Assessment Procedures

Classification	Code of Practice
Version number:	1 23
Status	Approved
Approved by:	Education Committee (EC)
Approval date:	22 July 2025
Effective from:	01 September 2025
Next review date:	2029-30
Document author:	University Working Group
Document owner:	Quality Support Service
Contact:	Quality Support Service
Report exemption to:	Education Committee
Collaborative provision:	Mandatory

State whether this document is applicable to the University's collaborative partners

Related documents:	University Programmes Regulations. Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy. Competence-based Assessment Framework. Inclusive Education Framework. Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Policy. Digital Education and Assessment Strategy. OfS Regulatory Framework for Higher Education in England.
University document:	Yes

A University document applies across the institution, is approved by a committee of Council or Senate and is held in the University Policy Directory on SharePoint.

Published location:	https://www.hull.ac.uk/policies-and-information/quality-and-standards-framework#assessment

- The University has adopted the principles of Designing for Diverse Learners, and all policy documents should be written with reference to these principles. Further information is available at the **Designing for diverse learners website**.

- An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) must be considered for all new and amended policies. Further information is available from the **EIA section of SharePoint**.

- This document is available in alternative formats from **policy@hull.ac.uk**.

- All printed or downloaded versions of this document are classified as uncontrolled

Assessment Procedures

Table of Contents

Assessment Procedures

1 Introduction

1.1 This code of practice is designed to bring together all matters relating to the process of assessment, complementing the codes governing boards of examiners and external examiners, and **should** be read alongside the University Programme Regulations and the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy. Its purpose is to make explicit the University's expectations of the conduct of assessment.

1.2 The University Education Committee is the final arbiter of the application and interpretation of this code of practice. Applications for exemption to the code will be determined by the Education Committee.

1.3 This code applies to all taught modules (whether offered self-standing for credit or as part of a programme of study leading to an award), whether delivered in whole by the University ('on campus' provision) or in whole or part by a partner institution ('collaborative provision'). Where this code does not apply to collaborative provision it is expressly stated within the text. This definition includes postgraduate taught modules which are also offered as part of the postgraduate research training scheme (PGTS), and the taught elements of research programmes.

1.4 The code does not apply to research modules offered as part of degrees classified as research with these falling under the scope of the Research Degrees Committee.

2 Definitions

2.1 **Class-based Assessments:** These are assessments that are not centrally time-tabled and/or are outside the University Assessment Period. These can include assessments such as MCQs, presentations, debates, lab practicals etc.

2.2 **Competencies:** The majority of the University of Hull programmes are now designed on competencies, and assessment will be demonstrating these competencies. Where this code references competencies, for programmes that are still based on learning outcomes, substitute learning outcome.

2.3 **Examinations:** Formal invigilated exams (either written or digital) that take place in the University Assessment Period at the end of modules and are organised centrally.

2.4 **Faculty:** Where noted in this code, Faculty includes stand-alone units that provide taught modules and programmes but are not classed as a faculty.

2.5 **Working Day:** Any weekday but excluding bank holidays and those falling within the University defined Christmas closure period or any other extraordinary University closure period.

3 Assessment Principles

3.1 The principles for assessment and feedback outlined below underpin assessment practice. They have been informed by existing University policies and frameworks, HE sector practice and align with the Regulatory Framework for Higher Education in England.

Principle	Explanation
Assessment Principles	
Valid	Assessments are aligned to the competencies for the programme and allow students to demonstrate their knowledge, skills and level of achievement against these competencies by the end of the module/programme.
Purposeful and meaningful	Assessments promote and facilitate students' learning, engagement and understanding. Assessments allow students to demonstrate and benchmark their knowledge, skills, competencies and level of achievement.
Developmental, scaffolded and appropriately challenging	Assessments promote and facilitate students' engagement with, and understanding of, the programme. Assessments are aligned to the curriculum and scaffolded to manage and focus academic challenge as students' progress through the course.
Inclusive	Assessments are designed to facilitate student learning and attainment of programme competencies, irrespective of the student's background or characteristics, aiming to ensure that the ways in which we assess do not exclude or unfairly disadvantage some students. Assessment procedures and methods are flexible enough to allow adjustments to overcome any substantial disadvantage that individual students could experience.
Achievable, efficient and manageable.	At both a programme and module level, the scheduling of assessments and amount of assessed work provides a valid profile of achievement without overburdening students or staff.
Clear, reliable, consistent and fair	Assessments and associated criteria are designed so that they can be clearly understood and that they fairly, reliably and consistently evaluate students' performance. Assessment briefing materials set clear expectations in what students **should** produce and how it will be evaluated, supporting students in understanding assessment requirements. Resource: Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy
Digital first	The University has adopted a "Digital First" approach to assessment. Where feasible, digital modalities are used for all stages of the assessment process – preparation and dissemination of assessment information, completion and submission of assessment tasks, marking (and collation of marks), feedback, moderation and external examining. Digital assessment will be used not just for online assessment but will routinely be used for campus-based assessment.
Feedback Principles	

Meaningful and developmental	Feedback relates to the stated competencies and assessment marking criteria. It is used as an opportunity to promote further learning and facilitate the ongoing development and improvement of the students' work.
Constructive and supportive	Feedback is constructive and supportive and enables students to focus on what they need to do to improve and develop their learning.
Timely	Feedback is provided within the stipulated timescale, and when it is likely to have the most impact on students' learning and performance in subsequent assessment tasks. These timescales are clearly and consistently articulated to students.
Clear and consistent	Feedback is clear and consistent, enabling students to understand, interpret, use and apply the feedback they have been given.

