

Assessment Policy

LSBF Executive Education Programmes

Version 1.4

Contents

1.	Scope and Purpose	2
2.	Policy Statement	2
3.	Definitions and Terminology.....	3
4.	Objectives	5
5.	Assessment Procedure	5
6.	Grading Process	11
	Appendix One – Assessment Brief Internal Verification and External Approval form	15
	Appendix Two – External Assessor Feedback Form	17
	Document Information Table	21

1. Scope and Purpose

- 1.1** This policy covers all assessed programmes offered at LSBF Executive Education (LSBF EE) and will also apply to other assessed courses should they become a part of the curriculum in future.
- 1.2** LSBF EE currently offer assessed and non-assessed programmes; Postgraduate Certificates (which consist of at least four separate 'module' courses) and Postgraduate Diplomas (which consists of at least six 'module' courses and an independent major project) are assessed, while Short Courses, Summer/Winter Business School, Leadership Development Programme, Professional Development Programme and Management Development Programmes are non-assessed. Assessed courses are assessed through assignments¹.
- 1.3** The purpose of assessment is to ensure that effective learning of the content of each unit has taken place. Evidence of this learning, or the application of such learning, is required for each unit. This assessment of the evidence relates directly to the assessment criteria for each unit, supported by the generic grade descriptors.
- 1.4** The purpose of this assessment policy is to ensure that assessment processes are consistent and transparent, that evidence is reliable, valid, sufficient and authentic and that judgement of evidence is valid and reliable.

2. Policy Statement

LSBF EE is committed to ensuring that standards of assessment are consistent and transparent. The way learners' work is assessed must serve the stated learning objectives of the programmes and facilitate the achievement and wider development of our learners. LSBF EE gives importance to the practical application of the assessment criteria, providing realistic scenario for learners to adopt, making a maximum use of work-related practical experience.

¹ As per LSBF Executive Education Assessment Guidelines document

3. Definitions and Terminology

- **“Assessment”** is defined as the process where tutors as well as non-instructional staff (including but not limited to External Assessors and Academic Programme Managers) make judgements on evidence produced by learners against criteria upon which Learning Outcomes are measured.
- **“Assignment”** – is defined as any formally assessed components of an assessed course. Assignments may include (but are not limited to) written essays, presentations and group projects.
- **“Learning Outcomes”** describe what learners are able to do as a result of learning. It is increasingly recognised that the learning outcomes associated with professional qualifications should be clearly specified "up front", and be based on real requirements for work and/or educational progression. Assessment is then concerned with evaluating evidence of individuals' capabilities against the learning outcomes specified.
- **“Standardisation”** is a method of comparison to enable LSBF EE to review the consistency and accuracy of any given assignment.
- **“Summative Feedback”** refers to the formal written feedback provided to learners by the course tutor regarding their achievement in respect to the learning outcome(s) of a course.
- **“Formative Feedback”** refers to informal feedback provided to learners by the course tutor throughout a course, most often orally.
- **“Independent Major Project”** refers to a learner-lead project which will be undertaken under the guidance of a Major Project Supervisor. At the end of the agreed period, the project report and the supervisor contact log book will be submitted for grading.
- **“Supervisor Log Book”** refers to a template that needs to be used whenever a learner meets with their independent major project supervisor to show his/her progress. There are four mandatory meetings that a learner must have during the duration of the project. Failing to have these meetings may result in the school not accepting the project for grading.
- **“Internal Verification”** – refers to the process where a suitably qualified academic reviews assessment documents including (but not limited to) Assignment Brief, delegate submission, Grading Sheet etc. to ensure that an accurate and consistent assessment has taken place

- **“External Assessment Process”** - refers to the process where a suitably qualified academic who is external LSBF EE will review a sample of the assessed work including (but not limited to) Assignment Brief, delegate submission, Grading Sheet and the Internal Verifier feedback.
- **“Extension”** – refers to the extension of an assessment deadline. Extensions must be made prior to the deadline (with exceptions considered for Extenuating Circumstances) and approved by the Academic Programme Manager.
- **“Resubmission”** – refers exclusively to pre-graded assignments that happens as a result of a submission made by a delegate, which have received 25% or higher similarity score and/or don’t include correct referencing (e.g. in-text citations, lack of bibliography) upon first submission to turnitin.com.
- **“Re-Sit”** – refers exclusively to post-grading cases where a delegate has received less than 50% for an assignment (i.e. has failed the assignment) and makes a request to redo the same or similar assignment.
- **“Regrade”** – refers exclusively to assignments after they have been graded (i.e. post-grading) in cases where delegates or staff have cause to believe that there have been inconsistencies, including (but not limited to); arithmetic errors, processing errors, data entry errors, lack of uniformity, tutor bias etc.

