INTERNATIONAL TEACHING PARTNER ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

LANCASTER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE @ BEIJING JIAOTONG UNIVERSITY (LUC@BJTU)

POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

(APPLICABLE FROM OCTOBER 2022)

Academic Quality, Standards & Conduct

LUC@BJTU Postgraduate Assessment Regulations

MARP 2022-23

POSTGRADUATE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS FOR POSTGRADUATE PROGRAMMES DELIVERED AT LANCASTER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BEIJING JIAOTONG UNIVERSITY, CHINA

CONTENTS

BP 1 POSTGRADUATE AWARDS 1

BP 2 STRUCTURE OF MASTERS DEGREE PROGRAMMES AT LUC@BJTU 1

BP 3 CRITERIA FOR AWARD 1

BP 4 PROGRAMME STRUCTURE 2

BP 5 CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS 2

BP 6 REASSESSMENT 4

BP 7 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES 4

BP 8 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS 7

BP 9 PUBLISHED INFORMATION 8

BP 10 EXCLUSION 8

APPENDICES TO THE LUC@BJTU POSTGRADUATE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS 9

APPENDIX 1: GRADING TABLE 9

APPENDIX 2: GRADE TRANSLATION 10

APPENDIX 3: GUIDANCE FOR SCALING OF MARKS 12

POSTGRADUATE REGULATIONS FOR POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT PROGRAMMES DELIVERED AT LANCASTER UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT BEIJING JIAOTONG UNIVERSITY, CHINA

BP 1 POSTGRADUATE AWARDS

Postgraduate awards currently offered at the Lancaster University College at Beijing Jiaotong University (hereafter LUC@BJTU) campus:

Undergraduate awards	**Level**	**FTE period of study (normal)**	**Normal total credit value**	**Normal minimum credit at level of award**
Masters degree: MA; MSc	7	2 years	180	150
Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)Postgraduate Diploma (PGDip)	7	Up to 2 years	120	90
Postgraduate Certificate (PGCert)	7	Up to 2 years	60	40

BP 2 STRUCTURE OF MASTERS DEGREE PROGRAMMES AT LUC@BJTU

BP 2.1 Masters degrees comprise learning at level 7, normally with 180 credits of assessment of which a substantial proportion represents a dissertation.

BP 2.2 Postgraduate degree programmes and assessment arrangements are based on the principle that the load on students in terms of total teaching, learning and assessment activities should be equally distributed between each academic session.

BP 2.3 The arrangement for each programme of study shall be published in student handbooks and in the Courses Handbook, available online for staff and current students.

BP 3 CRITERIA FOR AWARD

BP 3.1 BJTU uses a percentage scale for marking Postgraduate awards.

BP 3.2 For all modules that contribute to a taught Masters degree and other postgraduate awards, a passing mark shall be 60% with credit for a module being awarded when the overall mark for the module is 60% or greater. The tables provided in Appendices 1 & 2 sets out how this passing mark aligns with LU's postgraduate scale, and how grades should be translated between institutions.

BP 3.3 In order to qualify for the overall award, students must have attained in full the minimum credit requirement for the programme and passed all contributory modules with a passing mark as outlined in BP 3.2 above.

BP 3.4 Students studying on a LUC@BJTU partnership programme receive two awards – one from Lancaster University based upon modules contributing to the Lancaster degree, and one from BJTU based upon modules contributing to the BJTU degree. Should a student meet the requirements for the Lancaster award but not for the BJTU award, their Lancaster award will be held in abeyance whilst the student is provided with the opportunity to re-take appropriate modules that contribute to the BJTU degree award. Once the student achieves an overall passing mark for their BJTU degree, both degrees will be awarded. The original marks for those modules that contribute to the Lancaster award will remain unchanged for the purposes of the Lancaster degree (i.e. they will not reflect any improvement in results following resit for BJTU award purposes).

BP 3.5 Students who meet the requirements for the Lancaster award but who, after re-taking the modules contributing to the BJTU award as outlined in BP 3.4 above, remain ineligible to graduate from BJTU, will be awarded the appropriate exit award for the credit achieved.

BP 4 PROGRAMME STRUCTURE

BP 4.1 Requirements for progression from one stage (or element) of a postgraduate taught programme to the next (for example taught module stage to dissertation/project/ placement) should be specified at the time the programme is approved and communicated to all students when they first enrol on the programme.