3.2   Faculties **should** have Faculty policies on assessment and feedback, and these **must** adhere to these Principles, this Code of Practice and the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy.

4   University Assessment Expectations

4.1   The assessment expectation recognises that credits relate to learning hours, rather than simply to the number of words written, length of an examination, or duration, volume or extent of any other form of assessment. The expectation also recognises that a smaller limit to an assessment does not necessarily represent less work, especially where a large amount of data/material/information has to be organised, prioritised, edited and presented.

4.2   The expectation also recognises that modules and programmes are assessed in the wider context of their discipline. The expectation is designed, therefore, to allow programme teams to exercise academic judgement in determining the type, size and scale of assessment tasks across a programme or suites of programmes.

4.3   Module assessments **must** allow the student to demonstrate the competencies attached to the module.

4.4   Programme teams **should** develop assessment strategies that minimise the risk of assessment overload and inequity.

4.5   In determining the appropriate amount of summative assessment, programme teams **should** set the minimum summative assessment required to address the competencies of the module and/or to meet the requirements of relevant PSRBs where applicable.

4.6   Programme teams **must**, if using a mixture of assessment modes within a single module, ensure that the overall assessment load for each student is not excessive, bearing in mind the requirements above.

4.7   In keeping with the Inclusive Marking and Assessment Policy, all assessment **should** be inclusive by design.

4.8   New methods of assessment **should** not be introduced in the final stage of a programme. However, it is acknowledged that some assessments such as dissertations

may legitimately involve new approaches to learning and associated new modes of assessment. These projects by their very nature are discipline specific, and may require more independent learning, research, data gathering, practice and rehearsal than other module assessments.

4.9   The assessment expectation recognises that students will have an opportunity, through established feedback mechanisms, to provide feedback about workload, assessment tasks and expectations, and feed into assessment design.

4.10   Taught modules **must** have a formative as well as summative assessment strategy designed to support students in addressing the programme competencies.

4.11   Module leaders **must** communicate precise assessment modes, whether they are summative or purely formative, assessment limits, weightings, assessment criteria, and the method and timing of feedback to students in writing no later than the start of the module. This information **must** be included on the VLE. They **must** also communicate whether assessments **must** be attempted (and/or passed) in order to pass the module.

4.12   In designing the assessment strategy for a module, module leaders **must** be aware of the impact of the timing of each assessment component on student workload and make appropriate allowance in that timing to enable students to benefit from feedback received from one piece of assessment in the next subsequent assessment.

Pass/fail modules

4.13   The use of pass/fail for individual assessment components is only applicable for those modules with PSRB requirements for assessing professional competency against relevant professional standards. Assessment components that are concerned with demonstrating professional competency, where attaching a numerical mark is inappropriate, may be marked pass/fail.

Assessment task scrutiny

4.14   Academic units are responsible for ensuring that assessment tasks are scrutinised appropriately and **should** have a mechanism by which this is recorded and reported to FESEC.

4.15   Assessment task scrutiny **should** involve consideration of assessment deadlines across the programme.

4.16   Assessment task scrutiny **should** be carried out prior to the start of the module, or prior to the central submission for examinations. For automated assessments, there **must** be clear evidence that the assessment has been checked for accuracy prior to use.

4.17   At a minimum, assessment task scrutiny **should** be proportionate to the level of risk posed by inaccuracies in the information provided to students. Examinations and in-class tests require a higher level of scrutiny to ensure accuracy than coursework assessments.

5   Reasonable Adjustments

Purpose

5.1   Where it has not been possible to deliver inclusion by design, reasonable adjustments to assessments may be needed to enable students to demonstrate their abilities. This **must** not change the purpose of the assessment but may alter the method. Where an alternative method of assessment is to be considered, staff **should** liaise with Student

Wellbeing.

5.2 Student Wellbeing will engage with all students who disclose a disability to the University to offer information, advice and guidance to help them effectively engage with their studies. This includes providing information on any necessary reasonable adjustments that can be made in teaching, learning and assessment.

5.3 Student Wellbeing **must** advise faculties of any reasonable adjustments a student may need. This **should** be managed through the Student Information System.

5.4 Where necessary information **should** be shared on a need-to-know basis and with student consent, as appropriate to meet individual student access requirements.

5.5 Faculty **must** ensure academic staff understand which, if any, reasonable adjustments are necessary to ensure the module is inclusive to the cohort enrolled and can identify which assignments/examinations are from students with disabilities that may need their disability taken into consideration when giving individualised, developmental feedback. In exams, cover sheets **must** be issued.

5.6 Module leaders **must** ensure they and all academic staff teaching/marking on the module are aware of and respond to the students' access requirements and reasonable adjustments.

Application to Collaborative Provision

5.7 All partner institutions **must** have in place comparable arrangements to ensure that reasonable adjustments are made.

