnaround required. |
| Mid October  | TSO      | - Deadline for TSO to ensure all September resit grades are entered on SITS. |
| October      | EBC / Registry | - EBCs, via Chair’s Action, to confirm grades and ratify any awards for September module resit students (assuming it was not possible to mark resits in time for Final Exam Board). Follow up with Registry to communicate to students. |
| October      | EBC / Registry | - After final Exam Board meeting, EBC to follow up with Registry to communicate project resit recommendations and exam resit recommendations. |
| November     | External Examiner(s) | - External Examiner(s) to submit their report within one month of final Exam Board meeting |
| December     | EBC      | - Complete response to External Examiners report (if not yet done). |
| December     | EBC      | - Liaise with TPD/Module Organiser(s)/TSO as appropriate to ensure that exam question setting has commenced for the following year. |
| December     | EBC      | - Chair’s Action confirmation of grades and ratification of any awards for ‘revise and re-submit’ project resit students. |
11. Exam Board Meeting

11.1 Awards Schemes

11.1.1 The Face-to-Face MSc Taught Programme Award Scheme can be found in Chapter 2 of the LSHTM Academic Manual. Assessment structures and compensation rules for face-to-face programmes can be found in Chapter 8a of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

11.1.2 The Distance Learning Programme Award Scheme can be found in the Distance Learning Postgraduate Taught Programme Regulations in Chapter 8b of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

11.2 Evaluation of Student Work for Borderline

The following procedure applies for cases of:

- Consider Distinction, i.e. where the final GPA lies between 4.15 - 4.29;
- Consider Merit, i.e. where the final GPA lies between 3.70-3.85;
- and cases of borderline pass/fail in the Core modules/Exams element of the F2F Master’s as detailed in the F2F MSc Award Scheme.

11.2.1 Determination of the final classification for borderline cases should be made by Exam Boards based on the recommendation of a group of evaluators who have considered a portfolio of the candidate’s work in advance of the Board meeting.

- These evaluators should be the External Examiner, the Exam Board Chair, and where possible another member of the Board (not the PD).
- They should be given sufficient time to review this properly, e.g. having it sent to them by no later than a week prior to the Board meeting, or by scheduling in specific review time ahead of the Board meeting on the day of the Board.

11.2.2 The portfolio of borderline candidates’ work to be considered should include all module assessments, summer examination papers, the project report,
and any practical examination papers, as appropriate. If a portfolio is incomplete when sent to an External Examiner, it should be accompanied by an explanatory note that clarifies when the outstanding work will be available and how it should be considered.

11.2.3 The work included in the portfolio will have already been graded and moderated, therefore individual components may not be remarked nor the overall GPA adjusted. Rather, the purpose of the portfolio is for the evaluators to look at the candidate’s work ‘as a whole’, to help decide whether they should be awarded a distinction/merit or remain at a pass classification, or alternatively decide whether they should be allowed to pass the Core modules/Exams element or remain as a fail. Vivas cannot be used to determine borderline classifications.

11.2.4 As an additional aid, the outcome of applying algorithms to the student’s work will be provided. These algorithm results are advisory only and should be considered along with the student’s portfolio. The algorithms are as follows:

For Consider Distinction candidates, meeting the following minimum element GPAs would lead to the recommendation that a Distinction be awarded:

- Core modules/Exams: 3.50
- Electives/Term 2-3 modules: 4.00
- Project: 4.00

These GPAs were chosen to represent consistently high achievement across the programme. Where the decision by the Exam Board is not to award a Distinction, a Consider Distinction student would automatically be awarded a Merit rather than a pass.

For Consider Merit candidates, meeting the following minimum element GPAs would lead to the recommendation that a Merit be awarded:

- Core modules/Exams: 3.50
- Electives/Term 2-3 modules: 3.50
- Project: 3.50

Where the decision by the Exam Board is not to award a Merit, a Consider Merit student would automatically be awarded a Pass.
11.3 Decisions

Evaluators are expected to apply academic judgement in making decisions, using the general principles set out below.

Signs that might indicate **an upgrade is appropriate** include:

- where one or two specific pieces of work have let a candidate down, but the remainder is generally of a similar (high) standard;
- where elements addressing higher-level skills such as synthesis and independent critical thinking have scored higher grades;
- the distribution of grades; individual Exam Boards may wish to place their own emphasis on the importance of particular elements, e.g. the grade achieved in the project or summer exams or a specific compulsory module.