4. Objectives

- 4.1** To assess learners' work with integrity by being consistent and transparent in assessment judgements and processes so that the outcomes are fair, reliable and valid.
- 4.2** To ensure that assessment standards and specifications are implemented fully (both in spirit and in letter), so that no risk is posed to the reputation of the accrediting/awarding bodies or the courses we offer.
- 4.3** To establish quality control and recording mechanisms for assignments and their assessment through a system of sampling, moderation, and internal/external verification as appropriate to the courses and programmes being offered.
- 4.4** Aid effective learning by seeking and interpreting evidence to decide the stage that learners have reached in their learning, and what further needs to take place.
- 4.5** To ensure that learners are given realistic targets and informed of their progress and to ensure that assessments lead to accurate and valid certification claims.

5. Assessment Procedure

- 5.1** All LSBF EE assessments are designed by course tutors according to the assessment criteria for each course.
- 5.2** All assessment criteria are matched to the Learning Outcomes for each course. Learning Outcomes are designed to be 'enabling objectives', or things a learner can 'do' following the successful completion of a course. Assessment criteria are designed to assess whether a learner can demonstrate sufficient mastery of the enabling objective, or can demonstrate ability to 'do' it.
- 5.3** All LSBF EE devised assignment materials are internally and/or externally verified before being issued to learners.
- 5.4** Learners are left in no doubt that any grade awarded will be subject to internal and/or external verification. It is LSBF EE policy to subject all assignments to a pre-assessment internal verification process (see Appendix A), and a sample of all assignments for any given intake (approximate sample size 10%) are subject to an External Assessor report. These processes are communicated to delegates during the induction process and by their tutor during the course, as well as being included in LSBF EE Policies and Procedures.

5.5 Learners will be given a deadline for each assignment. This deadline is communicated to delegates during the induction process by their tutor during the course, via MyPage and also contained on the Assignment Brief.

5.6 Pre-Assessment: After an Assignment Brief is designed and developed by a tutor, either the Academic Programme Manager or a tutor within the same discipline will review the Assignment Brief and complete an *Assessment Brief Internal Verification and External Approval Form* (see Appendix One).

If the assignment meets IV standards, then the form is sent to the Academic Programme Manager for final approval to be distributed to learners. If the IV standards are not met, the Assignment Brief is sent back to the tutor to be amended, and the process redone.

5.7 Post-Assessment: Once the delegates have submitted their assignments for grading, the administration team will check the assignments for plagiarism using turnitin. The delegates attendance is also checked. For delegates whose attendance has been confirmed as being less than 80% (without any extenuating circumstances or approved leave), a note is made on the relevant grading sheet recommending the delegates mark be capped at 50% (pass). To ensure that the Grading Criteria is being used correctly (i.e. that Grade Descriptors are being adhered to and that Grades are being distributed accurately) it is the policy of LSBF EE to submit 10% of all marked assignments to an Internal Verifier (IV) for a post assignment IV process, *except* in the case of new tutors.

For all tutors delivering courses at LSBF EE for the first time, 100% of assignments are selected to ensure tutors are marking to the correct standard. Once new tutors have successfully completed one full course cycle, a 10% selection of assignments will be used thereafter.

The IV will review a sample (or the totality) of the assignments for any given course/programme and complete the relevant section of the Grading Sheet. This is to ensure the grading of all assignments are consistent and meet the objectives and criteria as set out in the Assessment Brief, as well as ensuring the grading of all LSBF EE assignments meet best practice standards for fairness and equality.

