

Code of Practice on Assessment 2024/25

Leeds University Business School

Section 1 Purpose	4
1.1 Introduction.....	4
1.2 The University’s Approach to Assessment	5
Section 2 Module Assessment	6
2.1 About this Section	6
2.2 Approval of Assessment Methods	6
2.3 Preparation of Assessment.....	6
2.4 Formative Assessment	7
2.5 Summative Assessment	7
2.6 Registration for Assessments	8
2.7 Archiving of Assessment	9
Section 3 Coursework	10
3.1 About this Section	10
3.2 Preparation of Coursework	10
3.3 Submission of Coursework	10
3.4 Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct	12
3.5 Checking for Academic Misconduct.....	14
3.6 Completion of Coursework.....	15
Section 4 Module Marking	16
4.1 About this Section	16
4.2 Assessment Criteria	16
4.3 Anonymous Marking.....	16
4.4 Assessment of Written English	16
4.5 Double Marking/Check Marking.....	17
4.6 Requests for Re-marking	18
4.7 Normalisation	18
4.8 Marking Scales	18
4.9 Pass Mark and Award of Credit	19
4.10 Consideration of Module Marks	19
4.11 Publication of Module Marks	19
4.12 Changes to Module Marks	20
Section 5 Feedback to Students	21
5.1 Principles	21
5.2 Information about Feedback	21
5.3 Feedback	21
5.4 Feedback on Assessments Taken During a Formal Assessment Period	22
5.5 Engaging with Feedback.....	22

5.6	Timing of Feedback.....	22
Section 6	Programme Progression and Award.....	24
6.1	About this Section.....	24
6.2	Progression and Awards Boards and Related Committees.....	24
6.3	Undergraduate Progression.....	25
6.4	Classification Procedures.....	26
6.5	Special Circumstances Discretion.....	27
6.6	Publication of Degree Classifications.....	27
6.7	Diploma Supplement.....	27
6.8	Graduation.....	27
Section 7	Mitigating Circumstances.....	28
7.1	Absences Involving Assessed Work.....	28
7.2	Requesting consideration due to Mitigating Circumstances.....	28
Section 8	Resits.....	29
8.1	Number of Attempts.....	29
8.2	Timing of Resits.....	29
8.3	Format of Resits.....	29
8.4	Capped Resit Marks.....	29
8.5	Failed Resit Marks.....	30
8.6	Resubmission of Coursework.....	30
8.7	Resits in the Final Year.....	30
Section 9	Appeals and Complaints.....	31
9.1	Appeals.....	31
9.2	Complaints.....	31
Section 10	Annexes.....	32
10.1	Annex I. School UG Assessment Criteria.....	32
10.2	Annex II School TP Assessment Criteria.....	38
10.3	Annex: Staff with Management Responsibility for the Assessment Process.....	40
10.4	Annex: Internal Examiners and Assessment Assistants.....	42
10.5	Annex: External Examiners.....	42
10.6	Annex: Student Education Committees.....	43
10.7	Annex: Assessment Committees.....	43
10.8	Annex: Mitigating Circumstances Guidance.....	43
10.9	Annex: Academic Regulations.....	43

Section 1 Purpose

1.1 Introduction

This Code of Practice on Assessment (CoPA) describes the procedures for assessment and other related matters in Leeds University Business School. The aim is to explain the principles and processes governing assessment. The CoPA is based on a University template provided by the Assessment Team, supplemented by sections provided by the School. In this way, the CoPA identifies local practice within the context provided by the University's regulations and procedures.

1.1a Audience

The CoPA is aimed primarily at students but will also provide useful information for staff and External Examiners. Where this CoPA refers to **students** or to **you**, this means students registered on modules and programmes parented by Leeds University Business School. Where the CoPA refers to the School, this means Leeds University Business School, including its staff and formal committees. Where the CoPA refers to the **University**, this means the Senate on behalf of the University of Leeds and/or those offices and committees that deal with academic matters on its behalf.

1.1b Exceptions

Students on apprenticeship programmes are enrolled on some LUBS taught modules as part of their programme, and the information in this code of practice relates only to these taught modules. Non-LUBS elements such as the EPA (see section 2.5e) are not covered by this code of practice. Further exceptions are:

- Apprenticeship work is retained for six years to comply with ESFA, rather than the usual two stated in section 2.7
- Apprenticeship portfolios are not subject to the referencing guidelines detailed in 3.4b
- There is no ad personam provision for apprenticeship candidates (section 6.1c does not apply).

Students on the PhD programme at Leeds University Business School are enrolled on taught modules as part of this programme and the information in this code of practice relates only to these taught modules. Although the majority of this code is relevant for students taking taught modules on the PhD, there are some exceptions in certain areas.

- Section 6: Progression and Award (with the exception of Annex V Section 11.5 Mitigating Circumstances Guidance School Special Cases Committee) does not apply to the taught modules on the PhD.
- Student Conduct should be read in conjunction with the Research Student Handbook and student responsibilities in the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures. For PhD students, the 'Unsatisfactory Students Procedure' mentioned in this code is replaced with the Unsatisfactory Academic Progress Procedure for Postgraduate Research Students.

1.1c Version and Approval

This Leeds University Business School CoPA is scheduled to be approved by the Leeds University Business Faculty Taught Student Education Committee on the recommendation of the Faculty Assessment and Progression Group w/c 23rd September 2024, and applies to assessment in the 2024/25 session.

1.1d Queries

Should you have any queries about this Code of Practice, please contact Dan Dennett, Assessment Manager, Leeds University Business School.

1.2 The University's Approach to Assessment

The University's approach to assessment aims to:

- qualify student achievement of programme and module learning outcomes through a variety of appropriate forms of assessment;
- provide clear information on assessment to students, staff and external examiners;
- give students appropriate guidance and support in meeting learning outcomes and in preparing for, and completing, assessment;
- provide prompt and effective formative and summative feedback, through which students may learn how successfully they prepared for assessment and how they might improve; and
- maintain effective quality management and enhance procedures designed to ensure accuracy, fairness and consistent standards of assessment.

Section 2 Module Assessment

2.1 About this Section

In this section, you will find information on:

- How modules are assessed;
- The forms of assessment used by the University; and
- Assessment registration and timetables.

2.2 Approval of Assessment Methods

Modules are assessed using methods appropriate for the level of study, the subject material, the method of delivery and the learning outcomes. There is a [formal process](#) through which the form of assessment for each module is agreed and approved in advance.

You can check the approved forms of assessment for each module in the [module catalogue](#).

Schools must adhere to forms of assessment published in the catalogue unless the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee grants them express permission to make changes to accommodate exceptional circumstances. If changes have to be made after the catalogue has been published, you will be informed of this, and the reasons for doing so, in writing.

If you need to resit a module, the forms of assessment will usually be the same as for the first attempt. If the resit assessment is different from the original assessment, this will be described in the catalogue.

2.3 Preparation of Assessment

The assessments set each year are agreed through a process of approval. For assessments that are scheduled by the University's Assessment and Progress Team there is a University process for approving assessments.

In order to ensure standards are maintained, all draft assessment papers, model answers and assessment criteria are made available to the external examiner(s) for scrutiny.

Module Leaders will have the responsibility for setting the specific examination paper(s) or other forms of module assessment, including resit assessments, as outlined in the module catalogue. The draft examination papers, coursework briefs, or other assessment outlines (including outline answers or relevant marking scheme) will then be subject to a process of internal scrutiny.

For Examinations, Leeds University Business School operate Departmental Examination Scrutiny Panels (DESPs). These are internal meetings which take place in October (for Semester 1 assessments) and March (for semester 2 assessments) The DESP meeting is chaired by the Departmental Director of Student Education (DDSE), or their nominee, and attended by departmental academic colleagues. Examination papers are presented to the DESP after they have been internally moderated. Academic colleagues are required to present both the first sit and the resit paper for the DESP approval.

DESPs consider the following:

- The appropriateness of level and the general suitability of the exam paper;
- Any potential overlap and duplication within the paper or duplication between the paper and the resit paper;
- The phrasing of questions to ensure that they are clear and understandable, and the overall clarity and accuracy of presentation of the assessment;
- To ensure that there is no information missing which may prevent the student from giving a full answer;

- Any acronyms or abbreviations that are used in the exam paper are fully explained where necessary;
- The quality, clarity and detail of the model answers for each question (MCQ papers have solutions which are correct for every question);
- The time allowance is proportionate to task set and matches the module leader's expectations;
- The instructions to students and the rubric is clear, concise and unambiguous.

The module leader is responsible for ensuring that draft examination papers (including resit papers), model answers and marking guidelines are prepared in good time and in accordance with the requirements set out above. This should include providing an assurance that any examination paper does not contain a significant proportion (above 20%) of questions or other material that have been used in the same form over the previous four years.

Once assessments are internally approved, they are then sent to an External Examiner for comment and approval, along with outline answers and/or marking scheme. The External Examiner will also have access to the module information on Minerva.

2.4 Formative Assessment

Formative assessment is intended to monitor and enhance your learning and does not contribute to your overall module mark.

Your school will provide you with opportunities for formative assessment and will provide you with feedback that allows you to reflect on and improve your performance.

2.5 Summative Assessment

Summative assessment is intended to consolidate and evaluate your learning and contributes to the final module mark. There are a number of different categories of summative assessment in use within the School.

2.5a University Examinations

A University Examination is a formal examination which is timetabled and invigilated by the Assessment and Progress Team. These are held during one of the University's formal assessment periods at the end of each semester, with an additional resit in August as appropriate. The times, dates and locations are published online by the Assessment and Progress Team. You can also access a personal exam timetable via Minerva. Occasionally, the School may organise formal examinations outside of the University's formal assessment periods. These are called **Ad Hoc Examinations**. This will only be done where there is a reason the examination cannot be held during the formal assessment period. They are run in the same way as other University Examinations. Details are available on the [Students Key Dates and Locations website page](#).

