Coronavirus Response Education Support Sub Group:
Principles for Award, Progression and Assessment

(For all students completing assessments in the academic year 2019/20)

The principles and policies included in this document were arrived at after careful consideration, paying due regard to Queen Mary's academic quality and standards, the student experience, and the need for institutional consistency. The principles align with external expectations and have been approved on the delegated authority of the Senate. All schools and institutes are expected to follow the procedures set out in this document. If for any reason you do not feel able to do so, please contact eo-setl@qmul.ac.uk in the first instance before taking any action.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES (Please note supplementary details below)

1. A mark (and corresponding grade) should be produced for each module that a student has completed. All modules and assessments must pay due regard to the relevant subject benchmark statements and to any Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements.

2. Where at least some of a module’s assessments have been completed and the Module Organiser is satisfied that the learning outcomes have been sufficiently tested by those elements of assessment that have been completed, there is no requirement to conduct additional assessment. In most cases, evaluating whether students have demonstrated achievement of the intended learning outcomes will require that they have completed at least 50% of the assessment as originally intended, but there is scope for academic judgement here. In proposing this principle, it is recognised that a single, low-weighted element of assessment may not be reflective of a student’s overall ability: they may have put in less effort precisely because of the original weighting, or may have performed much more strongly in an individual element of coursework than in an examination. In arriving at a final module mark that reflects a student’s academic ability, it may be appropriate to reweight the completed elements by discounting the non-completed elements.

3. In the event that the Module Organiser cannot be satisfied that any assessed elements provide a reliable evaluation of whether students have met the intended learning outcome, an additional assessment will be required. If there are existing elements due for submission shortly then these may suffice if the requirements of point (2) can be met. In all other cases, Module Organisers should set an alternative assessment that can be completed and submitted online (see below for further guidance on alternative assessments). In this event, the module mark will be the weighted average of all assessed elements including the alternative assessment (having determined that the latter was required for the assessors to evaluate whether students on the module could demonstrate achievement of the intended learning outcomes).

4. All alternative assessments should be considered and approved by one central person/group in each School / Institute, with academic oversight from the relevant Dean for Education. The School / Institute group considering any proposals for alternative assessments should comprise one or all of (i) the Chair of the relevant Subject Exam Board (SEB), (ii) the Director
of Education (DoE) / Education Lead, and/or (iii) the Head of School / Director of Institute (though this work can be delegated up until the approval stage).

(5) For each year of study, the ‘year average’ for 2019/20 should be calculated excluding the lowest 30 credits. Hence for undergraduate programmes, this would normally mean calculating based on the best 90 credits (out of 120) and for a postgraduate Masters degree (MA/MSc/MRes/MBA/MPA) would normally be calculated based on the best 150 credits (out of 180). The PgCert (60 credits) is an exception, and only the weakest 15 credits will be discounted. Where a module has the lowest mark due to an assessment offence penalty, that module will not be excluded and we will look at the next lowest module. Where the lowest 30 credits do not fit within two 15 or one 30 credit modules (e.g. a 15 credit is lowest, then a 30 credit second lowest), the weighting of modules will be amended for the purpose of classification only (e.g. in that case, the 30 credit module would count only 15 credits towards classification). There are more details on degree algorithms below.

(6) All provisions apply equally to students in attendance for the first time this year, and to students resitting out of attendance, in recognition of the fact that all students being assessed in 2020 have been impacted. In some cases, this will mean that students who narrowly failed to meet the progression/award requirements last year will now meet them without additional work, though they have the opportunity to complete them to improve their profiles and are recommended to do so where they can.

UNDERGRADUATE AWARD RULES – STUDENTS SCHEDULED TO COMPLETE IN 2019/20

The mark for classification will be derived using all marks available from preceding years of study plus the best 90 credits from the final year of study (Year 3 for Bachelor’s degrees; Year 4 for undergraduate Masters programmes). The standard weighting will apply of 1:3:6 or 1:3:6:6 (for 3 and 4 year degrees, respectively) but the mark recorded for the final year will be the average of those 90 credits with the highest mark.