In the event an issue(s) with grading has been identified the IV will attempt to rectify the issue in the first instance with the assessor. This is done by returning the grading sheet with recommendations for remedial action for the tutor. Once the tutor implements the recommendations, the IV will then perform a 100% verification of the assessed work. In the event the IV is not satisfied with the improved work, the IV will inform the Academic Programme Manager (APM) who will recall all the assignments from the tutor in question. The assignments

will all be reviewed by either another suitably qualified tutor or an External Assessor (EA - appointed through collaboration between the Managing Director, and Academic Programme Manager). Based on the outcome of the new assessment decisions, the APM and MD will meet to discuss remedial action (including appointing of a new tutor for the course in question), if it is deemed necessary. Remedial actions might include (but are not limited to) re-grading all assignments from the course tutor in question or resetting the assignment question. Following remedial activities, the new assessor will submit a report to the Academic Programme Manager.

In addition to the above, an external assessment process will take place at least annually whereby an External Assessor will review a sample of all documents considered during a normal assessment cycle, and complete an External Assessor Feedback form (see Appendix Two) for review by the Academic Planning Committee (APC).

5.8 Assessment Board: Following the conclusion of the above process, the Assessment Board is convened to discuss the following:

- Confirmation and recording of Extenuating Circumstances
- Report on delegate performance and assessment
- Review of report by External Assessor
- Consideration of delegate results for referred/deferred modules from previous cohort(s)
- EA/APM comments

The ultimate responsibility of the Assessment Board is to confirm the grades for release to the delegates, which LSBF EE aim to deliver no later than six weeks following the *deadline* of the submission of their final assignment.

5.9 Grading: Learners will receive their final course grade, along with formal summative feedback **no later than six weeks** after the *deadline* of the submission of their final assignment.

5.10 Late Submissions: The submission deadline for assignments is two weeks after the end of classes. Delegates will be notified of the exact date during the course.

The Academic Programme Manager retains the right to consider granting an extension under extraordinary circumstances². However, under normal circumstances learners are responsible

² See Extenuating Circumstances form

for adhering to all deadlines concerning their studies and it is the learners' responsibility to make sure that they are aware of these deadlines. In the event that the submission deadline is missed and an extension has not been granted, the following applies:

- ***Submission of assignment within the deadline*** – Assignment will be marked to the grading scale
- ***Submission of assignment up to one week after deadline*** - Assignment will be capped at 50% (Pass Only)
- ***Submission of assignment between one and two weeks after deadline*** - Assignment will be capped at 50% (Pass only) plus the learner will pay a £50 submission fee to cover administration costs
- ***Failure to present an assignment more than two weeks after the deadline*** – No submission accepted. Unless the learner applies for extenuating circumstances, failure to submit an assignment more than two weeks after the deadline has expired will result in failure of the course and no certificate being presented.

5.11 Feedback: Learners are provided with both summative and formative feedback and guidance on their assignments about how they may improve by capitalising on their strengths and clear constructive comments about their weakness and how these might be addressed.

Formative feedback is delivered informally throughout the course, generally in the form of oral feedback. Formal summative feedback is provided along with the course grade after the final written assignment has been marked and graded. Learners will receive their course grade and accompanying summative feedback **no later than six weeks** after submitting their final written assignment.

Resubmission: Learner's whose assignment, after it has been submitted to Turnitin, has received 25% or higher similarity score and/or do not include correct referencing (e.g. in-text citations, lack of bibliography) upon first submission to turnitin.com, will be asked to resubmit their assignment again within a period of 48 hours after being contacted regarding this, unless there are extenuating circumstances.

The tutor responsible for the original grade will be asked to grade the amended assignment using the same criteria.

Please note that a delegate may only resubmit an assignment **once** in this instance.

5.12 Re-sit If a learner fails to achieve the 50% pass grade for an assignment, they can request to submit a new assignment based on a new assignment brief within a reasonable time from the publication of the original grade, provided LSBF EE offers the course in question at the time of request.

In the event that the request for resubmission is approved by the Academic Programme Manager and the re-sit fee is received, the tutor responsible for the original grade will be asked to grade the new assignment using the same criteria.

There will be a £50 fee charged to the learner and there will not be any marks cap for successful resits.