2.5b Online Time Limited Assessment

An **Online Time Limited Assessment** with a duration of 48 hours or less is a formal University assessment which is timetabled by the Assessment and Progress Team. These are held during one of the University's formal assessment periods at the end of each semester with an additional resit in August as appropriate. The times, dates and locations are published online by the Assessment and Progress Team. You can also access this through your personal exam timetable via Minerva. Details are available on the [Students Key Dates and Locations website page](#).

More support with Online Time Limited Assessments can be found on the [Library Skills website page](#).

2.5c Assessed Coursework

Assessed Coursework is a piece of work or activity completed outside of formal timetabled sessions. This may include essays, projects, reports and online assessment. For more details on the presentation of assessed coursework, deadlines, penalties for late submission and information on plagiarism, see [Section 3 Coursework](#).

2.5d Presentations

Presentations are an important part of the learning process and sometimes these will be assessed. Assessed presentations can take the form of either an individual or group presentation to an audience which may include peers.

2.5e Apprenticeships: End Point Assessment

In addition to module assessment and programme classification, all apprenticeship programmes are subject to a formal End Point Assessment (EPA) which confirms whether and at what grade you have met the requirements of the Apprenticeship Standard. The EPA is carried out by either an independent organisation from the Apprenticeship Providers and Assessment Register (APAR) approved by the Education and Skills Funding Agency or in the case of an integrated EPA, through the University who will also be registered on the APAR. The details of the EPA are set out in the Apprenticeship Assessment Plan developed for each Apprenticeship Standard. Your employer, in consultation with the University, will decide when you are ready to sit the EPA. The EPA will be organised by the University. The end point assessment will provide the outcome of the assessment and the apprenticeship certificate. Your School will inform you of the nature of the EPA.

2.5f Other Forms of Assessment

The University aims to continually develop and improve the way in which students are assessed. With this aim, other forms of assessment may be introduced from time to time. Where these contribute to the final module mark, they will be listed in the module catalogue and full information will be provided.

2.6 Registration for Assessments

You will automatically be registered for the first opportunity for each assessment. All assessments must be taken on the first occasion that they are offered in the year in which the module is studied unless the School gives you specific permission to delay. Marks for assessments which are not taken will be recorded as absent.

If you have been permitted to resit a module as a further first attempt, you must confirm with your school if you wish to take it. Contact your parent school for further information.

For resits as a second attempt you will need to apply online before you are registered for the relevant resit assessments.

For UG students, all resits must be taken at the next available opportunity. Non-registration for a resit will normally mean that attempt is forfeited. Marks for examinations which are not taken will be recorded as absent.

Taught Postgraduate Students

Taught Postgraduate students in Leeds University Business School do not apply for resits online, but must contact the Central Examinations Team directly to make arrangements. The Business School will contact students with further information about this procedure at the appropriate time.

2.6a Consecutive or Clashing Assessment

It is common to have assessment deadlines on the same or consecutive days and this is not grounds for applying for mitigating circumstances. If you have concerns about your assessment deadlines, please contact your School Student Curriculum and Operations (SCO) Team.

Online Time Limited Assessments, with a duration of 48 hours or less, that are scheduled to take place within the set University formal assessment periods, will often run consecutively or may overlap. However, if you have two of these assessments starting at the same time on the same day, you should immediately contact the [Assessment and Progress Team by email](#) so that alternative arrangements can be made where possible.

2.7 Archiving of Assessment

Assessed work is archived for at least one year after each student has left the programme. During this time period, assessed work may be made available for scrutiny during student education reviews or for scrutiny by regulatory bodies on request.

Section 3 Coursework

3.1 About this Section

In this section, you will find information on:

- Submission and preparation of coursework;
- Penalties that may be applied to coursework that is submitted late or incorrectly; and
- Academic integrity and academic misconduct.

The information in this section should be used in conjunction with the latest student guidance from the university. This guide is updated annually, but new developments in online technologies may require more frequent updates to be issued, in order to stay current.

3.2 Preparation of Coursework

3.2a Referencing

Referencing refers to acknowledging the sources used in producing a piece of work. Referencing correctly allows you to:

- Demonstrate how widely you have researched the topic;
- Show the basis of your arguments and conclusions;
- Acknowledge the work of others, and
- Avoid plagiarism.

3.2b Referencing Style

For modules in Leeds University Business School students should use the official University of Leeds version of the Harvard referencing style.

Guidance on how to source citations within the text and how to reference different types of material is available on the [referencing pages of the Library website](#). Marking of all submitted coursework will be informed by this guidance and will correspond to the style outlined on the Library's referencing website pages.

3.2c Group Work

If you are working in a group but are expected to submit an individual piece of work, then the coursework you submit must be your own work, even if the group shares the data or ideas obtained as part of a team. Copying or paraphrasing another student's work constitutes plagiarism.

Supporting information for Business school students can be found here:

[Leeds University Business School - Forms Guidance & Coversheets](#)

3.3 Submission of Coursework

3.3a Coursework Deadlines

Deadline times are set to ensure that you can submit your work well within office hours. Your teaching School will avoid, wherever possible, setting deadlines on:

- Fridays, the last day of term and the first day of the formal assessment period.

When you submit your work electronically, the time of submission is automatically logged.

It is your responsibility to ensure that work arrives by the deadline.

The deadline for submitting work is normally by 12 Noon UK time on the specified day.

3.3b Declarations of Academic Integrity

You must complete a [Declaration of Academic Integrity](#) for all assessment submissions. The statement reminds you of the University's definition of academic integrity and the consequences of academic misconduct.

3.3c Submission of Coursework

Students should check the work that they submit carefully and are responsible for ensuring the correct work is submitted. The School will only accept the coursework, which is submitted by the deadline, regardless of whether a student accidentally submits the wrong coursework or an incomplete draft.

Students should ensure that their uploaded assignments have the standard front cover sheet, available from the Leeds University Business School Taught Student Guide webpages:

<https://students.business.leeds.ac.uk/forms-guidance-and-coversheets/>

Detailed advice about how to submit can also be found on the Leeds University Business School online Taught Student Guide webpages:

<https://students.business.leeds.ac.uk/assessment/submitting-assignments/>

It is the student's responsibility to ensure that they leave sufficient time to complete the online submission process, as upload times can vary. Accessing the submission link before the deadline does **not** constitute completion of submission. Students **must** click the '**CONFIRM**' button **before 12 noon** for the assignment to be classed as submitted on time. If the deadline is not met students can still submit, up to 14 days after the deadline, but this submission will be subject to lateness penalties (5 marks per day). After 14 days of lateness, the work can no longer be submitted and will be marked as absent.

Students must click the download icon to download a digital receipt. Students are advised to save the receipt in a safe place as this is the only accepted proof of submission.

From within the document viewer, click the "Download" icon to download your digital receipt.

Save your receipt in a safe place as this will be the only accepted proof of submission.

It is the student's responsibility to ensure the correct file is uploaded to Minerva, and that it has been uploaded successfully.

3.3d Penalties for Exceeding Word Count

All coursework assignments that contribute to the assessment of a module are subject to a word limit, as specified in the online module handbook in the relevant module area of Minerva.

The word limit is an extremely important aspect of good academic practice, and must be adhered to.

Unless stated specifically otherwise in the relevant module handbook, the word limit includes everything that is included in the main body of the assignment including summaries, subtitles, tables, and supportive material (whether this is in the form of footnotes or in-text references). It does not include the main title, the reference list and/or bibliography, and any appendices.

It is not acceptable to present matters of substance, which should be included in the main body of the text, in the appendices as this is deemed appendix abuse. In addition, it is also not acceptable to attempt to hide

words in graphs and diagrams; only text which is strictly necessary should be included in graphs and diagrams.

You are required to adhere to the word limit specified and state an accurate word count on the cover page of your assignment brief. Your declared word count must be accurate and should not mislead.

Making a fraudulent statement concerning your submitted work could be considered as academic malpractice and investigated as such.

If the amount of work submitted is higher than that specified by the word limit or that declared on your word count, this will be reflected in the mark awarded and noted through individual feedback given to you.

3.3e Penalties for Late Submission of Coursework

If you submit your work past the deadline, penalties will be applied.

The penalty is deducted from the mark for the individual piece of work that has been submitted late. For every period of 24 hours or part thereof that your assessment is overdue, you will lose 5% of the total marks available for that assessment component. This includes weekends, Bank Holidays and University closed days. The deduction is applied before any conflation with other marks (i.e. with other assessment components for the module) to give the overall result of the module. If your assessed work is over 14 days late, the submission will be deemed to have failed for non-submission (a day being a single 24-hour period).

Online Time Limited Assessments with a duration of 48 hours or less must be submitted within the time period stated. Late submissions will not be accepted in any circumstances.

If you have not left sufficient time to submit, you may have to submit your work late (up to 14 days) and you will incur a late penalty.

If you have not received a receipt for your coursework submission, this may be because your submission has not successfully uploaded. If this is not rectified before the deadline time, you will incur a late penalty. Please see section 3.3c for further information about timely submission and obtaining a receipt.

If you fail to ensure that you have uploaded the correct file to Minerva, it will be deemed that you have not submitted and if this situation is not corrected before the deadline, you will incur a late penalty.

3.3f Proofreading

The University [policy on proofreading](#) provides definitions of proofreading in the University of Leeds context, and guidance to help avoid contravening the policy, and possible consequences of doing so.

You are required by the University to proofread your own work. Guidance on proofreading is available from the [University Library website](#).

3.4 Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct

Academic integrity is a commitment to good study practices and shared values, which ensures that your work is a true expression of your own understanding and ideas, giving credit to others where their work contributes to yours. This University definition of academic integrity recognises that each individual has a responsibility to contribute honestly within our academic community. Breaching academic integrity standards can lead to serious penalties. Guidance on Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct can be found on the [For Students website pages](#) and definitions of specific integrity breaches can be found in the Academic Misconduct Procedure on the [Student Cases website page](#).