BP 5 CLASSIFICATION OF AWARDS

PT 5.1 Once students have attained sufficient credit, taking full countenance to exceptional circumstances as reported from the Exceptional Circumstances Committee, reassessment, they will be considered for awards of the University.

PT 5.2 All postgraduate taught awards (PGCert/PGDip/Masters) are available for classification irrespective of whether these are 'target', 'intermediate' or 'exit' awards[4]. The MRes is also a classifiable award.

PT 5.3 Where awards are classified an overall average for the programme should be computed in accordance with the approved credit weightings for each module. This average should be expressed to one decimal place and be used to determine the class of degree to be awarded in accordance with the class boundaries as defined below. In respect of a redeemed failed module (capped at 60%), the resit module score will be used as part of the computation of the overall mean unless the resit module score is lower than the original, in which case the original score will be used.

PT 5.4 There will be three classes of awards: distinction, merit and pass. Where the overall average, calculated to one decimal place, falls within one of the following ranges, the examination boards will recommend the award stated:

84.5%+ distinction

74.5-84.4% merit

60-74.4% pass

Below 60.0% fail

PT 5.5 Merit and distinction classifications are not awarded in programmes where all assessment is wholly collaborative, involving peer assessment in each assignment.

PT 5.6 Where the mean overall average falls within one of the following 'borderline' ranges:

83.0-84.4% either distinction or merit

73.0-74.4% either merit or pass

The examining bodies will apply the following rubric for deciding the degree class to be recommended:

(a) For all students, where a student falls into a borderline then the higher award should be given where half or more of the credits from across the programme are in the higher class.

(b) Borderline students not meeting the criterion described in (a) above would normally be awarded the lower class of degree unless (c) applies.

(c) That for all students, borderline or not, examination boards should continue to make a special case to the Committee of Senate via the PGT Classification and Assessment Review Board for any student where the class of degree to be recommended deviates from that derived from a strict application of the regulations. Such cases would be based around circumstances pertaining to individual students where these circumstances have not already been taken into account.

PT 5.7 Candidates for a taught Masters degree who fail to meet the requirements for the award of such a degree having exhausted all reassessment opportunities or who withdraw from the programme will be awarded either a Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate, provided that:

(a) such an award has been defined in the programme regulations; and

(b) the student has been awarded sufficient credit for these lower awards as defined above.

PT 5.8 Candidates for a Postgraduate Diploma who fail to meet the requirements for such an award having exhausted all reassessment opportunities or who withdraw from the programme will be awarded a Postgraduate Certificate, provided that:

(a) such an award has been defined in the programme regulations; and

(b) the student has been awarded sufficient credit for these lower awards as defined above.

PT 5.9 Academic judgement does not constitute ground for appeal; however, students who wish to challenge the process may do so under the procedures for Academic Appeals.

PT 5.10 The Postgraduate Taught Classification and Assessment Review Board (CARB) considers postgraduate taught non-standard cases as recommended by the relevant examination board, where the class of degree recommended by the board deviates from the class of degree derived from a strict application of the regulations. The procedures for the CARB will follow the regulations as laid out in the General Regulations for Assessment and Award, section GR 2.8.3.

BP 6 REASSESSMENT

BP 6.1 A student who fails a module will be required to undertake a reassessment for that module in order to be considered for progression to the next stage. If the module score after reassessment is an improvement on the original score, the reassessment score will count subject to a cap of 60%; otherwise the original score will stand. The resulting score will count towards the overall average.

BP 6.2 Students who have not passed all modules after a resit opportunity, will, immediately following the examination board at which the student was considered, be offered the opportunity to retake the module in the following year (uncapped first sit and capped resit opportunity). Only one retake opportunity will be offered for any failed module.

BP 6.3 The precise form of reassessment is for the department to decide, but the following principles should be borne in mind:

(a) the principal purpose of reassessment is to re-examine the learning objectives which have been failed at the first attempt;

(b) students who have failed all elements of assessment at the first attempt should not be advantaged over those who have failed only a part of the assessment.

BP 6.4 If the module percentage mark after reassessment is an improvement on the original mark, the new percentage mark will count subject to a cap of 60%; otherwise the original percentage mark will stand. The resulting percentage mark will count towards the overall average.