Please note that a delegate may only re-sit an assignment **once**. *However, it is possible to re-enrol on a subsequent intake and retake the course.*

5.13 Re-grading: If a learner feels they have received an unfair grade for an assignment, they may follow the Academic Appeals process as stated in the *Academic Appeals Policy*

5.14 Academic Appeals: Delegates studying the assessed courses taught by LSBF EE have the right to appeal against the results of internal assessments. For a comprehensive explanation of the Appeal process, please refer to the *Appeals Policy and Procedure for LSBF Executive Education Programmes*.

5.15 Academic Misconduct: All delegates of the LSBF EE are expected to act with integrity in relation to the production and representation of academic work. Academic integrity is central to academic life and requires that delegates are honest and responsible in acknowledging the contributions of others in their work.

In order to assure LSBF EE that the work is their own and that the opinions of others have been acknowledged, delegates must take care to follow the appropriate standards for academic practice. This includes:

- Providing full citation of all sources which have been drawn on in the preparation of an assignment;
- Properly referencing the sources of the arguments and ideas in an assignment using a recognised referencing system (as specified in the Delegate Handbook and/or from your tutor);
- Following other guidelines for preparing and presenting coursework as defined in the relevant course handbooks and assignment briefs;

- Using mechanisms for checking their own work, including Turnitin text matching software, and support and advice given by teaching staff.

Please refer to the LSBF Executive Education Academic Misconduct and Malpractice Policy for a comprehensive explanation.

5.16 Non-Issuance of Certificates and Transcripts: Although LSBF EE will make every reasonable effort to work with delegates to get the most value from their courses and programmes, there are some circumstances in which certificate of completion and/or transcripts will not be issued to learners. The circumstances are as follows:

- **No submission** – If learners on an assessed course or programme do not submit an assignment within two weeks following deadline set by the tutor, the delegate will not receive a certificate for that course. If the course represents a module in a Post Graduate Certificate (PG Cert), the learner will only receive certificates from modules to which assessments have been submitted (i.e. the learner WILL NOT receive a completed PG Cert certificate, but only certificates from completed individual courses) and the transcript entry for this programme will show the course as **Did not submit**.
- **No attendance** - If learners on any course or programme fail to meet the recommended attendance requirements (80%), and make no effort to engage with LSBF EE regarding their absence, the learners would be still eligible for their certificates and transcripts, but their grades will be capped at 50 (PASS only) – Unless there is extenuating circumstances.

If learners on any course or programme fail to meet the recommended attendance requirements (80%), and make no effort to engage with LSBF EE regarding their absence, and fails to submit any assignment for grading, the learner will not be eligible to receive any certificate from LSBF EE. Such learners will be issued only with a letter of participation/attendance upon request.

- **Submission but fail or non-submission**– If learners on an assessed course or programme submit an assignment within the deadline set by the tutor but fail the course, or does not submit an assessment answer for grading, they will receive a Letter of Attendance from the DSO and a transcript showing the failed grades(s) or non-submission.

Non-payment of fees - If learners on any course or programme fail to pay the full amount of their course fees prior to completing the course, their assessments will only be marked once all course fees are settled in full.

6. Grading Process

The purpose of the grading process is to ensure the reliability, validity and consistency of the LSBF EE assignment process as outlined in this document.

Each successfully completed assignment will be awarded the following grade, according to the quality of the completed assignment:

- Distinction 70 – 100%
- Merit 60 – 69%
- Pass 50 – 59%
- Fail Less than 50%

The relevant generic grade descriptors must be identified and specified within an assignment and the relevant indicative characteristics should be used to place the required evidence in context.

In order to achieve pass	Achieve a minimum of 50% marks (irrespective of covering all the learning outcomes)
In order to achieve a merit	Pass requirement achieved Overall mark between 60 – 69%
In order to achieve a distinction	Pass requirement achieved Overall mark of >70%