In some cases, students with high grades for modules sat in the Semester A exams in January and from a final year research project will already have 90 credits with grades on the basis of which they can be recommended for a ‘good degree’ (first or upper second class honours). Such students may elect not to complete the alternative assessments for the remaining 30 credits in Semester B modules. To ensure that students are able to make informed decisions, finalists should be advised where the School / Institute is already in a position to recommend a degree classification based on 90 credits of assessed modules. (This should hopefully reduce avoidable stress and anxiety among the maximum number of students.) Given the commitment to discount marks from the lowest 30 credits, completing all available assessments will always give students the best chance at the best possible outcomes, and it is recommended that students be reminded of this; completing the minimum available assessments may allow the student to achieve an award but the classification will be badly impacted as all but 30 credits of marks (15 for PgCert) will still be used in calculating the College Mark.

To be eligible for a Foundation Certificate or a Graduate Diploma, a student must take 120 credits and pass a minimum 90 credits (including a minimum 30 at the level of the award).

1 Throughout this document, the term College Mark is as defined and applied in the University’s Academic Regulations (e.g. regulations 2.15 and 2.16 in the 2019-20 Academic Regulations). The university was granted Degree Awarding Powers by the Privy Council in 2008 and all references in this document to College Mark relate to the Academic Regulations and the former, federal structure of the University of London.
To be eligible for a Bachelors degree, a student is required to have studied 360 credits, and to have passed a minimum of 270 credits in total with at least 30 credits passed at level 6*. For an intercalated Bachelors award, a student must take 120 credits and pass a minimum 90 including at least 30 at level 6.

To be eligible for an undergraduate Masters degree, a student is required to have studied at least 480 credits, and to have passed a minimum 360 credits in total with at least 30 credits passed at level 7*.

In both cases, note that the final year still counts for a high proportion of the degree even with 30 credits discounted. While it is mathematically possible for a student who passed 240 credits across years one and two to pass just 30 credits in the final year in order to receive a Bachelors award, the low marks for the other, uncompleted, final year modules would have a severe negative impact on classification. Again, students are encouraged to complete alternative assessments where they can, to give themselves the greatest number of opportunities for success.

We do not yet know whether there will be travel restrictions in place for the late summer resit period. Resits will go ahead (slightly later than usual) and colleagues considering those assessments are encouraged to use formats that can be delivered remotely for that sitting, too. Where possible, please use the same format as the original attempt, so that students are familiar with the scheme.

(*Requirements for professional accreditation of an award may be higher).

**POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT AWARD RULES**

For postgraduate taught (PGT) awards the standard regulations for award will apply, except that (a) failed modules can be condoned from zero rather than 40.0 (where condoned failure is permitted), and (b) the College Mark will be calculated excluding the weakest 30 credits-worth of marks (15 credits, for PgCert). For part-time PGT students not due to graduate in 2020 but impacted by the covid-19 pandemic, “the principles described herein will be applied in their year of graduation. PSRB requirements may mean that certain programmes are obliged to follow the original rules to qualify for accreditation.

**CORE MODULES**

Core modules (those that must be taken and passed – distinct from compulsory modules which must be taken but can be failed and/or condoned) must still be passed, as they are, by nature, fundamental to their respective programmes. However, the marks can still be excluded for the purpose of classification (see above) where core modules are among those with the lowest marks.