BP 6.5 Where reassessment is prohibited for reasons of professional accreditation this will be clearly stated in the assessment guidelines provided to students and alternative awards and other available options identified.

BP 6.6 Students may not seek reassessment to improve a passing grade unless required for professional accreditation and allowed under specific accreditation arrangements.

BP 6.7 The overall profile will only then be considered for classification when all the results of reassessment are available.

BP 7 INCOMPLETE ASSESSMENT AND EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES

BP 7.1 For the purposes of these regulations ‘exceptional circumstances’ will mean properly evidenced and approved claims from students that demonstrate good cause as to why their performance and achievements have been adversely affected by means which have not been fully addressed through extension and other available assessment procedures.

BP 7.2 For the purposes of these regulations ‘good cause’ will mean illness or other relevant personal circumstances affecting a student and resulting in either the student’s failure to attend an examination, or submit coursework at or by the due time, or otherwise satisfy the requirements of the scheme of assessment appropriate to his or her programme of studies; or, the student’s performance in examination or other instrument of assessment being manifestly prejudiced.

BP 7.3 A chronic medical condition, for which due allowance has already been made, will not itself be considered a good cause although a short-term exacerbation of such a condition might be so judged.

BP 7.4 'Evidence' will mean a report descriptive of the medical condition or other adverse personal circumstances which are advanced by the student for consideration as amounting to good cause. Such a report should include a supporting statement from an appropriate person. Where the report refers to a medical condition of more than five days' duration the report must be completed by an appropriate medical practitioner who would be requested to comment on how the medical condition concerned would be likely (if this were the case) to have affected the student's ability to prepare for or carry out the assessment(s) in question.

BP 7.5 Where an incomplete assessment may be the result of good cause, it will be the responsibility of the student concerned to make the circumstances known to their department or equivalent body and to provide appropriate evidence. Notification later than forty-eight hours after the examination, or after the date at which submission of the work for assessment was due, will not normally be taken into account unless acceptable circumstances have prevented the student from notifying the department within this time.

BP 7.6 Lancaster and BJTU will have a joint Exceptional Circumstances Panel whose primary responsibility it is to consider claims of good cause for the programmes they administer. Any such claims would be subject to confirmation by the examining bodies at a later date. The Exceptional Circumstances Panel would be required to meet at least once per annum prior to the final Examining bodies, but might usefully meet to consider claims of good cause on a more frequent basis. The Exceptional Circumstances Panel will produce minutes of its meetings to be submitted to the appropriate examination body. Guidance on the management and operation of Exceptional Circumstances Panel can be found in the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

BP 7.7 In considering claims of good cause:

(a) the evidence provided by the student claiming good cause, and any relevant and available material submitted by him or her for assessment will be scrutinised;

(b) fairness to the individual student claiming good cause must be balanced with fairness to other students and the integrity of the assessment as a whole;

(c) in the event of the student having failed to attend an examination or examinations, or having failed to submit course material or other work for assessment at or by the due time, it will be determined whether the failure to attend or submit has been justified by good cause;

(d) in the event of the student having submitted work for assessment by examination or otherwise, it will be determined whether such work has been manifestly prejudiced by good cause. If such prejudice is established the work affected will normally be deemed not to have been submitted.

BP 7.8 Where it is determined that the evidence presented does not support the student's claim that they were prevented by good cause from attending an examination or from submitting work for assessment, the student will be awarded Grade N (a score of zero) for the assessment or assessments in question. Where work is submitted but the student makes a claim that it has been affected by good cause (or a late penalty is applied), and the evidence presented does not support the student's claim then his or her work will be assessed (or penalised) as though no claim of good cause had been received and the student's grade for the module will be calculated accordingly.

BP 7.9 In the event of incomplete assessment arising from good cause being established the student will normally be expected to complete his or her assessment by attending the

examination at a subsequent session, or submitting outstanding work for assessment, if an opportunity to do so occurs within his or her period of study. In considering whether this requirement should apply, the desirability of the student's assessment being conducted in full should be balanced with the practical considerations and financial costs to the student and the University of providing a later completion date. Consideration should also be given to the student's other assessment commitments to ensure that they are not unreasonably burdened. In order to permit such completion:

(a) a special sitting of an examination may be arranged, or the student will be required to attend for examination at a scheduled session; and/or

(b) a date for completion of non-examination assessment will be set; as appropriate in the circumstances. In any such event, that sitting or submission will be regarded as the student's first attempt if the examination or assessment missed would itself have been his or her first attempt.