6   Conduct of Assessments

6.1 Work **must** be submitted via the agreed University systems to a set deadline. The method of submission **must** be notified to students in advance. Students **must** not be allowed to submit in other ways than those published for the module.

6.2 It is the responsibility of the student to ensure they submit the right assessment to the right location, in the required format, and that the submission is complete and can be accessed. Work that cannot be accessed, whether this is through an incorrect file type, broken link or other issues, will not be marked and will be awarded a mark of zero. However, if the file has been submitted on time, but to the wrong assessment or module, Student Administration are able to move the work to the correct assessment, and it will be marked.

6.3 Where students are allowed to submit multiple times up to the deadline, the final submission will be the one that is marked. If a student makes submissions after the deadline, it **must** be the final submission that is marked, and any late penalties **must** be applied.

Class-based assessment

6.4 Class-based assessments are those that take place in time-tabled or additional sessions usually during the teaching period. These can include assessments such as MCQs, presentations, debates, lab practicals etc.

6.5 Summative class-based assessment **must** not be used unless it has been approved prior to commencement of the module as part of the module assessment strategy and published as part of the module specification.

6.6 All summative class-based assessments **must** be communicated to all students in

advance and **must** be published on the VLE at the beginning of the module. It is good practice to reinforce information using other methods of communication to students, such as announcements, email or directly to students in class.

6.7   Prior to holding summative class-based assessments, the person responsible for the assessment (normally the member of academic staff) **must** consider the venue for the assessment. Consideration **must** be given to the:

a.   physical environment (heating, lighting, physical space, etc),
b.   the security of the assessment,
c.   the opportunities for students to use academic misconduct (e.g. are the students separated enough, are they permitted personal belongings whilst taking the assessment, is the venue a suitable one to invigilate the assessment in),
d.   appropriate arrangements for late arrivals, etc.

6.8   The person responsible for the assessment **must** consider appropriately the needs of any student with recognised alternative needs, and **must** make any agreed reasonable adjustments such as additional time, rest breaks, use of a scribe etc. Students with alternative needs are assessed through Student Wellbeing, and changes to the assessment arrangements for these students **must** only be made on their advice in line with the reasonable adjustment statements for those students.

Examinations

6.9   The default length for all formal University examinations is 2 hours. Faculty Education and Student Experience Committees have the authority to permit variations where there are professional body requirements, or where the form of assessment does not require 2 hours, (for example where the examination takes the form of a multiple-choice test), or where there are other sound academic reasons.

6.10   Where an exception to the standard duration is approved by FESEC, this **must** be communicated to the Student Administration for purposes of timetabling.

6.11   Unless agreed by FESEC no other durations are permitted for university examinations.

6.12   Further considerations for the conduct of exams are provided in Appendix A.

7   Marking and Assessment Criteria

7.1   All assessed work **must** be marked against clear assessment criteria and follow the principles outlined in section 3.

7.2   Heads of Academic Units are responsible for ensuring that the marking of summatively assessed work is undertaken using discipline/assessment task specific assessment criteria that are linked directly to the competencies being assessed.

7.3   Students **must** be informed of the criteria applicable to each assessment task at the time the assessment information is published.

7.4   Where appropriate and feasible consideration **should** be given to mark assessed work anonymously.

8   Feedback on Assessment

8.1   Feedback on assessment **must** adhere to the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy and as such address the following principles:

a.   Feedback **must** be clear, and where written, legible, and where recorded audible.

b. Feedback **must** include specific reference to competencies or to clear grading criteria derived from competencies and **should** indicate specifically whether each competency has been achieved, and if not the reasons for this judgement.

c. Competencies **should** be stated on the feedback (such as through rubrics), rather than students being referred to other separate documents or VLE pages.

d. Feedback **must** be balanced, to include strengths as well as areas for development.

e. Feedback **must** include some targets for future development (relevant at both mid- and end-module) and practical ways to improve these areas.

f. At the point of submission students may request targeted feedback on specific competencies assessed.

g. Clarification relating to feedback **must** be made available to students on request.

8.2 A clear statement **must** be given on the period of time in which student work will be returned with feedback. The period **must** be calculated to begin with submission deadline and end with the return of student work and **must** not exceed 20 working days.

a. The 20 working days noted above **must** include all first making, moderation or second marking of work submitted for that deadline and applies to all forms of assessment including examination marks.

b. Students **must** be provided with an opportunity to act on the feedback in preparing for further assessments in the same or related modules.

9 Overlength Assessments

9.1 To ensure students are clear on the expectations of each assessment task, a specified limit **should** be placed on the task. This may be a word count, page count, time limit or any other parameter limiting the scope of the assessment.

9.2 Assessment limits:

a. Assessment Briefs **must** make it clear what is included within the limit.

b. Unless otherwise specified the published limit **must** include explanatory footnotes. quotations and in text references and citations.

c. Assignment limit does not include the assignment title or instructions.

d. Unless otherwise specified the published limit for written work **must** exclude charts, graphs, tables. images etc included in the assignment.

e. Unless otherwise specified the published limit **must** exclude references in footnotes, appendices, references lists and bibliographies.

9.3 Coursework assessment rubrics **must** instruct students to declare the assignment length, e.g., word count, slide numbers, detailed time, on the coversheet where adhering to a word count, presentation time or other stipulation is included. An erroneous declaration **must** be dealt with as suspected use of academic misconduct. The case **must** then be followed up according to the Regulations governing Academic Misconduct.