3.4a Academic Integrity Tutorial and Test

There is a compulsory online academic integrity tutorial and test for all students. The tutorial comprises a series of short units and an associated end of tutorial test explaining good study habits (e.g. good note

taking and referencing) as well as practices that undermine the integrity of academic work (e.g. plagiarism, collusion and third-party authorship). If you are new to study at the University, you must complete all the units and correctly answer all questions in the associated test. You should complete this within your first few weeks of teaching, following the timetable specified by your School, and before submitting any formative or summative assessed work. Completion will be monitored by your School. Further details are available on the [Minerva Support website page](#).

3.4b Academic Integrity Education

All taught programmes provide specific advice regarding academic integrity and good practice in writing and, where appropriate, the production of other forms of academic work. You will also be directed to information that explains how and why such forms of behaviour are not consistent with academic integrity, and the consequences of academic misconduct, such as plagiarism, collusion, reliance on others to do your work for you and unauthorised use of artificial intelligence. The compulsory online academic integrity tutorial will provide advice and guidance on these topics. The Library also provides detailed guidance and training materials related to academic integrity in the [Academic Skills section of the Library website](#).

Leeds University Business School has an Academic Misconduct Officer who is a nominated member of academic staff responsible for ensuring consistency within the Faculty in relation to the implementation of plagiarism procedures and practice and the investigation of suspected cases of plagiarism.

The role of the Business School's Academic Misconduct Officer is to ensure equity of treatment of all students. The role holder is also responsible for plagiarism education, including raising staff and student awareness of plagiarism issues.

Leeds University Business School takes plagiarism education very seriously. Good academic practice advice is embedded into induction sessions for all students. Students are directed towards the Academic Integrity Tutorial and Test (see 3.4a above) and are directed to the LUBS Referencing & Presentation Guidance information at the start of their programme. All students have access to study skills sessions directly via skills@library (<https://library.leeds.ac.uk/skills>).

Guidance on academic referencing is integrated into selected modules on every taught programme.

Further information about referencing can be found in the LUBS Referencing and Presentation Guidance available on the LUBS Taught Student Guide web pages <https://students.business.leeds.ac.uk>.

3.4c Re-using Your Own Work

Submitting or re-submitting the same work or part of the same work, in exactly the same form, to satisfy the requirements of more than one assessment is considered misconduct, even if the work is for a different module or qualification. This is because it is unfair to reward the same work twice. This includes work that you may have completed at school, college, or at another University before coming to Leeds. There may, however, be exceptions to this rule where an initial submission is intended to help you to develop a second, usually larger, piece of work. You will receive specific instructions where this is the case. If there are other instances where you feel that a further exception is justified, you must have specific written permission from the University staff concerned.

3.4d Advice from Staff

It is your responsibility to work with academic integrity. Where the School agrees that you can submit a draft for initial advice and feedback, if evidence of academic misconduct is found in the draft, staff will advise you on academic integrity, but it is not their responsibility to identify and highlight academic misconduct in draft work.

Whether or not you have submitted a draft, and whether or not the School has identified academic misconduct in the draft, you remain responsible for the submissions you make.

3.4e Draft or Erroneous Submissions

You are responsible for assessment submissions. If, after making a submission, you claim that you mistakenly submitted a draft or the wrong version, your original version will be treated as the submission.

3.4f Cheating

Cheating in University examinations is taken very seriously by the University. If you are found to have breached the [University's rules governing the conduct of examinations](#), you are likely to be permanently excluded from the University with no award.

3.4g Artificial Intelligence in Assessments

Content generated by artificial intelligence assistance tools and presented as your own work does not comply with the University's definition of academic integrity and would be considered an academic misconduct offence. You will be clearly advised when it may be appropriate to make use of artificial intelligence assistance tools and you will need to clearly acknowledge when you have made use of artificial intelligence tools in developing your work. The statement of principles of academic integrity and good study practices is available on the [For Students website pages](#).

3.4h Penalties for Academic Misconduct

The University takes all forms of academic misconduct very seriously. You may be excluded from the University without award if you present coursework in breach of the [University's rules](#) on academic integrity.

3.5 Checking for Academic Misconduct

The School uses a number of ways to check for academic misconduct, including manual checks from the staff marking your work as well as electronic tools.

3.5a Explanation of Turnitin

The University uses an internet-based text-matching service called Turnitin to provide evidence of originality of electronic coursework submissions. The tool compares text submitted with a wide range of electronic material, including journals, websites and student work from current and previous years, from Leeds and other UK universities. The software highlights if you have submitted the same or similar text as another student, or published material, or if you have submitted the same or similar text for more than one assessment.

3.5b Use of Turnitin

Your School will provide you with an introduction to Turnitin during your first semester of study to support your understanding of academic integrity.

In your first year as a Level 1 Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate you may be allowed one opportunity to see a part of a Turnitin originality report, based on an example assignment. You may also be allowed one opportunity to see an originality report for a draft assignment you have written, as long as this is under academic supervision. At level 2 and above, you will not generally be provided with an originality report.

3.5c Turnitin and Academic Misconduct

Whether or not the School has used Turnitin routinely for a particular assessment, if the person marking your work is suspicious of academic misconduct, that piece of work will be submitted to Turnitin.

3.5d Originality Reports

The originality reports created by Turnitin are considered for possible academic misconduct as part of a review of a submission. However, it is your School, and not the software tool, which will decide whether or not academic misconduct has taken place; Turnitin is just one element of the evidence used to make this decision.

Your School will check all originality reports for work submitted electronically through Turnitin for plagiarism, regardless of the percentage match indicated by the similarity index.

Leeds University Business School checks all assessed coursework for plagiarism using the Turnitin software. The Module Leader is generally responsible for undertaking this check. Where this process identifies sufficient concerns about the originality of content within a piece of work, an investigation will be initiated to explore the academic integrity of the work. The mark and feedback will be withheld until the investigation is complete. In cases where the outcome of that investigation is suspicion of plagiarism or academic malpractice, the student will be required to attend a meeting with the Plagiarism Panel.

3.6 Completion of Coursework

You are expected to submit all coursework associated with modules, including formative assessment. If you persistently neglect your studies or repeatedly fail to submit coursework within a reasonable time, the School may begin disciplinary proceedings which could result in you being excluded from assessments and/or required to withdraw from the University. The School will follow the [University's formal procedures](#) for this.

Section 4 Module Marking

4.1 About this Section

In this section, you will find information on:

- Marking policy and practices;
- Marking scales; and
- Consideration, approval and publication of module marks.

These procedures apply to Leeds University Business School. If you are also studying modules in other schools, you should consult the [teaching school's CoPA](#) for information on their process for module marking.

4.2 Assessment Criteria

Each school has agreed assessment criteria which describe in detail how your performance for a piece of work will be rewarded, in respect of the learning outcomes. These statements specify the standards that must be met and what evidence is expected to show that you have achieved the learning outcomes.

Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate assessment criteria can be found in Annex I of this document.

The process of determining final module grades is the responsibility of the school teaching each module.

4.3 Anonymous Marking

4.3a Anonymous Marking

In accordance with the University's expectations, assessment is marked anonymously. However, the School may make exceptions to this rule, including:

- Where the assessment takes the form of a practical demonstration performed in the presence of examiners (such as orals, scientific practicals, lab books, clinical examinations, or performances);
- Where the assessment takes place over a period of time with support from a designated supervisor or tutor (such as projects, dissertations and portfolios); and
- Where the assessment takes place during a module for formative purposes and anonymity might prevent speedy and effective feedback.

It is students' responsibility to follow those instructions regarding the submission of assessment that enable anonymous marking, such as the correct use of student identification numbers (SID) in electronic file names. Failure to do so may remove the ability to mark anonymously.

4.3b Exceptions to Anonymous Marking

Individual and group presentations, video projects and dissertation/projects (including in some cases research proposals or reflective logs) are all exceptions to anonymous marking.

4.4 Assessment of Written English

Assessment criteria will clearly specify the approach to assessing technical accuracy in written expression and, where appropriate, the approach will be referenced in assessment rubrics.

Where students are entitled to particular consideration in terms of their written expression, for example if a specific learning difficulty is involved, the assignment will be flagged, so that the marker will be aware.

4.5 Double Marking/Check Marking

4.5a Definitions

Double marking means that in addition to the first marker, another member of staff independently marks your work. Check marking means that in addition to the first marker, another member of staff samples or audits the marking across the module to review overall marking standards and consistency between individual markers.

In cases where a student attempts more than the required number of questions, and does not clearly indicate on the script by crossing out those that should not be marked, the markers shall mark only the required number of answers.

The markers shall mark the answers in the order that they are completed in the script booklet, or as indicated by the student on the front of the booklet as the order in which they were answered, or if completed in separate script booklets, in numerical order.

4.5b Processes for Double Marking/Check Marking

On completion of first marking, marks are checked by another marker who will check all fails, a representative sample* of firsts, and a representative sample* of the middle range of marks, including all borderline cases. Any changes to marks should be made by the first marker/module leader in agreement with the person checking the marks. Once agreed both the first marker/ module leader and person checking the marks need to sign off the marks before they are sent to the External Examiner. In Leeds University Business School, with the exception of modules covered in 4.5c, it is normal practice to check mark.

*(Suggested representative sample 20%)

4.5c Projects and Dissertations

Projects and Dissertations must be double marked. The rationale for this is based on typically larger credit value, the student-led or independent nature of the topic, and one-to-one supervision conventions (typically supervisors support and mark some students on the module and double marking ensures that one or more of the markers is independent).

Dissertations are generally first-marked by the supervisor and then second-marked by another appropriate academic member of staff. The first and second markers then agree the mark to be awarded, and return feedback for students to the Assessment team within the Student Curriculum and Operations. The marks and samples are then sent to an external examiner to be signed off.

4.5d Resolution of Discrepancies between Markers

Discrepancies between internal markers are resolved within the relevant Department before the marks are returned to the Assessment team within the Student Curriculum and Operations.