Grade descriptors

Criteria	70 – 100% Distinction	60-69% Merit	50-59% Pass	0 -49% Fail
Generic skills: communication and presentation (10%)	Comprehensive and correctly structured assignment. Style of writing is very fluent and develops a coherent and logical argument. Excellent referencing.	Well-structured report which follows appropriate format but some aspects of layout and referencing could be improved. Style of writing is fairly fluent. Good referencing.	Good report in most aspects but suffers from variations in quality and the layout contains some inadequacies. Style of writing is satisfactory. Referencing needs improving.	Very poor report which is incorrectly structured and contains major errors and omissions. Style of writing lacks coherence and fluency. Poor referencing.
Knowledge & Understanding (10%)	Demonstrates excellent knowledge of theory and provides critical theoretical underpinning. Very good interpretations and summarising of main themes.	Wide range of knowledge demonstrated and evidence of good understanding of the topic. Ability to interpret and summarise succinctly.	Good range of knowledge demonstrated but weaknesses in key areas. Some understanding displayed of the topic. Summary and interpretation are satisfactory.	Very poor range of knowledge demonstrated and there are major weaknesses evident in interpretation and understanding. No clear interpretation of main themes.
Analysis (30%)	Excellent use of theoretical and conceptual models to guide analysis linked with a critical discussion of main themes. Deconstructs the major themes used in the argument.	Very good use of the theoretical and conceptual models with good critical discussion and application. Good evidence of deconstruction.	Use of theory and concepts limited but relevant. Application could be improved and there is a tendency towards description. Must provide more evidence of deconstruction.	Very poor use of theory and very little application of concepts. Very little description with not much evidence of analysis.
Synthesis/ Creativity/ Application (20%)	Logical presentation of themes with appropriate examples being demonstrated. Very good demonstration of synthesis. Models have been clearly applied to the argument.	Very good account of main themes with sound application. Good attempt at applying models to the argument. Fairly good attempt at synthesising the salient points.	Good account of main themes with some attempt at application. Limited evidence of synthesis.	Very poor account of main themes with little or no application. No links between models and argument.
Evaluation (30%)	Shows clear evidence of in-depth critical reflection and evaluation of the argument by providing a robust defence of the opinions presented in the assignment.	Shows evidence of critical reflection and evaluation and a fairly cohesive defence of the argument	Shows some evidence of critical reflection but could have been developed.	Shows little or no evidence of critical reflection and needs to be much more developed. There is no defence of the opinions presented.

7. Assignment Submission Process - Delegate

7.1 Delegate uploads their assignment onto MyPage prior to the submission deadline set by the course tutor (see **Assessment Policy, 5.10 Late Submissions** for process and penalties)

7.2 After receiving all assignments for a course (plus apologies for potential late/non-submissions) the Delegate Support Officer checks the delegate attendance and make a note on the grading sheet for those who has less than the recommended level of attendance. Secondly, the DSO submits all assignments to turnitin.com to check for plagiarism

7.2.1 In the event that there is no plagiarism suspected (see *Academic Misconduct and Malpractice Policy*) the Delegate Support Officer sends the assignments and Grading Sheet to the course tutor for grading.

7.2.2 The course tutor grades all assignments as per Grading Criteria (see 6.3), providing a grade, a mark (out of 100) and summative feedback. Once all assignments are graded (under normal circumstances no longer than two weeks after receiving the assignments) the course tutor will send the Grading Sheet containing all information to the Delegate Support Officer.

7.2.3 Upon receiving the Grading Sheets back from the course tutor, the DSO will send a sample³ of the assignments to an Internal Verifier (IV) for review.

7.2.4 In the event that there are no issues with the assignments, the IV will sign off the appropriate section in the *Grading Sheet* and send back to the Academic Programme Manager and Delegate Support Officer, who will generate an assessment report to present at the Assessment Board.

7.2.4.1 In the event an issue(s) with grading has been identified the IV will attempt to rectify the issue in the first instance with the assessor. This is done by returning the grading sheet with recommendations for remedial action for the tutor. Once the tutor implements the recommendations, the IV will then perform a 100% verification of the assessed work. In the event the IV is not satisfied with the improved work, the IV will inform the Academic Programme Manager (APM) who will recall all the assignments from the tutor in question. The assignments will all be reviewed by either another suitably qualified tutor or an External Assessor (EA - appointed through collaboration between the Managing Director, and Academic Programme Manager). Based on the outcome of the new assessment decisions, the APM and MD will meet to discuss remedial action (including appointing of a new tutor for the course in

³ If the course tutor in question has not taught at LSBF Executive Education before, 100% of the assignments will be sent for review by an Internal Verifier. If the course tutor has delivered courses in the past, a typical sample size for IV is 10%.

question), if it is deemed necessary. Remedial actions might include (but are not limited to) re-grading all assignments from the course tutor in question or resetting the assignment question. Following remedial activities, the new assessor will submit a report to the Academic Programme Manager.