9.4 Overlength assessment applies to all forms of assessment with a stipulated limit. The University has a standard system of penalties that Academic Units **must** apply to summatively assessed work that is overlength.

9.5 The following penalties **must** be applied to work that is over the specified limit:

a. Up to 10% over the specified limit, no penalty applied.

b. 10-20% over the specified limit, a penalty of 10% of the available marks for the

assessment or reduction to the pass mark, whichever is the higher.

    c.   20-50% over the specified limit, the maximum mark awarded will be the pass mark.

    d.   More than 50% over the specified limit, the work will not be marked and a mark of zero will be recorded.

10   Penalties for Late Submission

10.1   There is a university standard system of penalties for late submission of coursework. The aim of the system is to encourage good time-management skills, and to operate a clear, simple, rigorous and transparent system.

10.2   All coursework assessments **must** have a published submission time which **should** be no earlier than 10am and no later than 4pm, and on Mondays to Thursdays inclusive. This submission time **must** be communicated effectively to students. Academic Units delivering non-standard modules may apply to FESEC for exemption to these timeframes.

10.3   There is a stipulated late period, where students will still be able to submit coursework assessments, which is up to and including 5 working days late.

10.4   Where work is submitted within the stipulated late period the following penalties **must** be adhered to:

    a.   Penalties are a percentage of the maximum mark available for the assessment component that has been submitted late.

    b.   The late submission penalties which **must** be applied to coursework submitted after the published deadline are:

        i.   Up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10% or the mark is reduced to the pass mark, whichever results in the higher mark.

        ii.   More than 24 hours and up to and including 5 working days after the deadline the mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark.

    c.   Work that is marked, and that does not achieve the pass mark through this marking and therefore does not demonstrate that competencies have been met on the assessment task, will not be subject to a late penalty, and the academic mark will be awarded to the work.

    d.   Where assessments are pass/fail, work that is submitted up to and including 5 working days after the deadline can be awarded a pass mark, dependant on PSRB regulations.

10.5   Where work is submitted <u>outside of the stipulated late period</u> (greater than 5 working days late) it **must** not be marked and a mark of zero **must** be awarded.

> *10.2: Requiring deadlines to be set no earlier than 10am and no later than 4pm, and on Mondays to Thursdays inclusive is intended to maximise the inclusivity of the deadline, e.g., for students who are parents to school-age children. Where an exception to this requirement is needed to maximise inclusivity or on other practical grounds, e.g., for part-time courses whose students work during office hours, an exemption request may be made. Deadlines on Friday, Saturday and Sunday **should** be avoided, because students submitting on these days will have limited access to support.*
>
> *10.3: Examples applying the penalties) for coursework submitted up to and including 24 hours after the deadline:*
> - *If the maximum mark for the assessment is 100 and a student submits the assessment 2 hours after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 or reduced to the pass mark – whichever results in the higher mark. For example, a mark of 65 will be reduced to 55. A mark of 48 will be reduced to 40. A student will not fail work due to the application of late penalties alone.*

Examples applying the penalties for coursework submitted more than 24 hours and up to and including 5 working days after the deadline:

Where the maximum mark for the assessment is 100 and the pass mark is 40 and work achieves pass mark

Student	A	B	C	D	E
Pre-penalty mark	100	50	45	40	30
Up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10% **or**	90	40	35	30	
or the mark is reduced to the pass mark, whichever results in the **higher** mark	40	40	40	40	
Outcome (the higher mark)	**90**	**40**	**40**	**40**	
More than 24 hours and up to/incl. 5 days after the deadline, mark is reduced to the pass mark	40	40	40	40	
Does not achieve the pass mark					30

11 Non-submission/Non-attendance

11.1 Following failure to submit a piece of assessed work by the published or, in cases where an extension has been granted, the extended deadline or attend an examination or assessment opportunity, without receiving the approval of the Additional Consideration Committee, a mark of zero **must** be recorded for that piece of assessed work.

12 Internal Evaluation of Marking and Feedback

12.1 The following definitions inform the University's expectations for internal evaluation:

a. Marking: a process by which a numerical score is attached to a student's work,
b. Single marking: students' work is marked by a single internal examiner,
c. Moderation: a process of checking that the assessment procedures have been adhered to and that the standard of marking and feedback are at the appropriate level. It assures all assessments are marked in an academically rigorous, fair, reliable, consistent manner and with reference to agreed marking criteria.
d. Second marking: a model of marking involving two markers, the second of which can do so with or without knowledge of the grade given by the first.

12.2 In applying university requirements for internal evaluation, account **should** be taken of:

a. the significance of the assessment,
b. the experience of the marker,
c. the type of the assessment.

12.3 All forms of internal evaluation **must** be completed in a timely manner so that all feedback is returned to the student within 20 working days.

12.4 For all assessments at all levels fail verification is required. This is not included in the moderation sample.

12.5 Summative assessments at Levels 5, 6 & 7 **must** be subject to internal evaluation. Where the marker has no previous marking experience, all summative assessments **must** be subject to internal verification.

12.6   Final dissertations (or their equivalents) require second marking. All other work requiring internal evaluation, requires moderation.