**PROGRESSION RULES (Excludes LLB, MBBS and BDS)**

Non-finalists will be assessed as described above. **All non-final year** students (including students on an integrated “with foundation” degree programme) will be permitted to progress, irrespective of the number of credits passed. However, students will be advised that they may have passed insufficient credits to receive an award and should be advised to take resit assessments in the ‘late summer’ period. (This will not be the first two weeks of August, but exact timings will be dependent on the duration of the current pandemic).
Schools/institutes may be aware that some students were on track not to progress irrespective of the impact of the coronavirus (e.g. they had failed more than 30 credits in the Semester A exams). We should avoid setting these students up to fail, and schools/institutes are advised to discuss these students’ situations with them individually, noting issues such as the additional costs they will accrue in 2020/21 with potentially little realistic chance of ultimately completing the degree. Where possible, please record that in writing and retain that written record. If such a student nonetheless wishes to continue, they can do so.

When continuing students complete (i.e. no earlier than the summer of 2021), their final marks will be calculated both including and excluding 2019-20, and, consistent with the ‘no detriment’ principle, the student will receive the higher of those two marks.

For a Bachelors student currently in Year 1, this would mean calculating their final mark based on a weighting of 1:3:6 and of 0:3:6, and taking the better of the two outcomes. For a Bachelors student currently in Year 2, this would mean calculating their final mark based on a weight of 1:3:6 and of 1:0:6, and taking the better of the two outcomes. (For students on undergraduate Masters degrees, we would use the best outcome from 1:3:6:6 and 0:3:6:6 or 1:0:6:6 or 1:3:0:6, depending on which developmental year corresponds to the academic year 2019/20).

This is, in effect, a double no-detriment approach. The marks for the weakest credits from the year will be excluded in all cases; where the recalculated year average would still bring the College Mark down, the whole year will be excluded from classification. Note that this only applies to UG programmes, not part-time/multi-year PGT programmes.

**EXTRAMURAL YEARS**

Students on extramural years (abroad, in industry, on placement) in 2019/20 will suffer no detriment in progression and award. Excepting cases where professional accreditation requirements are attached to the year, these students will:

- be deemed to have met the progression requirements to the subsequent year of study and remain registered on the ‘with year abroad/placement (etc.)’ route; and,
- **Either:**
  - Where the year has not been completed, or where it has been completed but including it would bring down the student’s eventual College Mark, the student will receive a pass (on a pass/fail basis) with credit awarded for the year, treating it as experiential learning. The year will not count towards classification even where it would normally have done so.
  - Where the year has been successfully completed with results that would increase the student’s eventual College Mark and where the year would normally count towards classification, the year will count in the usual way.

These students may therefore choose to continue, or not, with any outstanding assessments and activities on a no detriment basis. Note that all marks must be recorded (and, where appropriate, converted) in the usual way as we will not know whether they will increase or decrease the College Mark until the students complete their final years of study.

Where there are specific PSRB requirements, Schools / Institutes must inform students of these and of any consequences of non-completion.
SUBJECT EXAM BOARDS / DEGREE EXAM BOARDS

To accommodate the submission extensions already granted to students, the dates of the DEB meetings will be deferred by 3 weeks. By reducing the SEB-DEB interval by a week, this will allow us to extend the final date for SEBs to ratify module marks / grades and upload to SITS by 4 weeks, as below. However, it is vital that all SEBs adhered to the revised dates for submission of SEB paperwork prior to the DEBs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Deadline</th>
<th>Revised Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG SEB</td>
<td>19 June 2020</td>
<td>17 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG SEB</td>
<td>03 July 2020</td>
<td>31 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG DEB†</td>
<td>03 July 2020</td>
<td>24 July 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG DEB</td>
<td>14 July 2020</td>
<td>04 August 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(† Excludes LLB, MBBS, BDS and all TNE programmes)

The above revised deadlines require the Late Summer Exam period to be deferred from the first two weeks of August to the last two weeks of August and assume that Schools / Institutes will advise students who may have failed modules in July that they will need to resit in August.

ALTERNATIVE ASSESSMENTS

Alternative assessments should be designed to provide the Module Organiser and their fellow assessors with a basis on which to evaluate that the student has achieved the intended learning outcomes. Details of the alternative assessments will be released to students online and students will make their submissions online (via QMPlus). A backup copy of the student’s submission for any alternative assessment should also be submitted directly to the email address as directed by the School / Institute.