4.5e The External Examiner

The role of the External Examiner is to ensure comparability of the University's standards with those in peer institutions and national benchmarks. It is not to contribute to the assessment of individual students. If an External Examiner cannot endorse the marks given to assessed work within a sample, they may require:

- Additional marking of all the student work within the group;
- Additional marking of an element of the assessed work of all students within the group; or
- Adjustment of the marks for all students within the group.

In this way, the External Examiner has oversight of the whole cohort of marks, rather than those of individual students. However, in exceptional circumstances, an External Examiner may be permitted to determine an individual mark where they have been specifically invited to adjudicate between markers.

4.6 Requests for Re-marking

Your School will follow the defined procedure for double marking/check marking as set out above. Assessed work will not be re-marked at your request. This will only be done if the School is instructed to do so by the University following a [formal appeal](#).

4.7 Normalisation

Normalisation refers to a process of adjusting mark profiles for each module so that the overall average falls within an expected range. Normalisation is used only exceptionally and if your school does normalise marks for a module, particular attention will be paid to setting and marking of assessment in that module the next time it is offered.

4.8 Marking Scales

The University uses a number of different scales to express results at different stages of the assessment and classification process. Further information about marking scales is available on the [For Students website page](#).

4.8a Marking Scales

For the purposes of publishing module marks, all assessments are marked on a 0 – 100 scale (or a categorical marking scale aligned to a 0 – 100 scale) and all module marks are returned on a 0 – 100 scale.

4.8b Pass/Fail Modules

For a limited number of modules, you will not receive a numerical mark but instead a “pass” or “fail” grade. Within the Leeds University Business School, the following modules are assessed on a pass/fail basis:

- LUBS8003 Year in Research
- LUBS5999M Postgraduate Study Abroad

The following modules are assessed on a distinction/merit/pass/fail basis:

- LUBS7001 Year in Enterprise
- LUBS8001 Training in the Workplace

The following modules are assessed on a merit/pass/fail basis:

- LUBS9001 Study Year Abroad

4.8c Module Marks

Although local marking scales for individual pieces of work may differ, a single marking scale is used when expressing module marks. All module marks are expressed on the University’s 0-100 scale.

For more information, see the [Academic Regulations](#). For more information on how module marks contribute to classification decisions, see [Section 2 Module Assessment](#).

4.9 Pass Mark and Award of Credit

If you pass a module, you will gain the entire credit for that module. However, if you do not pass a module, you receive no credit for that module (the University does not award partial credit). The pass mark for modules at FHEQ level 4, 5 and 6 (levels 0, 1, 2 and 3) is 40. The pass mark for postgraduate modules at FHEQ level 7 (level 5M is 50).

	Undergraduate Students	Taught Postgraduate Students
Undergraduate Modules (Codes numbered 0, 1, 2 or 3)	Pass mark is 40	Pass mark is 40
Taught Postgraduate Modules (Codes numbered 5....M)	Pass mark is 50	Pass mark is 50

4.10 Consideration of Module Marks

4.10a School Assessment Board

The School Assessment Board agrees the modules marks/grades for all students. The School adopts the [standard Terms of Reference and Membership for School Assessment Boards](#).

4.10b Semester 1 and Semester 2

The School Assessment Board normally meets after Semester 1 to agree recommended marks and grades for completed modules. These are published via Minerva. The marks/grades are provisional at this stage.

The School Assessment Board meets again after completion of Semester 2 to agree recommended marks/grades for completed modules. The marks/grades for all undergraduate Semester 1 and 2 modules (those at FHEQ level 4, 5 and 6) will be approved by the Progression & Awards Board (of which the External Examiner is a member). The marks for taught postgraduate modules (those at FHEQ level 7) may be provisional if they have not yet been endorsed by the External Examiner(s).

4.10c Taught Postgraduate Modules

For all Taught Postgraduate modules the Progression and Award board meets in November to agree externally endorsed marks and award classifications.

For all taught modules undertaken by PhD students, the School Assessment Board meets in November to agree externally endorsed marks.

4.10d Consideration of Resit Results for Undergraduate Modules

The School Assessment Board normally meets again in September to agree marks/grades for August resits.

4.10e Consideration of Resit Results for Taught Postgraduate Modules

Taught Postgraduate resit results are considered at the annual November School Assessment Board and the June Undergraduate Assessment Board.

4.11 Publication of Module Marks

If your school publishes provisional marks, you should be aware that these have not been approved by the School Progression & Awards Board (see [4.10a](#) above). The final published marks may be higher or lower than the provisional marks.

Module marks are published to students by the School on specific dates published each year on Minerva and communicated to students via email. From those dates, students can also view their feedback, where this is available.

Module marks may be published via Minerva, the Portal, or by email.

The University will publish final confirmed marks and classifications on Minerva in early July 2025 for undergraduate students and on 20 November 2025 for taught postgraduate students. The final date for the publication of marks and classifications for undergraduate students will be published on [the University website](#).

4.12 Changes to Module Marks

Once the University has published the formal decisions of the School Progression & Awards Board, module marks will not be changed. The only exception is if the School is instructed to make amendments by the University following a formal appeal or consideration of an exceptional case.

Section 5 Feedback to Students

In this section, you will find information about the sort of feedback you can expect, how it is provided and how you are expected to engage with it.

5.1 Principles

The University has a number of principles relating to academic feedback with the aim that you are provided with:

- Feedback that is personal to you and your work;
- Feedback that is constructive and helps you understand how it relates to assessment criteria; and
- Feedback that is specific and designed to help you see what you have done well and how you can improve.

Sometimes, your individual feedback will be supplemented with generic feedback that can be provided more quickly. Generic feedback is given to all students about general performance in a particular assessment.

5.2 Information about Feedback

When assessment is set, you will be told when and how you will receive your feedback. The purpose of providing you with feedback will also be explained and you will be informed of who to contact should you want to discuss the feedback you receive.

In Leeds University Business School, feedback will be in a form appropriate to the type of assessment, and will include information on common themes related to the performance of an assessment group as whole and linking the module to learning outcomes. The School will provide feedback in a retainable form appropriate to the assignment. Where written, it will be clear and legible. For non-exam assignments, annotated comments and/or supplementary comments that refer to the submission will be provided, where appropriate.

5.3 Feedback

In Leeds University Business School, our processes will provide you with individual feedback that is fit for purpose, in an agreed timeframe. This will help you to set yourself academic targets; and support for this can be provided by the School if you need it.

Some disabled students such as those with specific learning difficulties (SpLDs) will be eligible to attach an electronic cover sheet to their work. Feedback on the work will therefore be tailored sensitively.

Feedback mechanisms for individual modules are described within the module information section in the relevant module area of Minerva. For assessed coursework, written feedback is provided on an individualised basis, which may take the form of written comments, completion of mark sheet with tick boxes, or annotations on the submitted work. For presentations, documented feedback will be provided and may take the form of written comments or oral recorded feedback.

For examinations, generic feedback is provided. Generic feedback is feedback given to the whole cohort about performance in a particular assessment. Whilst there are opportunities for individual feedback by request, this is usually not required as the generic feedback provided addresses most queries students may have about their performance in the assessment.

Individual feedback is also given through the statistics provided with the return of marks to students.

There will be occasions when (due to the nature or timing of the assessment) it will not be possible to provide individualised feedback within the normal timescale. When this occurs, we will help students to continue thinking about their work and to stay in the 'learning loop' through group feedback, either face to face, or via audio/video.

5.4 Feedback on Assessments Taken During a Formal Assessment Period

Your feedback on any assessment type (i.e. examination, Online Time Limited Assessment (OTLA)) taken during a formal assessment period can be different from other assessment feedback. For logistical reasons, you may not receive detailed individual feedback within the normal timescale.

Where an examination has taken place, your examination script belongs to the University and will be archived. Scripts have to be retained for use by External Examiners, internal review processes, and scrutiny by regulatory bodies if requested. You are encouraged to discuss your marked submissions as part of your feedback opportunities.

In Leeds University Business School, your examination feedback will be provided in the following way(s):

For every examination, including multiple choice examinations, generic feedback will be given to students by the module leader via Minerva.

Other feedback on examinations takes different forms, recognising that the nature of examinations varies as does the number of students on the module. Further to the expected generic statement of feedback, those forms may include (but are not limited to) feedback sessions, individual feedback sheets and module statistics. In case of queries after feedback has been provided, there are opportunities for students to discuss their examination performance on a one-to-one (for example, during academic support hours) or small group basis. The minimum requirement is that students have the opportunity to receive at least one form of feedback which helps improve their future performance, and feedback arrangements for each module are clearly outlined in the online module handbook in the relevant module area of Minerva. To request feedback on an examination script you should contact the Module Leader directly.

5.5 Engaging with Feedback

Engaging with the feedback you receive is an important part of your learning experience. You are expected to be active in obtaining, reflecting on and acting on the feedback given to you. As a student, you will find that feedback is provided in many different ways. You are expected to make use of the range of different feedback opportunities available to you.

You should take up the opportunities for formative assessment and you should ask for support if you need it.

The School aims to offer timely opportunities for meetings with Module Leaders, Personal Tutors, or another relevant academic member of staff to discuss feedback in greater detail. Students should contact the relevant academic staff member directly, or refer to the module information area of Minerva, for individual academic support hours.

5.6 Timing of Feedback

Usually, you will receive your feedback before your next assessment for the module is due, if it is a module with more than one assessment component. When you submit your piece of work, you will be told when to expect feedback on it which will normally be within 15 working days. Where modules have very big classes, we may need longer to mark. If this is the case you will be informed of the expected return timeline when you hand in the work.

Occasionally, an exception to the feedback timeline guidance might need to be made. The most common reasons for this are late changes outside of the School's control, such as staff illness. If this happens, you will be told why the date has been changed and the school will provide you with a new date for when you can expect your feedback.