12.7   Where modules are marked by a team of markers, there is an expectation that there will have been an internal calibration process during the marking to ensure all markers are applying assessment criteria and marks in the same way. It **must** not be left solely for the internal evaluation process to resolve differences in marking practice.

12.8   Regardless of the form of internal evaluation used, the first marker **must** provide the second marker or moderator with the following:

    a.   the assignment brief,
    b.   where appropriate, outline solutions which indicate how marks within a question (or other element of the assessment) have been allocated,
    c.   the grading criteria used.

12.9   Clear records **must** be kept of all discussions between markers and outcome decisions; these **must** be made available to the appropriate External Examiner(s).

12.10   Subject areas may determine and publish policies on the appropriate use of different forms of internal evaluation within their disciplinary context, provided they exceed the University minimum requirements of this Code e.g., in accordance with PSRB standards, or where there is an added value in additional. In all cases, the Associate Dean for Education and Student Experience of the relevant faculty **must** be informed.

12.11   Where an assessment is conducted 'live' e.g., presentations, performance, professional competency etc. a provision for internal moderation **must** be made. This **must** involve having two or more markers present or the use of recordings where appropriate. Provision of recordings would also allow the External Examiner(s) to verify the marking.

12.12   Where an assessment has been moderated, any work that is submitted after the module board for example through extensions or additional considerations, or as a result of reassessment, does not need further moderation. All work that is submitted after the module board that achieves a fail mark **must** be subject to verification.

12.13   Where an assessment on a module has been second marked, any work that is submitted after the module board, for example through extensions or additional considerations, or as a result of reassessment, **must** still be second marked as with the other assignments.

Moderation

12.14   An appropriate member of academic staff **must** undertake all internal moderation within a module, and they **should** not have been involved in the teaching or marking on that module.

12.15   The moderator samples work carried out by the marker/s and will have access to all grades and associated feedback. In this form of moderation, the role of the moderator is to check for consistency, accuracy and correct use of specific grading criteria/mark schemes. When carrying out this form of moderation it is expected that all fails are verified and then no less than 10% (or 10 pieces whichever is the higher) of all assessed work is reviewed. This **must** include a representative number from across the full range of marks awarded.

12.16   Where more than one person has carried out the initial marking process, at least 10% or 10 pieces of work **must** be included from each marker involved in the process. Where a large team of markers has been deployed, this number can be varied if it would

otherwise result in the whole cohort being reviewed.

12.17 Where the first marker is inexperienced at marking at the level, the sample of moderation **should** be increased.

12.18 A record **must** be kept of all pieces of work moderated along with any comments made by the moderator; this **must** be made available to the appropriate External Examiner(s).

12.19 Colleagues acting as moderators **should** also employ an arithmetical check on any combined marks and ensure that marks are correct across all the candidates.

12.20 If the moderator is assured the marking process meets the expectation set out above, the first mark will stand.

12.21 If the moderator feels there are significant issues with the marking, then they **must** not make changes to individual marks; they **should** discuss their concerns with the marker and a review of the marking of the full cohort **should** take place. At this point, the relevant School Director of Learning and Teaching (or equivalent) **should** be made aware, and they **should** oversee the process; should the Director of Learning and Teaching be involved in the marking or mitigation process the Associate Dean for Education and Student Experience **should** be consulted.

12.22 After review and in discussions with the Director of Learning and Teaching, scaling or remarking of the full cohort can be suggested. Any recommendations that involve a scaling of marks **must** be agreed with the relevant External Examiner(s).

Second Marking

12.23 For dissertations or their equivalents, second marking **must** be undertaken.

12.24 For dissertations or their equivalents, it may be the case that there are a team of second markers rather than a single second marker due to the nature and size of the assessment.

12.25 Feedback **should** be agreed or given separately.

12.26 Clear records of any discussions and the final agreed mark **must** be kept.

12.27 A final grade is agreed through discussion between the 2 markers.

12.28 A third marker **must** be used where the first and second markers are unable to agree a final mark. The role of the third marker **must** not be to overrule the existing marks but to contribute to resolving the issues.

12.29 Third marking to reconcile differences **must** not be carried out by an External Examiner.

12.30 Clear records **must** be kept of all discussions between markers and outcome decisions; these **must** be made available to the appropriate External Examiner(s).

12.31 All grading differences between first and second markers **must** be resolved prior to module boards taking place.

Automated Assessment

12.32 An exemption from the requirement for moderation will be given where assessment methods are automated, however when using this form of assessment there **must** be clear evidence that the assessment has been tested and checked for accuracy prior to use.

Collaborative Provision

12.33 For collaborative provision, reference **must** also be made to the requirements for moderation specified in the University Code of Practice on Moderation of Collaborative Provision.

13 Reassessment

13.1 Students shall always be given an opportunity to undertake reassessment in modules in which they have not achieved a weighted average mark of at least 40 in levels 3, 4, 5 and 6 and 50 in level 7.

13.2 Where a student does not achieve the weighted average mark that is required to secure a pass in a module and cannot be considered for compensation or condonement, they **must** only be reassessed in those components of assessment which they have failed, except where the programme/module specification specifically prescribes otherwise.