Due to the challenge of students working in different time zones and, even within the UK, with different levels of access to computers and the internet, the exercise should be designed to be completed typically within 24, 48 or 72 hours (as determined by the Module Organiser). (In keeping with the QMUL commitment to inclusivity, the intended time required to complete the alternative assessment of up to 72 hours should incorporate sufficient time to accommodate those students with Examination Access Arrangements, e.g. students with disabilities, including specific learning differences (e.g. dyslexia) and mental health diagnoses. The maximum amount of additional time recommended at the university is 100%). If the alternative assessment is in the form of coursework, this may be completed over a period of weeks as is customary.

Where a School / Institute does need to set an online assessment of less than 24 hours, they should survey all students on the relevant module(s) and confirm that they will have robust internet access for the duration of the time-limited exam. (This would need to be established before confirming details of the alternative assessments). Students who cannot complete an assessment for these reasons will be able to claim ECs for a first sit, but we should ensure that we are not delaying awards for substantial numbers of students by using particular assessment formats where they are at all avoidable. Where schools/institutes wish to run exams of fixed durations they should follow the requirements of the paper circulated last week, including a) the ability to set up exam access arrangements for these students and b) a mechanism for dealing with questions about any exam question paper errors/typographical errors within the sitting.
Schools / Institutes are also asked to take account of students on Joint Programmes where a candidate may be required to complete more than one alternative assessment in the same 24-72-hour window. (As for examinations, alternative assessments will need to be coordinated and timetabled across Schools and even across Faculties in order to manage the workload of (a) students and (b) the systems used to receive such a large volume of online submissions, many of which will be simultaneous at the end of each 24-hour submission window).

Guidelines on developing alternative assessments have been developed by the QM Academy, and are available here: https://elearning.qmul.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Guidelines-for-Constructing-Alternative-Assessments.docx.

(These principles apply to those alternative assessments set and marked by staff within QMUL and cannot extend to any intercollegiate exams set by other universities as part of a QMUL degree. While QMUL cannot determine the nature of assessments for modules run by partner institutions, the principles for award or progression as defined above will still be applied in considering marks returned for intercollegiate programmes.)

EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Students may claim for extenuating circumstances in the usual way. However, in addition to the usual grounds for ECs students may claim on the grounds of employment and/or caring responsibilities (there are usually limitations on those grounds), and on a lack of appropriate equipment or technology to complete assessments. Household circumstances (such as a lack of private space in which to undertake an alternative assessment) will also constitute an EC for assessment.

Additionally, students may self-certify for assessments during the current situation, i.e. a student does not need to supply any supporting evidence for an EC claim to be accepted (but must still submit the claim itself, in the usual manner). (This is in accordance with a direct instruction from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator.)

If you have a query that is not covered by the above guidance, please can you email this to eo-setl@qmul.ac.uk so that it can be considered and responded to by the Education Support Sub-Group.

Anthony Warrens (Dean for Education, School of Medicine & Dentistry)

Christina Perry (Dean for Education, Faculty of Humanities & Social Sciences)

Tony Michael (Dean for Education, Faculty of Science & Engineering)

For and on behalf of the Coronavirus Response Education Support Sub-Group

31 March 2020
Supplementary details on assessment, progression and award

This document should be read and applied in addition to the previous staff communication. The details below are the official policies of Queen Mary, and should be followed in full – this is not a guidance document.

1. Double marking and moderation of assessment

With many adjustments to our assessments this year, it is vital that we are able to demonstrate fair and consistent marking. This means that we should aim to apply Code of Practice on Double-Marking and Moderation as usual where we can, with the following exception to its normal provisions: where moderation is used, in cases where the normal minimum sample size is 25% this can be decreased to a minimum of 20%. Where the normal minimum sample size is 10%, there is no change. Samples can never contain fewer that ten students’ submissions (as usual).