At the end of Semester 2, a significant amount of administrative work is undertaken which involves confirming, checking and processing marks to ensure Progression and Awards Boards can take place. If you submit assessment for any undergraduate modules at this time, the School will aim to provide your feedback in the normal timeframe, but your final results cannot be released until the University's official publication date (see [Section 4.11 Publication of Module Marks](#)).

Section 6 Programme Progression and Award

6.1 About this Section

The process of determining awards is the responsibility of the parent school and is separate from the process of agreeing module marks (although in some cases, the two processes take place consecutively).

6.1a Definitions

Progression refers to a structured process undertaken by the School that determines whether you have met the requirements to continue to the next stage of your programme. This is usually only relevant for undergraduate students and takes place at the end of each year of study.

Classification refers to identifying the type of qualification and classification of award that you will receive on completion of the programme.

6.1b University Progression and Award Regulations

The criteria for progression/award are determined by the University's regulations set out in the [Academic Regulations](#), as well as by individual programme rules set out in the programme specification. The [programme specification](#) identifies the modules within any given programme of study which must be passed in order to allow progression/award. The Progression and Awards Board is required to implement decisions in accordance with the [Academic Regulations](#) and the programme specification. The School does not have discretion to vary the rules for individual students at the Progression and Awards Board.

6.1c Ad Hoc and Ad Personam Programmes

If there are exceptional circumstances, the School may consider varying the programme rules for a cohort of students (an **ad hoc** programme) or for an individual student (an **ad personam** programme). For example, the required combination of modules could be amended, or particular programme rules waived. This decision is taken in advance and is based on the circumstances affecting the group or individual. The decision is **not** taken by the Progression and Awards Board.

Any ad hoc or ad personam programme must be approved in advance by the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee or by the Pro Dean for Student Education acting on the Committee's behalf. Once the ad hoc or ad personam programme is approved, this new programme is the one which will be applied by the Progression and Awards Board in considering your results. The School will provide you with a copy of the approved programme which supplements the published programme specification.

6.2 Progression and Awards Boards and Related Committees

6.2a School Special Circumstances Committee

The School Special Circumstances Committee is responsible for assessing all applications for mitigating circumstances and making recommendations to the Progression and Awards Board on any adjustment that the Board should make to accommodate those circumstances. Anonymous minutes of the School Special Circumstances Committee are taken, along with a summary of the recommendations made, to the Progression and Awards Board.

This Committee comprises of a Director of Student Support (Chair); one academic representative from each Department and Student Support Officers.

The Committee meets regularly throughout the academic year, including after examination periods and prior to Assessment and Progression and Awards Boards.

6.2b Progression and Awards Board

The Progression and Awards Board has responsibility for approving module marks, making decisions about progression, and for deciding the award you will receive and, where relevant, its classification. The School adopts the [standard Terms of Reference and Membership for Progression and Awards Boards](#).

6.2c Consideration of Progression and Awards

In the majority of cases, the Progression and Awards Board makes straightforward decisions based on credit requirements and the classification average. The classification rules are detailed in the University's [Academic Regulations](#).

For students who commenced their programme at the University prior to academic year 2022/23, the classification algorithm as specified in the [Rules for Award: 2023 – 24](#) (iteration A) applies. This allows for academic discretion for borderline cases. In these cases the Business School awards board will implement Undergraduate borderline discretion as follows:

All Students within a 0.05% can be raised using the rule based approach:

Rule 1 – At least 60 credits of final year credits are in the higher class

Rule 2 – At least 120 credits of year 2 & 3 credits are in the higher class

Rule 3 – At least 100 credits of year 2 & 3 compulsory and optional credits for the programme are in the higher class. In making the judgement, any **one** result of 49, 59 or 69 may be interpreted as if it belonged to the higher class.

In cases of mitigating circumstances, the Board receives recommendations from the School Special Circumstances Committee, and may apply Special Circumstances discretion. This procedure applies to all students, where relevant, regardless of the date studies commenced.

The Progression and Awards Boards meet in June and September for Undergraduate programmes, and in November for Taught Postgraduate programmes.

6.2d Referral to the University Special Cases Committee

The Progression and Awards Board can only exercise its powers within the context of the University's rules and regulations, and in particular, the [Academic Regulations](#) and the programme specification. However, if following these procedures would lead to a perverse or unfair judgement, the School may make an application to the [University Special Cases Committee](#) to make exceptions to the rules. If the School does this, you will be informed, giving the reason. The School must present a case to the Committee; you cannot apply yourself.

6.3 Undergraduate Progression

To progress to the next year of an undergraduate Honours programme, you must:

- obtain a minimum of 100 credits in the current programme year;
- pass all of those modules listed as 'pass for progression' in the programme specification; and
- meet any other criteria listed in the programme specification.

Furthermore, students must obtain an average grade of 40 or better (averaged over at least 120 credits in the programme).

Students on four year programmes (Industrial or International variants) must pass their industrial or international placement as specified in the relevant module handbook. If a student were to fail their

industrial or placement year they would be transferred back to the three year variant of the relevant programme.

6.4 Classification Procedures

This section describes the main classification rules for the principal types of qualifications. This is a summary only and the full details of the procedure for all types of qualification are published in full in the [Academic Regulations](#).

6.4a Classification System

The University operates a unified institutional degree, diploma and certificate awarding/classification system for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes. The classification system is based on averaging and is designed to be consistent with the national [Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications](#).

6.4b Classification Average

Modules are marked against a 0-100 marking scale. Module marks are converted to a 0.0 to 100.0 Classification Average scale expressed to one decimal place and rounded accordingly.

For more information, see the [Academic Regulations](#). A [Classification Calculator](#) is also available which will allow you to estimate your final degree classification.

6.4c Bachelor's Degrees with Classified Honours

Details about degree classification for Bachelor's degree with classified honours are available on the [Classification website page](#).

6.4d Undergraduate Classification Thresholds

Details about classification thresholds for Bachelor's degrees with classified honours are available in the [Academic Regulations](#).

6.4e Taught Postgraduate Awards

Taught postgraduate awards are classified by credit-weighted average grades across all modules studied as part of the programme.

6.4f Taught Postgraduate Classification Thresholds

Details about classification thresholds for taught postgraduate degrees are available in the [Academic Regulations](#).

6.4g Treatment of Supernumerary Modules (Prescribed)

If a programme prescribes that students must study more than 120 credits (undergraduate) or 180 credits (taught postgraduate) in any one programme year, the credit-weighted average over the full number of credits will be used for progression and classification purposes.

6.4h Treatment of Supernumerary Modules (Optional)

If students choose to take more than 120 credits (undergraduate) or 180 credits (taught postgraduate) in any one programme year, neither the credits nor the grades for the additional modules will be taken into account in determining progression or classification. You must decide at the point of enrolment which modules will count towards progression and classification; you cannot ask later for only a selection of the best results to be considered.

6.4i Advanced Standing

Credit imported as part of accreditation of prior learning contributes towards the credit requirements for the award but does not contribute to the classification average. Where, however, you are re-entering University of Leeds programme under the provisions of Sections 5.33 of the [Academic Regulations](#), your marks as well as your credit will be imported and will contribute to the classification where applicable.

6.4j Treatment of International Programme Year

For students undertaking a four-year undergraduate degree programme which includes a year abroad, successful completion is determined on a merit/pass/fail basis, and marks do not contribute to the classification of your degree. The form of assessment is described in the programme catalogue.

Further information on the Industrial Year can be found here:

<https://business.leeds.ac.uk/undergraduate/doc/study-abroad>

6.4k Treatment of Industrial Programme Year

For students undertaking a four-year undergraduate degree programme which includes a year in industry, successful completion is determined on a merit/pass/fail basis, and marks do not contribute to the classification of your degree. The form of assessment is described in the programme catalogue.

Further information on the Industrial Year can be found here:

<https://business.leeds.ac.uk/undergraduate/doc/work-placement>

6.5 Special Circumstances Discretion

The Progression and Awards Board will consider applications for mitigating circumstances and decide what action to take. This is not confined to borderline cases. The Board will usually accept the recommendations of the School Special Circumstances Committee (SSCC). The basis and process for decisions will be recorded in the SSCC minutes. Module marks will not be changed, regardless of the outcome, with the exception that where penalties for late submission have been applied, the School may choose to waive those penalties and restore the original mark.

6.6 Publication of Degree Classifications

The dates on which degree classifications are published apply across the University. These dates are published each year by the Programmes and Assessment Team. The School will not publish your classification, provide written confirmation of it nor discuss it with you prior to the official publication.

6.7 Diploma Supplement

The [Diploma Supplement](#) provides you with a formal description of the nature, level, context and status of studies undertaken for a particular qualification. The University issues this in addition to your degree certificate.

6.8 Graduation

[Graduation](#) ceremonies are held in July and December. Degree certificates are not issued during the ceremonies and will be sent out by post shortly afterwards. The University will provide you with full details nearer the time.

Section 7 Mitigating Circumstances

It is important that you let the School know about illness or personal circumstances that are affecting your attendance or assessed work.

7.1 Absences Involving Assessed Work

If you are absent from a class involving assessed work, you must provide independent evidence of the illness or circumstances which caused you to be absent.

If you are absent from any assessment or fail to submit any coursework for a module, and you do not provide a reason/evidence to your School's satisfaction, you will receive an "AB" code as the mark for that assessment. This translates to the lowest grade on the marking scale, "0".

7.2 Requesting consideration due to Mitigating Circumstances

Mitigating circumstances are defined by the University as normally exceptional, short term, unforeseen and unpreventable events that may have a significantly disruptive effect on your ability to take assessments. These events are over and above the course of everyday life, and normally outside of your control. They may affect your ability to complete coursework or other assessments, and revise for and attend examinations.

The University has procedures in place to assess claims for consideration and, at the parent School's discretion, to take account of them when making decisions about assessment and/or Award. The Mitigating Circumstances Guidance is available on the [Student Cases website page](#).