13.3 Reassessment **should** be by resubmission of the original work, modified to demonstrate achievement of the failed competencies. Exceptionally, reassessment may be by submission of a new piece of work.

13.4 Reassessment that **must** deviate from the original form of assessment **must** be highlighted on the module specification but **must** ensure that all competencies of the original assessment are still met.

13.5 Refer to the relevant University Programme Regulations for clarification of reassessment procedures.

14 Retention and Archiving of Summative Assessed Work

14.1 The Executive Dean is responsible for establishing a process to ensure adherence to the University's Retention and Archiving Assessment requirements. Heads of Academic Unit are accountable for ensuring implementation of that process. Each Faculty **must** submit its process to the Quality Support Service.

14.2 There are two main reasons for retaining and archiving students' assessed work:

   a. in case of query, complaint or appeal by, or about, the student,
   b. to provide an archive of sample marked work for assurance and enhancement purposes.

14.3 Retention is the process of keeping all assessed student work until the student has completed their studies. The reasons for retaining student work include query, complaint or appeal and assurance and enhancement activities.

14.4 Archiving is the process of keeping a sample of students' work for a period of 5 years primarily for the purpose of assurance and enhancement.

Retention of assessed work

14.5 For the purpose of the retention of assessed work in case of query, complaint or appeal no distinction is made between coursework and formal examination scripts. It is expected that all assessed work and associated marking / feedback sheets be retained.

It is assumed that after the formal approval of a mark for a piece of coursework at a Module Board of Examiners, the coursework (with any annotated feedback) is returned to the student. A copy of the originally submitted coursework and any additional feedback sheets therefore need to be retained.

14.6 The retention of assessed work may be in paper format or using electronic methods, to

reduce the need for large storage areas. It is acceptable in the case of large pieces of practice work, artifacts, performances and presentations to store photographs or recordings.

14.7 All assessed work which contributes to the final module mark **must** be stored securely and confidentially for as long as the student has not completed their studies in the programme to which they refer.

14.8 All assessed work submitted and marked through the University's virtual learning environment is deemed to be stored securely and confidentially and adheres to retention and archiving guidelines.

14.9 All assessed work not submitted and marked though the virtual learning environment (including, but not limited to paper submissions, large pieces of practice work, artifacts, performances and presentations) **must** be retained and stored by Faculties.

14.10 Where practicable, all assessed work **must** be kept for three months following formal notification of the final award. During this period, students **must** be given the opportunity to arrange for collection of any physical retained work.

14.11 Three months after formal notification of the final award, any assessed work not collected by or returned to the student, **must** not be retained by the academic unit (but with allowance for 14.13 below). It **must** be destroyed as confidential waste.

14.12 Where a student is in dispute with the University by way of a query, an academic appeal or complaint by, or about, the student, all assessed work relating to the candidate **must** be kept until the dispute is resolved.

Archiving of assessed work

14.13 A sample of all assessed work at module level **must** be archived. A suitable sample of work would include work from the top, middle and bottom of the range and would also cover students from the different degree programmes for which the module is a component. This work will be used periodically to monitor trends in, for example, marking and achievement. A five-year sample **must** be available; this may include the work of currently registered students.

14.14 Faculties **must** maintain detailed records of all archived work. The record **must** include sufficient detail to enable the efficient retrieval of documents and confirm details of when work **should** be disposed of.

Retention of work for longer periods of time

14.15 Academic Units that wish to retain work, in addition to the archived sample, following formal notification of the final award, **must** seek permission to do so from the relevant FESEC (or equivalent). Academic Units granted permission to retain work for longer periods of time **must** make explicit to students the reasons for doing so and **must** ensure that the work is disposed of when that purpose is fulfilled. Reasons for retaining work for a longer period of time include:

   a. to meet the requirements of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body,
   b. to show to future students as examples.

14.16 The Chair of the relevant FESEC (or equivalent) is responsible for keeping a record of those academic units with permission to retain work for a longer period of time and for monitoring that the work is disposed of at the end of the permitted extended period.

14.17 Note: assessment data stored by third parties, for example TurnitinUK, is subject to the

Service Level Agreements with those parties.

General Data Protection Regulations

14.18   In order to comply with the General Data Protection Regulations and the University of Hull's Data Retention Policy, when the work is no longer required for the purpose for which it was retained, the work **must** be disposed of as confidential waste.

15   Appendix A: Examination

Invigilation of Examinations

15.1   Student Administration is responsible for recruiting, training, paying and allocating a team to perform the duties of invigilator at centrally organised University examinations within the central examination venues. This includes written and digital examinations.

15.2   The invigilation team will be recruited by application from people external to the University and/or graduate researchers.

15.3   Examinations which are not organised centrally, or not held in central examination venues will continue to be invigilated by internal staff members.

15.4   All Invigilators **must** have undertaken suitable training for the role prior to undertaking any invigilation duties.

15.5   A Chief Invigilator will be assigned to each examination session, with additional responsibilities.

15.6   Each academic unit **must** have an identified member of staff who is familiar with the academic content of the module and who **must** be available to be easily contacted for the duration of the examination, in case of query.

15.7   For digital examination a member of the academic team, with access to the software being used for the examination **must** be present to set off the examination in each of the rooms.