BP 7.10 Where it is determined that the evidence presented supports the student's claim that they were prevented by good cause from completing work for assessment on or by the due time and where no means of substituting an alternative assessment may be found, the assessment(s) in question will be excluded (without penalty) from the calculation of the module aggregation score(s) and the following regulations will apply.

(a) The extent to which the student's total assessment has been completed will be determined as a percentage, taking into account the relative weights attributed to those assessments as published in the relevant approved assessment scheme.

(b) Examining bodies will make an overall judgement of the student's work submitted for assessment, using as far as possible the standards and criteria applied in respect of the work of other students.

(c) At module level where the student has:

(i) completed 33% or more of the total summative assessment required, the examining bodies can recommend an overall module result on the basis of work completed so long as that work is deemed to demonstrate attainment against substantial elements of the module's learning outcomes;

(ii) completed less than 33% of the work required for assessment, they will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a grade in the module. In such cases they should be given an opportunity to complete the missing work as a first attempt.

(d) At programme level where the student has:

(i) completed 75% or more of the total work required for programme assessment, the Examining bodies will recommend an award or other outcome on the basis of the work completed;

(ii) completed at least 30% but less than 75% of the work required for assessment, an Aegrotat (unclassified honours) degree may be recommended if the completed portion is of honours standard, or, if the completed portion is not of honours standard, no award will be made;

(iii) completed less than 30% of the work required for assessment they will be regarded as not having completed sufficient assessment to be awarded a degree.

BP 7.11 Where examining bodies decide to recommend an Aegrotat (unclassified honours) degree, and this recommendation is approved by the Committee of Senate via the Classification and Assessment Review Board then the Aegrotat degree will be awarded forthwith and the student will be invited to attempt, within two years, to qualify for the award of a classified honours degree by completing examinations and/or other work, under conditions and at times specified by the examining bodies, and approved by the Committee of Senate via the Classification and Assessment Review Board. Students who:

(a) undertake the further assessment specified, and who achieve the required level of attainment, will subsequently be awarded an appropriate classified honours degree;

(b) attempt further assessment, but who fail to achieve the required level of attainment for the award of a classified honours degree, will retain the Aegrotat degree already awarded;

(c) decline the invitation to attempt further assessment within two years, will retain the Aegrotat degree already awarded.

BP 8 CONSIDERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF RESULTS

BP 8.1 Senate has ultimate authority to determine all results of assessment leading to Lancaster University credit and awards. It exercises its authority to make final decisions as to granting of all credit-bearing University awards, primarily through the Committee of Senate with non-standard cases considered and recommended by the Classification and Assessment Review Board.

BP 8.2 The Committee of Senate provides:

(a) formal confirmation (or not) of recommendations from Boards of Examiners for the award to individual students of a named degree (i.e. qualification and subject) of a particular class;

(b) formal approval of recommendations from Boards of Examiners that students be awarded no degree with or without a further re-sit opportunity (i.e. Fails);

(c) formal ratification of second year results (of courses finally assessed at the end of the second year) including the timing and nature of re-sit opportunities for failed elements.

Further procedural details are set out in the General Regulations for Assessment and Award.

BP 8.3 For each degree programme approved by the University there will be an Examination Board comprising external and internal examiners which will be responsible for the assurance of standards through the exercise of their academic judgement both directly in the assessment of students' work and indirectly in the design of specific forms of assessment. The constitution and terms of reference for examination bodies within the constituent elements of the University are set out in the section on examination boards in the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

BP 8.4 The examination bodies will receive decisions from the Exceptional Circumstances Panel. Examination bodies cannot, of themselves, reconsider or change decisions of the Exceptional Circumstances Panel. Examination bodies may challenge decisions of

Exceptional Circumstances Panels by referring final decisions to the Committee of Senate via the Classification and Assessment Review Board, or equivalent body.