Mitigating Circumstances application differs for apprenticeship students, in order to comply with gateway requirements. Apprenticeship students should use the specific [Apprenticeship Mitigating Circumstances application form](#)

Section 8 Resits

If you do not pass a module at the first attempt, it is normally possible to resit. However, you cannot resit a module that you have already passed in order to improve your grade.

Where Schools deliver high/degree apprenticeships and where there are no restrictions listed in the Apprenticeship Assessment Plan, or the University's [Academic Regulations](#), an apprentice's employer decides how many attempts an apprentice may have to attempt their End Point Assessment.

In the case of Leeds University Business School Higher Degree apprenticeships, either the apprentice's employer decides how many attempts an apprentice may have to pass an End Point Assessment, or the number of resits are pre-determined in the Apprenticeship Assessment Plan, as set out by the Institute for Apprenticeships.

8.1 Number of Attempts

Undergraduate students are permitted two attempts to pass a module; the first attempt plus one resit. Attempts must be taken at the next available opportunity.

Postgraduate students are permitted two attempts to pass a module; the first attempt plus one resit, but may only take up to three resit attempts in the August of their study year. Additional or postponed attempts (including the dissertation, which is handed in after August of the study year) will take place in the following academic session.

Decisions about mitigating circumstances can change the number, timing, and type of resit attempts. The Progression and Awards Board in your parent School makes this decision. For more information on mitigating circumstances, see [Section 7 Mitigating Circumstances](#).

8.2 Timing of Resits

For students commencing their programmes in September, resit examinations are normally held in the August resit period. Students with coursework resits will be advised of the submission deadlines, which will normally be during the August resit period. For postgraduate modules (those at level FHEQ level 7), wherever possible, the second attempt will be arranged before the final Progression and Awards Board. For apprenticeship students, resits are arranged to meet gateway requirements and scheduled end point assessments.

There may be circumstances which affect these timings, for example if you have been granted mitigating circumstances, if you need to undertake significant laboratory or project work in order to pass a module, or if the resit will clash with other work for your programme. The School will provide information on the resit opportunities available to you when we publish the final module marks.

8.3 Format of Resits

Usually, the format of the resit will be the same as for the original module. If a different form of assessment will be used for the resit, this will be explained in the module specification in the online module catalogue.

8.4 Capped Resit Marks

The maximum mark you can obtain for a second attempt (i.e. a resit) is 40 for undergraduate modules and 50 for taught postgraduate modules.

Students on integrated foundation years are permitted an attempt to resit where they have passed modules but have not achieved the progression requirements of their designated programme of study. The mark achieved on re-assessment for these students will not be capped at 40.

	Undergraduate Students	Taught Postgraduate Students
Undergraduate Modules (Codes numbered 0, 1, 2 or 3)	Capped at 40	Capped at 40
Taught Postgraduate Modules (Codes numbered 5...M)	Capped at 50	Capped at 50

8.5 Failed Resit Marks

If you undertake a resit as a second attempt, but your mark for the resit assessment is lower than the mark you originally received, the highest mark achieved will apply when calculating classification. Marks achieved in the different attempts will appear on the transcript.

8.6 Resubmission of Coursework

Students resitting modules assessed by coursework will normally be required to submit a new piece of work on a new topic. The submission policy for resit coursework is the same as that for first submissions – (see Section 3.3c)

In some cases, where coursework cannot be replicated (e.g., the assessment contained group work) the format of the resit might be different from the original.

8.7 Resits in the Final Year

In the final year of study, it is possible to apply to resit failed modules in order to improve the classification average and/or to make up the credits. This applies whether or not the results obtained so far are sufficient for the award of a degree. However, once you have accepted and received an award, you cannot then resit for a different award/classification. You must choose either to resit or, if you are eligible, to receive the award.

If this situation applies to you, you are strongly recommended to get in touch with the School to discuss your options before you make a decision.

8.7a Eligible for Ordinary; Resit for Honours

Ordinary degrees may be awarded by Leeds University Business School's Awards Board where students have failed to meet honours requirements. In order to be eligible for an ordinary degree, students must;

- Achieve at least 240 credits, of which at least 60 must be passed at FHEQ 6 (level 3) and;
- 160 credits at FHEQ 5 and FHEQ 6 (levels 2 and 3) combined.
- Eligible students must achieve an average across all modules taken in the final years of the programme that is equal to or greater than the minimum pass.

Section 9 Appeals and Complaints

9.1 Appeals

You have the right to appeal against a final decision of the Assessment Board or Progression and Awards Board. The deadline for receipt of your appeal is 20 working days from the date of the publication of the decision against which you wish to appeal. Before entering the formal appeals process you should attempt to resolve the issue within the School. You should raise your concerns with the Head of School.

Guidance on the formal appeals procedure is available on the [Student Cases website page](#).

9.2 Complaints

The University is committed to listening and being responsive to student views and needs and it is recognised that sometimes the University may get things wrong. You therefore have the right to lodge a complaint against a School, Service or individual in the University if you feel that your legitimate expectations are not being met.

To raise a complaint, or alert the School to a problem, please contact Jane Coyle, the Student Curriculum and Operations Manager for the Business School: J.V.Coyle@leeds.ac.uk

Complaints should initially be raised as near as possible to the point at which the problem occurred - in the School or University Service - and should normally be pursued informally in the first instance. However, there may be times when you do not feel able to make a complaint locally, or when you are dissatisfied with the response or proposed remedy. If this happens you can make a formal complaint using the [Student Complaints Procedure](#).

You can seek further guidance on making an appeal or a complaint from Leeds University Union (LUU) Student Advice using the self-help [LUU Help and Support website pages](#) or by contacting [LUU Help and Support by email](#).

Section 10 Annexes

10.1 Annex I. School UG Assessment Criteria

Undergraduate Level 1: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ 4)

These marking criteria are generic and designed to be used as guidance. The levels structure relates to National Qualifications Framework (NQF) curriculum levels in which students demonstrate progression as they move between levels (see QAA 2014). The mark awarded will take into consideration the 'best fit' band for that piece of work, i.e. the work may display one or two of the characteristics in a particular band, but may not achieve the standard of the band overall. The mark awarded should reflect the overall best fit band for that piece of work. For less generic pieces of assessment, marking criteria should be provided on a modular basis and tailored to these particular forms of assessment, for example group work and oral presentations.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Research and evidence	Analysis and Evaluation	Presentation, including adherence to word count
Grade	range, depth and understanding of principles and concepts; evaluation and interpretation	identification of relevant data/literature/information to support task	application of technique/interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data/synthesis	argument/focus/structure/conclusions; spelling and grammar; referencing
93-100 Exceptional	Exceptional knowledge of key foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; ability to evaluate and interpret these innovatively within the area of study. Awareness of ambiguities of knowledge	Exceptionally wide range of appropriate research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to decipher relevant data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Exceptional ability to identify and apply relevant techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; sophisticated interpretation of key arguments and identification of points of difference in literature	Exceptionally coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear, valid and reflective conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
70-92 Excellent	Excellent knowledge of key foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; ability to evaluate and interpret these reflectively within the area of study. Begins to show awareness of limitations to knowledge	Very high quality evidence of appropriate research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to engage with relevant data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Excellent ability to identify and apply relevant techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; clearly identifies relevant arguments and points of difference in literature	Very high quality, coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear, valid and reflective conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar, accurate and consistent citation and referencing
60-69 Good	Good knowledge of foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; ability to evaluate and interpret these within the area of study	High quality evidence of appropriate research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to locate required data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Good ability to apply required techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; identifies key arguments and points of difference in literature	High quality, coherent, clear and balanced argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar, accurate and consistent citation and referencing
50-59 Reasonable	Reasonable knowledge of foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; shows some ability to evaluate and interpret these within the area of study; some errors may be evident	Evidence of appropriate reading within the taught elements of the module; competent ability to locate data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Competency in applying required techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; identifies arguments and points of difference in literature but often descriptively	Reasonable, clear argument; focus on relevant issues; appropriate structure with good conclusion; accurate spelling and grammar, accurate and consistent citation and referencing
40-49 Limited	Threshold level Adequate knowledge of foundational principles and concepts at undergraduate level; shows limited ability to evaluate and interpret these within the area of study; some errors and omissions evident	Threshold level Use of set reading only; limited ability to locate data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Threshold level Limited ability to apply some techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data in accordance with foundational theories; limited ability to identify arguments and points of difference in literature; descriptive	Threshold level Limited argument; reasonable focus; structure evident; some errors in spelling and grammar, evidence of largely correct referencing and citation

35-39 Poor	Work does not meet the standards required to pass; gaps in knowledge of foundational principles and concepts; superficial attempts to evaluate or interpret these	Little evidence of reading within the taught elements of the module; insufficient ability to locate data/information/sources to address question/investigation	Lacking in ability to apply techniques to present, evaluate and interpret quantitative and/or qualitative data; little understanding of arguments and points of difference in literature	Work does not meet the standards required to pass; unstructured argument; lacking in focus; weak spelling and grammar, severe weaknesses in referencing and citation
1-34 Very Poor	Work is well below the standards required to pass; major gaps in knowledge of foundational principles and concepts; lacks evaluation and interpretation	No evidence of reading; unable to locate data/information/sources	No techniques used to present, evaluate and interpret data; no understanding of arguments and literature	Work is well below the standards required to pass; ; littered with spelling and grammar errors; lacks argument; no focus; no referencing
0	Work of no merit or absent			

Undergraduate Level 2: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ 5)