Checking Student Identity

15.8   Students are required to have photographic identification (ID) on display during examinations and this **should** normally be the student card. Invigilators **must** check the identity of each student to ensure that the correct person is taking the exam.

15.9   The name and registration number of any student unable to provide suitable ID in the exam **must** be noted on the attendance list so that the marker of the exam has an accurate record of those students without suitable ID.

15.10   The identity of each student unable to provide suitable ID in the exam **must** be checked prior to marking, using at least one of the following methods:

15.11   Check that the signature on the exam script matches other recorded signatures within the academic unit. Student Administration holds all the attendance cards completed by students during the examinations (and for 1 year previously) should a copy of a signature from a different exam be required.

15.12   Check the handwriting on the exam script against previous work.

15.13   Check the handwriting on the exam script against other documentation held in the Academic Unit.

15.14   The Head of Academic Unit is responsible for ensuring that the identity of each student unable to provide suitable ID in the exam is checked as set out above. The Head of Academic Unit **must** confirm with the Examinations Officer, Student Administration, that these checks have taken place before the exam is marked.

15.15   If the marker (or other staff member checking ID in the Academic Unit) is satisfied that

the script has been written by the correct student, the student **must** be contacted by the Academic Unit and be made aware of the university requirement in relation to ID at examinations. This warning **should** be recorded for future reference.

15.16   If the marker (or other staff member checking ID in the Academic Unit) is not satisfied that the script has been written by the correct student, then it **must** be dealt with as suspected use of academic misconduct. The case **must** then be followed up according to the Regulations governing Academic Misconduct.

Treatment of Students who do not Follow the Examinations Rubric

15.17   Where a student has answered too many questions, markers **must** mark all compulsory questions first and then mark the required number of questions in the order they appear on the examination paper, make a note on the script, and disregard all subsequent answers.

15.18   Where a student has failed to answer a compulsory question (whether that be for the whole paper or within a section of a multi-sectioned paper), they **must** be awarded zero for that question. The required number of additional questions **must** then be marked in the order they appear on the examination paper, disregarding any extra questions above and beyond what was required.

15.19   Examination rubrics **should** instruct students to cross out questions attempted that they do not want marked and **must** include a statement on the treatment of students who fail to follow the examination rubric.

16   Version control

Version	Author	Date approved	Relevant sections
1 23	Working Group	22 July 2025, Education Committee	Amendments include but not limited to: • Updated committee structures and named service areas. • Reorganisation of the code. • Addition of definition of key terms – section 2. • Addition of assessment principles – section 3. • Assessment Tariff reframed as assessment expectations – section 4. • Addition of assessment task scrutiny to align to the Code of Practice External Examining – section 4. • Inclusion of a section on conduct of assessments (submission processes and issues) – section 6. • Clarify that the 20 working days is counted from the deadline, not submission date (8.2). • Addition of overlength penalties – section 9. • Moderation/Second marking changed to Internal Evaluation – section 12. • Second marking only required for dissertations or equivalent (12.23).
1 22	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	ESEC, May 2024	• Reintroduced an amendment to ensure that work does not fail due to the application of late penalties alone (para 9.3d i and ii). • Makes clear where to submit an exemption to the Code.
1 21	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Aug 2023, Housekeeping	In relation to 4.1a above in relation to feedback on assessment, the 20-day rule includes examination marks.
1 20	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Aug 2023, Housekeeping	• Replaces Education Committee with Education Student Experience Committee.

			• Incorporates version control.
1 19	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	March 2022, Senate	• Clarifies that taught modules must have a formative as well as summative assessment strategy (1.4). • Removes reference to long thin modules. • Introduces pass/fail assessment (6). • Introduces non-attendance/non-submission (8). • Changes to published submission times for coursework assessment (9.2). • Removes reference to the timeframe for resubmission (12).
1 18	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Sept 2021	Migrated to new template
1 18	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Aug 2021, Education Committee	Removes the following temporary amendment in response to the Covid-19 pandemic: • The restriction on work submitted up to five working days after the deadline being failed due to a late penalty being applied is removed (para 37). And introduces the following requirement: Replaces blind second marking of assessments that contribute 70% or more to the assessment of a module equal to or greater than 30 credits with a requirement for second marking (para 41(i)).
1 17	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Feb 2021, Education Committee	Introduces the following temporary amendment in response to the Covid-19 pandemic: Suspends the requirement for blind second marking of assessments that contribute 70% or more to the assessment of a module equal to or greater than 30 credits (para 41(i)).

1 16	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Dec 2020, Education Committee	Ensures that work does not fail due to late penalties alone, by capping reductions in marks due to the application of late penalties at the pass mark and not applying penalties to work that is at, or below, the pass mark (para 37).
1 15	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	Sept 2020, Education Committee	• Clarifies that all assessment must be inclusive by design throughout. • Details of how reasonable adjustments may be communicated to Faculty and Staff. This information is crucial and must be disseminated as soon as possible, para 26. • Faculty policies must adhere to the Inclusive Assessment, Feedback and Marking Policy, para 29. • Removes temporary amendments in response to the Covid-19 pandemic.
1 14	Quality Manager, Quality Support Service	July 2020, Education Committee	• Introduces resubmission as the preferred method of reassessment para 68 and 69. • Amendments to overlength assessment (Chapter VI), para 31 – 34. • Replaces Quality Governance with Quality Support Service throughout.
1 13	Quality Manager, Quality Governance	April 2020, Education Committee	Introduces the following temporary amendments in response to the Covid-19 pandemic: • Confirms that Chapter VI Overlength Assessments will not be implemented for assessments impacted by Covid-19 (para 32). • Confirms that Chapter VII Penalties for Late Submission will not be implemented for assessments impacted by Covd-19 (para 34). • Confirms that minimum requirements, in Chapter