Signs that might indicate **an upgrade is not merited** include:

- where elements addressing few higher level skills have scored higher grades;
- where one or two particular pieces of work have scored highly and brought the candidate’s GPA into the ‘Consider’ range, but the remaining work is of a similar (pass/merit not merit/distinction) standard;
- where the student’s work throughout the year has been consistently just above pass/merit level.

**Other factors** that should be considered include:

- Performance in modules which have not contributed to the GPA – a lower grade in the module which does not count towards the GPA need not be a barrier to upgrading the classification. However, if this grade is almost at the same level as the four which have been counted in the GPA, consistency of performance may count towards an upgrade. For programmes where it is compulsory for certain modules to count towards the GPA, the module that does not count may actually be graded higher, which is likely to indicate that an upgrade is merited.
- Extenuating circumstances - If extenuation has been agreed in respect of any of the candidate’s results, this may be considered as
a factor in whether to upgrade the classification. Those reviewing the portfolio of work may not ask for visibility of case details, as this would necessitate breaching candidate anonymity.

11.4 Outcomes

(a) The final classification awarded and the basis for this decision should be recorded in the minutes of the final Exam Board meeting.

(b) Where a higher classification is awarded to a borderline case, a note will be placed on the student’s transcript to show that this decision was made by the Exam Board based on consideration of a portfolio of the student’s assessed work throughout the year, and (if applicable) based on consideration of extenuating circumstances.

(c) A student who fails to progress should be managed in accordance with the Termination of Studies regulations in Chapter 7 of the LSHTM Academic Manual.

11.5 Reporting

(a) **Confirmation and informal communication of results**

Provisional results from the summer written examinations should be available to students by the end of July. Final degree outcomes should be confirmed at the final Exam Board meeting and reported to Registry as soon as possible. They will be formally communicated to students based on this. It is recommended that result sheets be completed and signed by the Chair and the External Examiner(s) at the Final Exam Board meeting and submitted to Registry the same day.

Academic staff are not permitted to give individual printed feedback to students.

(b) **Confirmation and notification of final results**

Please see Chapter 8a (for face-to-face programmes) and Chapter 8b (for distance learning programmes) of the LSHTM Academic Manual for the regulations governing the confirmation of grades and notification of final results.
11.6 Student Debtors

LSHTM will release results, on demand, to students who remain in tuition fee debt at graduation but these will be provided on plain paper.

LSHTM's Tuition Fees Policy allows for the withholding of official transcripts, certificates and attendance at graduation if a student is in tuition fee debt.

12. Retention and Disclosure

12.1 Introduction

12.1.1 These guidelines provide advice to staff on retention and disposal of information and records in relation to teaching, learning and assessment for taught programmes. They address the requirements on LSHTM arising from the GDPR and the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act.

12.1.2 With some exemptions, Freedom of Information gives individuals the right of access to recorded information held by LSHTM. Further information can be found on the LSHTM Freedom of Information webpage.

12.1.3 Elements of Exam Board Minutes can be disclosed, for example where there is a minuted discussion of an individual candidate. Redacted minutes (e.g. where identification of individuals is removed) can also be disclosed under FOI.

12.2 Assessment Scripts and Marking Guides

12.2.1 Assessment scripts are any documents submitted for assessment including coursework, exams, project report. Assessment scripts are archived for two years after a student completes the programme and then destroyed. Electronic copies of MSc project reports are archived and, where possible, made available internally as reference documents by the Library for an agreed period of time in line with retention policy.
12.2.2 Other paperwork such as forms associated with module moderation should be retained for two years.

12.2.3 Under the GDPR, a student has the right to see markers’ comments made on an assessment script but not the actual script itself. If a student asks to see these comments, LSHTM will have the markers’ comments transcribed. If comments are made on a separate document, the student has the right to see that document which should be retained for two years.

12.2.4 In most cases at LSHTM, examination scripts are not written on directly and feedback is provided to students on separate sheets. Markers often make separate personal marking notes and these can be disclosed under GDPR as they are deemed part of the student’s assessment record. Personal marking notes need only be retained by markers until they have completed writing their feedback to students and completed reconciliation of grades with their co-marker. Markers should bear in mind that all comments made in connection with marking which are retained, may be disclosed to the student.

12.2.5 Marking guides and assessment criteria can be fully disclosed under FOI. These are already made available to students.