These marking criteria are generic and designed to be used as guidance. The levels structure relates to National Qualifications Framework (NQF) curriculum levels in which students demonstrate progression as they move between levels (see QAA 2014). The mark awarded will take into consideration the 'best fit' band for that piece of work, i.e. the work may display one or two of the characteristics in a particular band, but may not achieve the standard of the band overall. The mark awarded should reflect the overall best fit band for that piece of work. For less generic pieces of assessment, marking criteria should be provided on a modular basis and tailored to these particular forms of assessment, for example group work and oral presentations.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Research and evidence	Analysis and Evaluation	Presentation, including adherence to word count
Grade	range, depth and understanding of principles and concepts; evaluation and interpretation	identification of relevant data/literature/information to support task	application of technique/interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data/synthesis	argument/focus/structure/conclusions; referencing, spelling and grammar;
93-100 Exceptional	Exceptional knowledge of appropriate principles and concepts; excellent critical understanding of ways in which principles and ideas have developed; considerable understanding of the limits of own knowledge, and how this influences analyses/interpretations	Exceptionally wide range of research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; perceptive ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Exceptional application of appropriate methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; strong ability to evaluate critically and authoritatively different approaches and an excellent understanding of their limits; outstanding level of synthesis in addition to analysis; ability to apply concepts extensively beyond areas in which they were first studied; proposes own insightful ideas/interpretations	Exceptionally coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; convincing focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear, valid and reflective conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
70-92 Excellent	Excellent knowledge of appropriate principles and concepts; considerable ability to understand critically ways in which principles and ideas have developed; understanding of the limits of own knowledge, and how this influences analyses/interpretations	Very high quality evidence of research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; considerable ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Meticulous and consistent application of appropriate methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; ability to evaluate critically different approaches including an understanding of their limits; credible level of synthesis in addition to analysis; ability to apply concepts outside areas in which they were first studied; proposes own advanced ideas/interpretations	Coherent, clear, balanced and persuasive argument; convincing focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear, valid and reflective conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
60-69 Good	Good knowledge of appropriate principles and concepts; ability to understand critically ways in which principles and ideas have developed; some awareness of limits to knowledge	High quality evidence of research-informed reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Good application of appropriate methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches including their limits; good level of synthesis in addition to analysis; ability to apply concepts outside areas in which they were first studied; proposes own good ideas/interpretations	High quality, coherent, clear and balanced argument; strong focus on relevant issues; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
50-59 Reasonable	Reasonable knowledge of principles and concepts; some ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed; limited awareness of limits to knowledge	Some evidence of research-informed reading relevant to the module; competent ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Competency in applying methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; some ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches; some ability to apply concepts outside areas in which they were first studied; proposes some good independent ideas/interpretations	Reasonable, clear argument; focus on relevant issues; appropriate logical structure with good conclusion; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing

40-49 Limited	<p>Threshold level</p> <p>Limited knowledge of principles and concepts; limited ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed; basic awareness of limits to knowledge</p>	<p>Threshold level</p> <p>Limited evidence of research-informed reading relevant to the module; ability to identify some data, information and/or sources appropriate to the nature of investigation/question</p>	<p>Threshold level</p> <p>Limited application of some methods of enquiry relevant to investigation/question/data; shows some ability to evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches; proposes limited independent ideas/interpretations</p>	<p>Threshold level</p> <p>Limited argument; reasonable focus; some errors in spelling and grammar; structure evident; evidence of largely correct referencing and citation</p>
35-39 Poor	<p>Work does not meet the standards required to pass; gaps in knowledge of principles and concepts; little ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed</p>	<p>Little evidence of relevant reading; limited ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to the nature of investigation/question</p>	<p>Deficient in relevant methods of enquiry to investigation/question/data; no understanding of different approaches; little analysis; lacking in independent ideas/interpretations</p>	<p>Work does not meet the standards required to pass; unstructured argument; lacking in focus; weak spelling and grammar; severe weaknesses in referencing and citation</p>
1-34 Very Poor	<p>Work is well below the standards required to pass; Major gaps in knowledge of principles and concepts; lacking ability to understand ways in which principles and ideas have developed</p>	<p>Absence of relevant reading; inability to identify any data, information and/or sources</p>	<p>No relevant methods of enquiry; no understanding of different approaches; analysis absent; no independent ideas/interpretations</p>	<p>Work is well below the standards required to pass; littered with spelling and grammar errors ,lacks argument; no focus; no referencing</p>
0	<p>Work of no merit or absent</p>			

Undergraduate Level 3: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ 6)

These marking criteria are generic and designed to be used as guidance. The levels structure relates to National Qualifications Framework (NQF) curriculum levels in which students demonstrate progression as they move between levels (see QAA 2014). The mark awarded will take into consideration the 'best fit' band for that piece of work, i.e. .the work may display one or two of the characteristics in a particular band, but may not achieve the standard of the band overall. The mark awarded should reflect the overall best fit band for that piece of work. For less generic pieces of assessment, marking criteria should be provided on a modular basis and tailored to these particular forms of assessment, for example group work and oral presentations.

Grade	Knowledge and Understanding	Research and evidence	Analysis and Evaluation	Presentation, including adherence to word count
	range, depth and understanding of principles and concepts; evaluation and interpretation	identification of relevant data/literature/information to support task	application of technique/interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data/synthesis	argument/focus/structure/conclusions; referencing
93-100 Exceptional	Demonstrates exceptionally highly detailed understanding of the area of study; work reflects outstanding knowledge of relevant debates in the literature and current developments	Exceptional evidence of ability to manage own learning e.g. use of primary sources/reading well beyond the taught elements of the module; outstanding ability to identify independently a wide range of data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Demonstrates an exceptional level of conceptual understanding - including a considerable appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge - leading to outstanding ability to devise and sustain analysis and/or to solve problems; use of numerous ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of the discipline; able to exercise excellent judgement in analysis and interpretation of ideas	Exceptionally coherent, clear and comprehensive argument, consistently supported by evidence; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
70-92 Excellent	Demonstrates an excellent understanding of the area of study; work reflects sophisticated knowledge of relevant debates in the literature and current developments	Very high quality evidence of ability to manage own learning e.g. use of primary sources/reading well beyond the taught elements of the module; excellent ability to identify independently a wide range of data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Demonstrates an excellent level of conceptual understanding - including a considerable appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge - leading to an excellent ability to devise and sustain analysis and/or to solve problems; use of varied ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of the discipline; able to exercise excellent judgement in analysis and interpretation of ideas	Demonstrates excellence in coherence, clarity and comprehension of argument, consistently supported by evidence; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
60-69 Good	Demonstrates a good understanding of the area of study; shows comprehensive knowledge of relevant debates in the literature and current developments	High quality evidence of ability to manage own learning e.g. reading well beyond the taught elements of the module; good ability to identify independently data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Demonstrates a good level of conceptual understanding - including a good appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge - leading to a good ability to devise and sustain analysis and/or to solve problems; use of ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of the discipline; able to exercise judgement in analysis and interpretation of ideas	High quality; coherent, clear and comprehensive argument, consistently supported by evidence; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
50-59 Reasonable	Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the area of study; work reflects awareness of relevant debates in the literature and current developments	Some evidence of ability to manage own learning e.g. reading beyond the taught elements of the module; competent ability to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question evident	Demonstrates a reasonable level of conceptual understanding - including a some appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge - leading to reasonable ability to devise and sustain analysis and/or to solve problems; use of ideas and techniques; some attempt to exercise judgement in analysis and interpretation of ideas	Reasonable, clear and comprehensive argument, supported by evidence; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
40-49 Limited	Threshold level Demonstrates a limited understanding of the area of study; shows an acceptable knowledge of relevant debates in the literature and current developments	Threshold level Some evidence of ability to manage own learning e.g. reading beyond the taught elements of the module; ability to identify some data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Threshold level Demonstrates basic level of conceptual understanding - including some appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity and limits of knowledge - showing some ability to devise and sustain analysis and/or to solve problems; occasional ideas and techniques; some analysis and interpretation of ideas; attempt at exercising judgement	Threshold level Limited argument, supported by some evidence; use of logical structure with some clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing

35-39 Poor	Work does not meet the standards required to pass; demonstrates a superficial understanding of the area of study; gaps in knowledge of relevant debates in the literature and little awareness of current developments	Shows little evidence of ability to manage own learning e.g. reading beyond the taught elements of the module; some difficulties in identifying data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Demonstrates little conceptual understanding, showing little ability to devise and sustain analysis and/or to solve problems; lacks ideas and techniques; lacks interpretation of ideas; no attempt to make judgements
1-34 Very Poor	Work is well below the standards required to pass; lacks understanding of the area of study; major gaps in knowledge	Unable to manage own learning; unable to identify data, information and/or sources appropriate to nature of investigation/question	Demonstrates no conceptual understanding; no structured analysis and/or problem solving; lacks ideas and techniques; no attempt to make judgements
0	Work of no merit or absent		

10.2 Annex II School TP Assessment Criteria

Postgraduate/Apprenticeship Level 5: LUBS Generic Assessment Criteria (FHEQ 7)

These marking criteria are generic and designed to be used as guidance. The levels structure relates to National Qualifications Framework (NQF) curriculum levels in which students demonstrate progression as they move between levels (see QAA 2014). The mark awarded will take into consideration the 'best fit' band for that piece of work, i.e. the work may display one or two of the characteristics in a particular band, but may not achieve the standard of the band overall. The mark awarded should reflect the overall best fit band for that piece of work. For less generic pieces of assessment, marking criteria should be provided on a modular basis and tailored to these particular forms of assessment, for example group work and oral presentations.