BP 8.5 Boards of Examiners for Years 3 and 4 will consider the results of examinations and final marks and make recommendations to the Committee of Senate with non-standard cases referred for consideration and recommendation via the Classification and Assessment Review Board as to the award of degrees (and the classes of degrees) within the approved degree programme classification scheme. These Boards of Examiners also consider and confirm marks derived from all non-final year modules taken and examined in the academic year under consideration. Details of the role and operation of Boards of Examiners can be found in the section on examination boards in the General Regulations for Assessment & Award.

BP 8.6 The business of the examination boards will be minuted and the minutes will include a record of the External Examiner's adjudications, comments and recommendations, as well as particular decisions made by the Board. The minutes will also record the decisions of the Exceptional Circumstances Panel for each candidate considered by that committee (although detailed discussion of circumstances should not be undertaken at the Examination Board). The minutes must include a list of attendees (together with their status as external or internal examiners or assessor). This record of the proceedings of the board will be restricted and made available only to: the participating examiners and assessors; the Vice-Chancellor and other officers of the University as appropriate; the Committee of Senate and the Classification and Assessment Review Board; and appropriate Academic Appeal and Review Panels as defined in the chapter on Academic Appeals. Where the examination body has exercised its discretion in a particular case, as provided by these Regulations, the Committee of Senate via the Classification and Assessment Review Board will normally uphold its decision providing it had the support of the majority of the external examiners present at that examination board.

BP 9 PUBLISHED INFORMATION

BP 9.1 The determination of results and the classification of University degrees are subject always to ratification by the Committee of Senate and will be regarded as provisional until ratified.

BP 9.2 Immediately after the meetings of the relevant examining bodies, departments or equivalent may notify students of their provisional degree results.

BP 9.3 Students will receive certificates and transcripts from both Lancaster and BJTU. The Lancaster transcript includes notes of clarification including a statement that the programme was studied at LUC@BJTU campus in Weihai.

BP 10 EXCLUSION

BP 10.1 Students who, after undertaking agreed reassessment opportunities, fail to meet the stipulated criteria for progression or final award will be excluded from the University. Students are entitled to appeal against exclusion under the University's Academic Appeals procedures.

APPENDICES TO THE LUC@BJTU POSTGRADUATE ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS

APPENDIX 1: GRADING TABLE

Result	Broad Descriptor	Percentage Range	Primary verbal descriptors for attainment of Intended Learning Outcomes	LU Degree Class
Pass	Excellent	84.5-100	Exemplary range and depth of attainment of intended learning outcomes, secured by discriminating command of a comprehensive range of relevant materials and analyses, and by deployment of considered judgement relating to key issues, concepts and procedures	Distinction
Pass	Good	74.5-84.4	Conclusive attainment of virtually all intended learning outcomes, clearly grounded on a close familiarity with a wide range of supporting evidence, constructively utilised to reveal appreciable depth of understanding	Merit
Pass	Satisfactory	60-74.4	Clear attainment of most of the intended learning outcomes, some more securely grasped than others, resting on a circumscribed range of evidence and displaying a variable depth of understanding	Pass
Fail	Marginal Fail	45-59	Attainment deficient in respect of specific intended learning outcomes, with mixed evidence as to the depth of knowledge and weak deployment of arguments or deficient manipulations	Fail
Fail	Fail	30-44	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in critical respects, lacking secure basis in relevant factual and analytical dimensions	
Fail	Poor Fail	15-29	Attainment of intended learning outcomes appreciably deficient in respect of nearly all intended learning outcomes, with irrelevant use of materials and incomplete and flawed explanation	
Fail	Very Poor Fail	0	No convincing evidence of attainment of any intended learning outcomes, such treatment of the subject as is in evidence being directionless and fragmentary	

Other transcript indicators		
Flag	Broad descriptor	Definition
M	Malpractice	Failure to comply, in the absence of good cause, with the published requirements of the course or programme; and/or a serious breach of regulations
N	Non-submission	Failure to submit assignment for assessment
P	Penalty	Failure to submit within regulation requirements (late submission, improper format, etc.)
R	Resit	Attainment of a passing grade through reassessment processes
DP	Decision Pending	The grade is subject to investigation