However, we recognise that in some cases it will be impossible to apply the Code in full. The following are the absolute minimum requirements; where possible higher thresholds should be applied, and an exam board should not adopt the minimum requirements for every one of their modules without good cause:

- Double marking is still an absolute requirement for dissertations and projects. For other modules moderation can be adopted in favour of double marking (where either is possible).
- Where the first marker is a new or inexperienced member of staff, double marking or moderation is an absolute requirement.
- In other cases, where double marking/moderation is not possible single-marking will be accepted. However, module organisers must be paired with an experienced colleague in the field who can provide advice on any marking issue. Module organisers on team taught modules must take particular care to ensure calibration between markers.
- Module grade averages must be checked against those from the last iteration of that module to provide a check on consistency over time. Any significant anomalies should be reviewed and – if warranted - addressed and external examiners provided with a spreadsheet containing all revised module averages. The externals should look at this as a whole and agree whether grade averages are in line with those of previous years and whether any anomalies have been explained.
- A module impact report (see section 3, below) must be completed for every module, and this should include what was done in terms of marking.

2. External examiners

In line with our previous guidance, external examiners should be used as much as possible and wherever possible. External input is more important than ever in these extraordinary times, and guidance from the Quality Assurance Agency indicates an expectation of business as usual, here. Some externals will be unable to act, or unable to cover as much material as usual. Please review external sample sizes where possible, ensuring that you still provide enough material for them to make an informed judgement. Where external review proves impossible, make a note of this in the module impact report (below); if this applies to a significant number of modules, please raise this with your Faculty Dean for Education as a concern. The absolute minimum level for involvement of external examiners is described in the final bullet-point under ‘Double-marking and moderation of assessment’, above, but this should not be unilaterally adopted for all modules without good reason.
3. Module impact reports

In line with advice from the Quality Assurance Agency, Subject Examination Boards are asked to create module impact reports for consideration at their meetings. This will normally be a sentence or two for each module, perhaps in a table or spreadsheet, noting:

- Whether and how the module was affected by the impact of Covid-19.
- If so, what action was taken in respect of:
  - Adjustments to delivery.
  - Adjustments to assessment.
  - Adjustments to marking, double-marking/moderation, and external examiner review.

This will be an important document in justifying our approaches and marking to regulators and students, including academic appeals, especially given the changes that will apply to some modules for marking and review under points 1 and 2, above.

4. MSci/MEng progression and change of programme

MEng and MSci programmes require students to achieve a weighted aggregate mark of 60.0+ to progress to year four on top of the credit requirements. That threshold has been waived, but schools should communicate with students who they think would struggle at level 7 to discuss their options, and whether they might be better choosing to withdraw with a bachelors award.

Where a student currently on a bachelors degree wishes to change programme to the associated BEng/MEng, the usual requirements remain in place. There is no automatic right to transfer.

5. Progression to a year abroad (other than BA Modern Languages)

The usual regulations apply. A student must not have failed any modules, and must have a weighted average of at least 60.0 to be eligible. However, the 2019/20 year average that contributes to that weighted mark will exclude the poorest 30 credits worth of marks. Please note that we may find externally imposed limitations on whether students are able to go overseas in 2020/21.

6. Deferral of an optional year abroad

A student scheduled to study abroad in 2020/21 may choose to defer that until 2021/22. Requests will be managed on a case-by-case basis by the Global Opportunities Office. The School of Languages, Linguistics and Film has discretion to set its own policy on this point for the BA Modern Languages and associated programmes. Please note that we may find externally imposed limitations on whether students are able to go overseas in 2020/21.