Grade	Knowledge and Understanding	Research and evidence	Analysis and Evaluation	Presentation, including adherence to word count
	range, depth and understanding of principles and concepts; evaluation and interpretation	identification of relevant data/literature/information to support task	application of technique/interpretation of qualitative and quantitative data/synthesis	argument/focus/structure/conclusions; referencing
93-100 Exceptional	Demonstrates exceptional mastery of a complex and specialised area of study; work displays exceptional critical awareness of current debates and problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field	Exceptional ability to act autonomously in devising a research strategy; strong evidence of a self-directed and original approach to addressing and solving problems/research questions; exceptional ability to identify and critically engage with a range of literature relating to current research and advanced scholarship in the discipline area	Exceptional ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates exceptional capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make insightful judgements in the absence of complete data; displays meticulous understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates a progressive degree of originality in the application of knowledge, with exceptional understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area	Exceptionally coherent, clear and comprehensive presentation of complex arguments, consistently supported by evidence; use of logical structure including clear, valid and original conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing; work is of publishable quality
70-92 Excellent	Demonstrates mastery of a complex and specialised area of study; work displays excellent critical awareness of current debates and problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field	Excellent ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates excellent capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make excellent judgements in the absence of complete data; displays meticulous understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates a high degree of originality in the application of knowledge, with excellent understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area	Excellent ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates excellent capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make excellent judgements in the absence of complete data; displays meticulous understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates a high degree of originality in the application of knowledge, with excellent understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area	Very high quality, coherent, clear and comprehensive presentation of complex arguments, consistently supported by evidence; excellent use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing
60-69 Good	Demonstrates a systematic understanding of a complex and specialised area of study; work displays good critical awareness of current debates and problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field	Ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates good capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make careful judgements in the absence of complete data; displays understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates originality in the application of knowledge, with a good understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area	Ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates good capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make careful judgements in the absence of complete data; displays understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates originality in the application of knowledge, with a good understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area	High quality, coherent, clear and comprehensive argument, supported by evidence; use of logical structure including clear and valid conclusions; accurate spelling and grammar; accurate and consistent citation and referencing

<p>50-59 Reasonable</p>	<p>Demonstrates a reasonable understanding of a complex and specialised area of study; work displays some critical awareness of current debates and problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field</p>	<p>Some ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make judgements in the absence of complete data; displays understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates originality in the application of knowledge, with an understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area</p>	<p>Some ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; able to make judgements in the absence of complete data; displays understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates originality in the application of knowledge, with an understanding of how established techniques of enquiry create and interpret knowledge in the discipline area</p>	
<p>20-49 Limited</p>	<p>Work does not meet the standards required to pass; demonstrates little understanding of a complex and specialised area of study; work lacks critical awareness of current debates and problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field</p>	<p>Lacking ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates little capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; unable to make judgements in the absence of complete data; displays inadequate understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates little originality in the application of knowledge</p>	<p>Lacking ability to evaluate methodologies and develop critiques and, where appropriate, to propose new hypotheses; demonstrates little capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; unable to make judgements in the absence of complete data; displays inadequate understanding of techniques applicable to own research or advanced scholarship; demonstrates little originality in the application of knowledge</p>	
<p>1-19 Very Poor</p>	<p>Work is well below the standards required to pass; demonstrates no understanding of a complex and specialised area of study; no critical awareness of current debates and problems and/or new insights at the forefront of the field</p>	<p>No research strategy; little evidence of problem solving or addressing research questions; unable to identify and critically engage with appropriate range of literature</p>	<p>No evaluation of methodologies and critique development; demonstrates no capacity to deal with a range of complex issues systematically and creatively; unable to make judgements in the absence of complete data; no understanding of applicable techniques; demonstrates no originality in the application of knowledge</p>	
<p>0</p>	<p>Work of no merit or absent</p>			

10.3 Annex: Staff with Management Responsibility for the Assessment Process

This section describes the key members of staff and committees involved in the assessment process within the Leeds University Business School and describes their main responsibilities.

Executive Dean of the Faculty

The Executive Dean of the Faculty, as the representative of the Senate, is ultimately responsible for all examination and assessment matters in the School. However, many of these responsibilities are delegated to other members of staff and to various formal committees.

Pro Dean for Student Education

The Pro Dean for Student Education, at the Faculty level, is not directly involved with the assessment of most students, but has overall responsibility for quality assurance, standards and quality enhancement of the Faculty's learning and teaching provision. The Pro Dean chairs the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee.

Faculty Director of Assessment

The Faculty Director of Assessment is responsible to the Pro Dean for Student Education, on behalf of the Executive Dean, for the development, organisation and management of the assessment policy and practices within the School.

Faculty Director of Enhancement and Innovation

The Director of Enhancement and Innovation provides academic leadership and oversight to the pedagogical development of taught programmes parented by the Business School including the development of the digital learning resources.

School Academic Lead for Inclusive Pedagogies

The School Academic Lead for Inclusive Pedagogies is a nominated member of academic staff who is responsible for promoting and embedding inclusive approaches.

Faculty Director of Quality and Programmes

The Director of Quality and Programmes provides academic leadership and oversight to the development of taught programmes parented by the Business School, and the quality assurance of their delivery.

Faculty Director of Student Support and Academic Personal Tutoring

The Director of Taught Programmes (Student Support and Academic Personal Tutoring) provides academic leadership and oversight to the development and delivery of student support on taught programmes parented by the Business School.

Departmental Directors of Student Education (DDSE)

The Departmental Director of Student Education is responsible for the overall management of undergraduate and taught postgraduate examinations and assessment in their respective department. Whilst the Departmental Director of Student Education has a responsibility to oversee the range of different types and timing of assessments on programmes, this is often discharged in co-operation with Programme Leaders.

Programme Leaders

A Programme Leader is responsible to the Departmental Director of Student Education for the development, organisation and management of a named programme and for the academic experience of the students on that programme. Programme Leaders play an active part in the development of the School's portfolio of programmes and the enhancement of the student academic experience. The Programme Leader for each programme is listed in the [programme catalogue](#).

Module Leaders

A Module Leader, a contracted member of academic staff, is appointed to lead each module in the School's portfolio and is responsible for its development, organisation and management, as well as for the assessment of students. Module Leaders, in liaison with Programme Leaders, are responsible to the Departmental Director of Student Education acting on behalf of the Pro-Dean for Student Education and Executive Dean of the Faculty. The Module Leader for each module is listed in the [module catalogue](#).

Academic Integrity Lead

The Academic Integrity Lead is a nominated member of academic staff who is responsible for ensuring consistency within the School in implementing academic misconduct procedures and practice, and investigating suspected cases of academic misconduct. The aim is to ensure equity of treatment of students. The role also involves academic integrity education, such as raising staff and student awareness of academic misconduct issues.

Student Curriculum and Operations

The Student Curriculum and Operations (SES) is responsible for the support of students throughout their time at University and supports academic staff in the administration of module assessments and final Degree Classification. SCO staff manage the administration in relation to assessment for modules (including the collation, entry, and release of marks in line with University regulations), support School level procedures such as mitigating circumstances and academic integrity and services all Assessment, Progression and Awards Boards.

Operational Delivery Lead for Assessment

The role of the Operational delivery Lead, as a member of the Faculty Education School Management team, is to liaise with staff involved in assessment to improve the consistency of processes and practices and to promote the sharing of ideas and good practice. The Operational Delivery Lead will also co-ordinate the introduction of developments or improvement initiatives which impact upon assessment.

Senior Student Curriculum and Operations Officers – Assessment

The Senior Student Curriculum and Operations Officers have responsibility for Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduate assessment respectively. It is the Programme Officer's role to facilitate the delivery of assessment within their own area, from the setting of assessment to classification at the examination board. They also work closely with the Operational Delivery Lead and the Faculty Assessment Directors to deliver continuous improvement in the delivery of student education practices, with a particular focus on the area of assessment.

10.4 Annex: Internal Examiners and Assessment Assistants

10.4a Internal Examiners

Every taught credit-bearing module must have an internal examiner, an identified individual who takes responsibility for the assessment on each module. Although marking of assessment may be undertaken by a team, the internal examiner has responsibility for the marks awarded. The internal examiner is usually the module leader.

There may be occasions when it is appropriate for another qualified and experienced individual, such as a Foreign Language Assistant, a member of staff at a collaborating partner institution, or a retired or visiting member staff, to act as internal examiner. The module leader retains overall responsibility and accountability for the module whilst delegating responsibility for assessment to another. In such cases, the School will make a formal nomination of the individual as an internal examiner and the appointment will be approved by the Faculty Taught Student Education Committee, or by the Chair acting on its behalf.

10.4b Assessment Assistants

Assessment assistants are individuals who, working under the supervision of the internal examiner, assist with the marking of students' work. The internal examiner remains formally responsible for assessment design and for the marks awarded. Assessment assistants usually have a formal link with the University (for example, are studying for a research degree), but are not academic members of staff. Assessment assistants are approved, appointed and monitored at the school level.

10.4c Use of Assessment Assistants

The School appoints assessment assistants under defined circumstances:

- Where the assessment is conducted against well-defined success criteria, e.g. in the case of an MCQ paper

10.4d Monitoring and Training for Assessment Assistants

Marking undertaken by Assessment Assistants is comprehensively monitored. The School maintains a complete, detailed and up-to-date record of appointed assessment assistants and the training they have received.

10.5 Annex: External Examiners

The School follows the agreed University [procedures relating to external examiners](#) for all taught programmes.

An External Examiner is appointed by the University to oversee each programme or area of study. The External Examiner provides independent assurance of the efficacy and fairness of the assessment procedures and maintenance of academic standards. External Examiners' reports from previous years are available to students.

10.6 Annex: Student Education Committees

The process of approving programme and module specifications, including assessment design, is the responsibility of the faculty Programme Approval Group, reporting to the [Faculty Taught Student Education Committees](#).

10.7 Annex: Assessment Committees

There are two types of meeting: the School Assessment Board (see [Section 4.10a School Assessment Board](#)), which oversees module marks/grades, and the Progression and Awards Board (see [Section 6.2b Progression and Awards Board](#)), which determines final outcomes (such as classification).

10.8 Annex: Mitigating Circumstances Guidance

The Mitigating Circumstances Guidance is available on the [Student Cases website page](#)

10.9 Annex: Academic Regulations

The [Academic Regulations](#) are the rules, approved by the Senate, under which the schools are allowed to make awards on behalf of the University. The [Academic Regulations](#) explain the University's general requirements for each type of qualification.