			IX, for second marking (para 38) and moderation (para 41) must not be exceeded. • Replaces University Learning and Teaching Committee (ULTC) with the Education Committee (EC).
1 12	Quality Manager, Learning and Teaching Enhancement (LTE)	June 2018, University Learning and Teaching Committee (ULTC)	• Amendments relate to Chapter XV Retention and Archiving of Summative Assessed Work (paras 68-81). In particular, the methods for retaining and archiving student work (para 73) and the requirement to maintain detailed records of all archived materials (para 79). • Housekeeping amendment to make clear the university definition of a working day. A working day is a day when the university is open (para. 29). • Substantive amendments to second marking procedures (para 35-43).
1 11	Quality Manager, Learning and Teaching Enhancement (LTE)	Feb 2018, Housekeeping	• Changes LEAP to Learning and Teaching Enhancement. • Makes clear that both first and second marking must be completed within 20 working days.
1 10	Quality Manager, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP)	April 2017, ULTC	• Clarifies the requirement for second marking (chapter IX, Reg. 38 & 39). • A new chapter on reassessment (chapter XI). • Confirms the duration for examinations (Reg. 17, 18, 19 & 20). • Replaces Registry Services with Student Services Directorate
1 09	Quality Manager, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP)	Sept 2016, Housekeeping	• Replaces department and Head of Department with school and Head of School. • Replaces Student Administrative Services with Registry Services.

			• Replaces Unfair Means with Academic Misconduct. • Replaces Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee with Faculty Education Committee. • Other minor amendments.
1 08	Quality Manager, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP)	June 2015, ULTAC	Amendments relate to Chapter XIV Retention and Archiving of Summative Assessed Work (paras 61-74). In particular the distinction between assessed coursework and examinations in terms of archiving has been removed.
1 07	Quality Manager, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP)	May 2014, ULTAC	Removes Chapter VIII – Principles for the Use of TurnitinUK (paras 33-40). This Chapter is replaced by a Policy on Staff Use of TurnitinUK which is published on the 'policies' area on section F of the Quality Handbook.
1 06	Quality Manager, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice (LEAP)	Feb 2014, Housekeeping	Unless otherwise specified the published word limit excludes references in footnotes, appendices, references lists and bibliographies but includes other footnotes, quotations and in text references and citations (para. 30 (iii)).
1 05	Quality Officer, Curriculum Development & Teaching Enhancement	Sept 2012, ULTAC	• Replaces "access to the 'Playpen' facility" with "the ability to submit draft assignments to TurnitinUK" (para. 38). • Mandatory requirement for departments to make clear to students the process for utilising draft submissions to TurnitinUK (para. 38).
1 04	Quality Officer	May 2012, ULTAC	• Standardised penalties for late submission and overlength assessment (paras. 29-32). • A new chapter on the use of TurnitinUK (paras. 33-40). • A new chapter on the treatment of students who do not follow the examination rubric (paras.66-68).

			• Explanatory note added to further clarify the role of second markers (para. 41)
1 03	Quality Officer	Sept 2011, ULTAC	• Examinations which are centrally organised and held in central examination venues will be invigilated by a team of people external to the University and/or postgraduate students (paras.53-54). • A new chapter on checking student identity (paras.60-65).
1 02	Quality Officer	Sept 2011, ULTAC	• Proportion of summative assessment permitted during the first semester of a long-thin amended to no more than 50%, (para.19). • Strengthens the requirements for feedback to students on assessed work – that it should be returned within no more than 4 semester weeks; that feedback refers to module learning outcomes or grading criteria derived from LOs and that it contains targets for development. • Penalties for overlength assessments: students must be consulted on departmental policies. • Second marking: amended to require that second marking be of a representative sample equally spanning the full range of marks awarded and removes the upper limit of 25 papers. • Several amendments for clarity.
1 01	Quality Officer	Oct 2010, Academic Board	
1 00	Quality Officer	Sept 2007, Academic Board	• This code brought together a number of previously separate codes: Assessment Tariff (formerly F3), Reasonable Adjustments (F14), Class Based Assessments (F15),

			Anonymous Marking (F6), Late Submission (F11), Invigilation (F12), Second Marking (F7) and Archiving of Assessed Work (F9).
			• It also introduced new arrangements governing: Overlength assessments, Feedback on assessment, Assessment criteria for levels 4-7 (replacing the single level generic criteria, F4). Assessment criteria for level 3 will be produced by the Assessment Committee in 07/08.
			• Chapter VI Overlength Assessments was new provision which adopted the same approach as for class-based assessments and late submission in requiring each department to establish a policy taking into account University-wide principles set out below and requiring consultation with students in the development of the policy.
			• The remaining chapters involve at most minor changes to existing requirements.