7. Application of award rules to different groups

- Students currently in the final year (including those who first took it in a previous year, eg resitters and those returning from interruption) will be considered under the alternative award rules communicated recently. The rules will carry forward for these students if they do not complete this year due to, eg, ECs or resits.
- Part-time and variable mode students are treated as above – these are effectively in the final developmental year for the whole duration of their studies, even where this spans multiple academic or calendar years. When discounting the weakest credits for these students, those credits do not have to come from 2019/20 (this maintains parity with discounting semester A modules for full time students, which were equally unaffected by the impact of Covid-19).
- Students not currently in the final year will be considered for progression/award in subsequent years on the standard regulations that they entered under, not the alternative provisions. It is therefore important to advise students where it is mathematically impossible for them to ever
reach the eventual award thresholds (though bear in mind that many will have trailing resits/first sits that they can take in late summer 2019/20 or in 2020/21 to make good the deficits. In some cases that may result in a considerable study load on top of the 2020/21 diet – these students can choose to resit out of attendance in 2020/21). Please note that the final bullet point may have to be reassessed depending on national circumstances at the start of the 2020/21 academic year – if that is the case, any amendments would only be to a student’s advantage.

8. Borderline classification policy
The borderline classification policy has been amended. All students within 1.5% of a classification borderline will now fall into the zone of consideration. Those of them with at least half of the final year credits being used in classification at the higher level will be raised to the next level (eg, for a BA/BSc/BEng, 45 of the best 90 final year credits would need to be at the higher level, rather than the usual 60 of 120). A student with fewer than half of those credits at the higher level cannot be raised to the next classification band, even if they are within 1% of the border as this would not represent adequate evidence of attainment at that level.

9. Regulation 3.56.vi (2019/20)
Previously regulation 3.82ii, this allows the discounting of up to 30 credits of final year modules from the calculation of the classifying mark, for certain UG awards. We have in effect applied this to all students this year by discounting the weakest 30 credits. Regulation 3.56.vi cannot be used on top of that (and other additional provisions, including ECs and the borderline policy) as this would place an extremely high weighting on extremely small group of assessments.

10. Extenuating circumstances: fit to sit
Queen Mary has previously agreed (and communicated) that students will be able to self-certify for extenuating circumstances (ie, submit claims without evidence).

Queen Mary has, additionally, partly lifted the fit to sit policy for assessments. A student who has attempted an assessment may subsequently submit an EC claim and have it accepted, but may only do so up to the relevant school/institute’s deadline for submission of ECs. Students cannot claim beyond that point and no results (provisional or otherwise) should be released before the SEBs so as not to direct student behaviour on the basis of marks achieved rather than fitness to sit. As always, we cannot give additional marks for ECs; acceptance of ECs here would mean voiding the original attempt and giving a first sit at the next normally available opportunity. This applies only to assessments taking place in the affected period, not to assessments from earlier in the year.

Finally, where a student does not submit or complete an assessment, we will treat that as ECs – even if no claim is made – and award a first sit without penalty at the next opportunity. What would normally be recorded as a 0NS (non-submission) should therefore be recorded as 0NA (certified absence). This recognises that some students will be unable to either complete assessments or submit ECs, and should help to reduce the number of late EC claims and appeals requiring consideration from schools/institutes.

11. Late submission of assessments, including timed ‘examinations’
School/institutes have already adjusted submission deadlines by up to two weeks. Where a student does not submit, or submits after that deadline the late work penalty will apply as usual – this ensures that there is still a fixed deadline for submission (though bear in mind the changes to the EC policy, above).
Timed assessments including 24/48 hour ‘exams’ will cease to be valid measures of attainment after the submission deadline, and rather than deducting five marks a day for seven days, we will apply an immediate mark of zero (which, again, can be waived with ECs). This is provided for by the standard late work penalty (regulation 3.48.ii).

12. Subject and Degree Examination Board dates
Revised dates for Degree Examination Boards and for Subject Examination Board submissions were communicated previously, and these have not changed. However, please note that the SEB deadline is for submission of all paperwork and marks to ARCS – it is strongly recommended that you do not schedule SEBs close to that deadline as you are likely to need several days for post-SEB checks, amendments, and the writing and checking of minutes and reports. Paperwork must be submitted by 12 noon on the day of the deadline, and the deadline is absolute – it has been set to give as much time as possible to SEBs, and this has meant a reduction in the time available for DEB preparation. If the 12 noon deadline is not met we cannot guarantee consideration of your recommendations at the DEB. ARCS would be very grateful to receive submissions ahead of that deadline where that is possible.