7.2.4.2 The Assessment Board (see 5.8) will either recommend remedial action before releasing grades to delegates, or approve the release of the grades as presented to the Board.

7.3 In the event there is a case of plagiarism (or some other form of academic misconduct is suspected), the course tutor is contacted, it is determined whether the case is *Serious* or *Non-Serious* and the Academic Misconduct Process is followed (see *LSBF Executive Education Academic Misconduct and Malpractice Policy*).

7.4 In the event that the delegate has not referenced their assignment correctly or if the assignment's similarity index is higher than 25%, the Delegate Support Officer will contact the delegate and request that they resubmit the assignment with correct referencing / correct paraphrasing within 48 hours (unless there are extenuating circumstances where this is not possible), whereby the Delegate Support Officer will resubmit to turnitin.com. If the similarity score is still high, then the Academic Misconduct Process is followed (see *LSBF Executive Education Academic Misconduct and Malpractice Policy*). In the event the delegate makes no effort to resubmit or establish communication, the DSO will attempt to contact them using alternate communication methods, the date/time of attempted communication is recorded on mypage under student notes, and the work is treated as a non-submission.

7.5 In terms of submission of a PG Diploma delegate's independent major project, the submission deadline will be communicated by the delegate support officer on the first week of commencing his/her project. The deadline will usually fall on the same week as the other assignment submission deadlines for the PGD/PGC courses. Delegates must submit a soft copy via mypage, together with a copy of the supervisor log book (appendix 3) and the delegate declaration (cover page) for grading. The assessment process for the independent major project will be similar to that of any other assignment from this point onwards.

Appendix One – Assessment Brief Internal Verification and External Approval form

Course Title:		Program Name:	
Tutor			
Set by (Authors Name)			
Date to be issued to delegates			
Assignment Submission Date			
Internal Reviewer			
External Reviewer			
Verification Deadline Date			

Review Questions	Internal Verifier		External Reviewer	
	Yes	No*	Yes	No*
1. Are instructions to candidates clear?				
2. Is the paper free from typographical errors and incorrect calculations?				
3. Does the paper adequately address the Learning outcomes specified?				
4. Are the questions clear and unambiguous?				
5. If elements of the assignment been taken from a published source has permission been sought from the copyright holder?				
6. Are questions at an appropriate equivalent NQF level as per best practice standards?				
7. Are marks correctly allocated?				
8. Are grade criteria specified?				
9. Is the assignment criteria and marking scheme enclosed?				
10. Do the marks allocated match the paper?				
	Internal Verifier		External Verifier	
	Yes	No*	Yes	No*
Overall is the assignment fit for purpose?				
Remedial Action Required:				

* If “No” is recorded and modifications are suggested please recommend remedial action.

Internal Verifier - Comments	
External Review - Comments	
Internal Verifier : Signature and Date	
External Reviewer: Signature and Date	
Academic Programme Manager: Signature and Date	

Appendix Two – External Assessor Feedback Form

External Assessment verification					
Course title:			Programme title:		
Tutor:			External Assessor name, title, organisation:		
Assignment title:					
Learner's name:					
Marks and grade awarded by the original assessor	Fail	Pass	Merit	Distinction	% Mark

Section 1 – Assessment Instrument		Comments
Assignment brief date/version:		
Assignment brief author name:		
Does the assignment address all the relevant learning outcomes and assessment criteria?	Y/N	
Does the assignment give clear instructions including deadlines, advise on plagiarism and general assessment regulations?	Y/N	

Section 2 – Learner's work		Comments
Is the answer written at the correct level?	Y/N	
Has the learner complied with all assessment regulations?	Y/N	
Is there any reasonable adjustment requests for this assessment?	Y/N	
Has the learner addressed all of the learning outcomes?	Y/N	