APPENDIX 2: GRADE TRANSLATION

MSc Calibration

LU mark	BJTU equivalent	Performance Bands		LU mark	BJTU equivalent	Performance Bands
100	100			49	57.2	
99	99.0			48	56.0	
98	99.0			47	54.8	
97	98.0			46	53.7	
96	98.0			45	52.5	
95	97.0			44	51.3	
94	97.0			43	50.2	
93	96.0			42	49.0	
92	96.0			41	47.8	
91	95.0			40	46.7	
90	95.0			39	45.5	
89	94.0			38	44.3	
88	94.0			37	43.2	
87	93.0	Distinction		36	42.0	
86	93.0			35	40.8	
85	92.0			34	39.7	
84	92.0			33	38.5	
83	91.0			32	37.3	
82	91.0			31	36.2	
81	90.0			30	35.0	Fail
80	90.0			29	33.8	
79	89.0			28	32.7	
78	89.0			27	31.5	
77	88.0			26	30.3	
76	88.0			25	29.2	
75	87.0			24	28.0	
74	87.0			23	26.8	
73	86.0			22	25.7	
72	86.0			21	24.5	
71	85.0			20	23.3	
70	84.5			19	22.2	
69	84.4			18	21.0	
68	83.0			17	19.8	
67	82.0			16	18.7	
66	81.0			15	17.5	
65	80.0			14	16.3	
64	79.0			13	15.2	
63	78.0	Merit		12	14.0	
62	77.0			11	12.8	

61	76.0			10	11.7	
60	74.5			9	10.5	
59	74.4	Pass		8	9.3	
58	72.0			7	8.2	
57	70.5			6	7.0	
56	69.0			5	5.8	
55	67.5			4	4.7	
54	66.0			3	3.5	
53	64.5			2	2.3	
52	63.0			1	1.2	
51	61.5			0	0.0	
50	60.0					

APPENDIX 3: GUIDANCE FOR SCALING OF MARKS

1. All assessments and marking schemes should be created with the aim of ensuring that the resulting grades/marks give a good indication of the ability and application of the students. However, it is inevitable that on occasion this will not work as planned.

2. Reasons may include a misprinted examination paper, the interruption of an examination or, in a science laboratory, an instrumental malfunction not obvious at the time of the experiment; or it may simply be that examiners agree, using their academic judgment and with the benefit of hindsight, that an assessment, or part of an assessment, proved to be significantly harder or easier than expected.

3. In such cases it is appropriate to consider whether the marks should be scaled. Scaling may be of the overall mark for the module or of any assessment therein.

4. Although an unusual distribution of grades/marks is not of itself a sufficient reason for scaling to be applied, it may be an indication that something has gone wrong. For this reason, if the overall mean aggregation score for any module lies outside the range 14.5-17.5 (or 58% to 68% for percentage marks) then examiners must consider whether or not there is a case for the marks to be scaled.

   Note:

   For International and Regional Teaching Partnership provision the range outside which scaling must be considered is normally 13.5-17.0 (or 55% to 66.7%). The range outside which BJTU average module marks might be considered for scaling needs to take into account the higher pass mark of 60% (as opposed to 40% at Lancaster and other Strategic Teaching Partners); the approximate equivalent range for scaling is therefore 72% - 82%.

5. Where the possibility of scaling is being discussed, the precise method should also be discussed and should reflect both the nature of the assessment and the size of the cohort. Both the reason for scaling and the method used must be justified within the minutes of the examining body. If scaling is discussed and not used, the reason for not scaling must be recorded in the minutes. In all cases both the original and the scaled marks must be permanently recorded.

6. Where scaling is applied for the same module for at least part of its assessment on more than one occasion, the assessment practices of the module must be reviewed as appropriate.

7. Scaling may take any form as long as it preserves the ordering of students' marks; thus, for example, if Student A has a higher unscaled mark than Student B, then Student A's scaled mark must not be lower than that of Student B. Common examples of scaling methods are given below, but other methods are possible.

   (a) For work marked in letter grades, all grades may be raised or lowered by a constant amount.

   (b) For work marked in percentages, every mark may be multiplied by a constant factor, or have a constant value added to or subtracted from it, or a combination of the two.

   (c) As in (a) or (b) above, except that where marks are being reduced no pass is turned into a fail (thus, for example, where marks are in general being reduced by 10%, for an undergraduate module or assessment, all unscaled marks between 60% and 69% become scaled marks of 60%), or no condonable mark is turned into an uncondonable mark.