There is a longer SEB window this year. The additional SEB time is intended to allow for extra checks and reviews, particularly around the amended regulations; it is very strongly recommended that you use some of that time to hold a pre-board to carry out records checks prior to your main SEB. It is essential that if you will be entering any late marks beyond that date that you keep other SEBs updated, especially where there are joint honours programmes – the other SEB otherwise risks making incorrect recommendations based on partial data (this is not a situation particular to 2020, but we should be particularly careful).

Undergraduate SEBs (except MBBS and BDS, where dates are set locally)
- Mark entry deadline/TMR is run for the first time: Friday 3 July, 5pm
- SEBs can be held: 6-14 July (you can meet before or very slightly after this, but bear in mind that marks from other schools will not be final before 3 July, and that you need to allow time for post meeting actions and paperwork before 17 July.
- Deadline for submission of paperwork and post-SEB changes in SITS: Friday 17 July, 12 noon
- DEB: Friday 24 July

Postgraduate SEBs
- Mark entry deadline/TMR is run for the first time: Friday 3 July, 5pm
- SEBs can be held: 6-27 July (you can meet before or very slightly after this, but bear in mind that marks from other schools will not be final before 3 July, and that you need to allow time for post meeting actions and paperwork before 31 July.
- Deadline for submission of paperwork and post-SEB changes in SITS: Friday 31 July, 12 noon
- DEB: Tuesday 4 August

Please inform ARCS of your SEB date, once set, by emailing Alice de Havillan. If you wish to meet before 3 July please make that clear, as TMR will need to be run to allow reports to function.

Late summer SEBs (and late summer resits)
Further information on these dates will be circulated in due course, but these will be held later than the dates published at the start of the 2019/21 academic year.
Autumn PGT SEBs
The original dates will still apply. However, we aim to have an additional set of SEBs and DEBs in January/February 2021 to make awards to students who suffered delays and were granted extensions (this is not an additional assessment point – it is for extensions, not for considering the results of resits/first sits approved at the October boards).

13. Transcripts
It is expected that a general statement will be added to the transcripts of all students taking assessments this academic year. This text is being developed in conjunction with a number of other Russell Group universities, and is likely to read: “During 2019/20 all UK universities were affected by the Covid-19 pandemic, this seriously affected assessment methods and the delivery of teaching. This should be taken into account when considering student outcomes for the 2019/20 academic year.”

A Covid-19 specific grade/code will be developed for those modules where students had elected not to complete the alternative assessments for up to 30 credits in Semester B. The new code will be displayed against the modules on the transcript, alongside the general statement. Further details on this will follow.

14. Setting up of assessment and rubrics
The following guides have been produced by the ELU to explain the setting up, management and marking of online assessments through QMPlus. The guides are intended to give assistance with the most common assessment types, including essay submission using Turnitin, quizzes and video submission. Online training on these topics will also be scheduled during the coming weeks. If you have further queries about setting up assessments and rubrics, please contact the ELU at elearning@qmul.ac.uk

1. Creating a Turnitin assignment (assist with detecting plagiarism)
2. How to create & manage a Quiz
3. Creating and marking a video assignment
4. Creating a standard QMplus assignment

15. Advice to students on submitting assessments
The following guides will be useful to students, especially those who are unfamiliar with QMPlus assessments. Different guides will be useful depending on the assessment format planned for each student. A full list of student guides is available [here](#).

1. How to submit a QMPlus assignment
2. How to resubmit an assignment (if allowed)
3. Submission receipts for assignments
4. How to use equations within QMPlus
5. Uploading a video to your MyMedia area
6. Submitting a video assignment