Section 3 – Assessment of learner's work		Comments
Has the answer being assessed accurately, against the criteria set by the assignment brief?	Y/N	
Does the assessor provide constructive criticism of the learner's work?	Y/N	
Does the feedback provide the learner with suggestions for improvement?	Y/N	
Is there any evidence of assessment inaccuracies or malpractice?	Y/N	

Section 4 – Internal verification of assessments		Comments
Was there an internal verification of this assessment? (please answer the remaining parts of section 4 only if there has been an IV)	Y/N	
Does the IV process include constructive feedback to the assessor?	Y/N	
Are there any remedial action recommended by the IV?	Y/N	
Is there any evidence of the remedial action being agreed and implemented by the assessor?	Y/N	
Has the original grade / mark changed as a result of the IV process?	Y/N	

Section 5 - Recommendations		Comments	
Are there any concerns or recommendations for the current cohort?	Y/N		
Are there any recommendations for future assessments?	Y/N		
Remedial action taken (AL):			
External assessor signature		Date	
Academic Programme Manager		Date	

Appendix three

SUPERVISOR CONTACT LOG (TO BE SUBMITTED WITH MAJOR PROJECT)

Delegate Number:	
Diploma Programme:	
Proposed Major project Title (as submitted to LSBF EE office):	
Agreed Title (as agreed with supervisor):	
Supervisor's Signature:	Delegate's signature
Date:	Date:

Date and time of Meeting	Notes	Supervisor's initials
(mandatory)		
(mandatory)		
(mandatory)		
(mandatory)		

This form is to be submitted for signature by your supervisor on every occasion that you consult him or her regarding your major project. The completed log must be submitted with your major project.

Document Information Table

Version	1.4
Applicable Institution(s)	LSBF EE
Document Scope:	
Document Status:	ACTIVE
Content Owner*	LSBF EE APM

*Content owner is responsible for ensuring the regular review and update of the document to reflect changes in both internal governance and external regulations.

Authorship

	Name	Role	Date
Original Author(s)	Marc Granville	LSBF EE Programme Manager	25.01.17
Original Reviewer(s)	Shane De Fonseca	Academic Lead (LSBF EE)	29/03/17
Delegate Reviewers			

Annual /Biannual Review

Date Due	Done	Date Due	Done
1. 12 / 2012	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. 12 / 2013	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. 12 / 2014	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. 12 / 2015	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. 12 / 2016	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. 12 / 2017	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. 12 / 2018	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. 12 / 2019	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. 12 / 2020	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. 12 / 2021	<input type="checkbox"/>

Last Reviewed by:

Dessy Ohanians/MD, Shane De
Fonseka/APM, Andre Blackman/QA

Version Control Table

Version	1.0	Name: Marc Granville	Role: LSBF EE Programme Manager	Date: 25.01.17
Created by:				
Changes approved by:				
Version	1.1	Name	Role	Date
Amended by:		Academic Planning Committee		11.05.17
		<i>Format and content aligned to BAC requirements</i> <i>Definitions</i> <i>Internal Verification and External Assessment references amended</i> 5.13		
Approved by:				
Version	1.2	Name	Role	Date
Amended by:		Academic Planning Committee	Role: LSBF EE Programme Manager	21/06/2017
		<i>Details of amendments:</i> Definitions of extension, resubmission, resit and regrading added		
Changes approved by:				
Version	1.3	Name	Role	Date
Amended by:		Chair's action	LSBF EE APM	23/02/2018
		<i>Details of amendments:</i> Further clarification on the outcomes of IV process, action based on high plagiarism and certification		
Changes approved by:		DO, SF, AB		
Version	1.4	Name	Role	Date
Amended by:		Academic Planning Committee	LSBF EE APM	31/01/2019
		<i>Details of amendments:</i> Details about PG Diplomas and independent major project added with the relevant appendices.		
Changes approved by:				
Version		Name	Role	Date
Amended by:SF		Academic Planning Committee		04/07/2019
		<i>Details of amendments:</i> Amendments to section 5.16		
Changes approved by:		APC /04/07/2019		
Version		Name	Role	Date
Amended by:				
		<i>Details of amendments:</i>		
Changes approved by:				