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# Introduction

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.

The University Education Student Experience Committee is the final arbiter of the application and interpretation of this code of practice.

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).

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

# UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT TARIFF

* 1. This section codifies the criteria, approved by the Education Student Experience Committee with regard to summative assessment tariff requirements for the assessment of taught modules and programmes.
  2. The purpose of the tariff is to minimise the risk of assessment overload and inequity. The assessment tariff sets pro rata allowances for 20 credit modules. The tariff applies to all stages of an award.
  3. The tariff recognises that credits relate to learning hours, rather than simply to the number of words written or length of an examination or other form of assessment. For example, modules that involve a greater proportion of independent study (e.g., dissertation modules) might reasonably be assessed by a piece of work of greater length than a taught module of the same credit value. The tariff also recognises that fewer words do not necessarily represent less work, especially where a large amount of data has to be organised, prioritised, edited and presented. The tariff also recognises that modules are assessed in the wider context of the assessment strategies of programmes. The tariff is designed, therefore, to provide parameters within which assessment tasks **must** be based, but module leaders and programme directors may exercise academic judgement in determining the size and scale of assessment tasks.
  4. Taught modules **must** have a formative as well as summative assessment strategy designed to support students in addressing the module learning outcomes or competencies, and the details of both strategies **must** be communicated to students no later than the start of the module. This information **should** be included in module handbooks (or equivalent).
  5. Module providers **must** apply the tariff, in order to meet the learning outcomes/competencies of the module, precisely defining the word limits, or equivalent, which will apply to each assessment. Keeping within the limits specified below any piece of work **should** take into account:

1. the level of study (level 5 and 6 students might reasonably be expected to have the skills and experience to write in greater depth than level 4 students in the same amount of study time),
2. discipline-specific requirements.
   1. Module leaders **must** communicate precise assessment modes, word 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 **should** be included in module handbooks.
   2. 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.
   3. Module leaders must communicate to students in writing the precise nature of the assessments, whether they are summative or purely formative, and whether they **must** be attempted (and/or passed) in order to pass the module.

## Assessment Tariff

* 1. In determining the appropriate amount of summative assessment, module leaders **should** set the minimum summative assessment required to address the learning outcomes / competencies of the module and/or to meet the requirements of relevant PSRBs where applicable.
  2. The summative assessment for a 20-credit module (other than a 20-credit dissertation module) **should** be assessed by either:

1. A 4,000-6,000-word written assignment

**Or:**

1. A mixture of modes of assessment, which is evidence-based and commensurate with the allocated learning hours, and which may include, for example:
2. A formal 2-hour written examination
3. A 2,000-3,000-word written assignment
4. Presentations
5. Laboratory work
6. Experiments
7. Performances
8. In-class tests
9. Oral examinations
10. Projects
11. Portfolios
12. Computer-based tests
13. E-assessment
14. Exhibition of art works.
15. Live performance or outcomes evidenced through digital media.
    1. All assessment **must** be inclusive by design, in keeping with the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy.
    2. Academic Units **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.
    3. Modules of other than 20 credits **must** have an assessment load which takes the above requirements into account.
    4. Dissertations by their very nature require independent learning and scope to present an advanced, research based academic argument. For these reasons, dissertations require an extended word limit. Thus, for a:
16. 20 credit dissertation module, the limit **must** be within the range 5,000 – 7,500 words (or equivalent).
17. 40 credit dissertation module, the limit **must** be within the range 10,000 – 15,000 words (or equivalent).
18. 60 credit dissertation module, the limit **must** be within the range 15,000 – 20,000 words (or equivalent).
    1. It is acknowledged that in some disciplines, a ‘dissertation’ module is not solely a textural piece of work, but may include other single, large pieces of work such as, for example, design/exhibition of art works or musical/dance arrangement or performance. These tasks **must** be commensurate with the workload involved in producing dissertations to the word counts above.

## Examinations

* 1. 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. The length of the proposed assessment **should** be clearly stipulated on the examination paper coversheet that is submitted with the proposed paper to Student Services Directorate.
  2. Where an exam is solely multiple choice, the standard length shall be one hour unless Faculty Education and Student Experience Committee (FESEC) have agreed otherwise.
  3. Where an exception to the standard duration is approved by FESEC, the reasons for this shall be communicated to the Student Services Directorate so that a central record of all such examinations can be maintained. This authorisation **should** accompany the examination paper when it is submitted to Student Services Directorate in the first trimester of each academic year.
  4. No other durations are permitted for university examinations.

## Methods of assessment

* 1. In keeping with the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy all assessment **must** be inclusive by design.
  2. New methods of assessment **should** not be introduced in the final stage of a programme. However, it is acknowledged that project work and dissertations may legitimately involve new approaches to learning and associated new modes of assessment.

# REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS

## Purpose

* 1. Reasonable adjustments to examination and assessment arrangements may be made to enable disabled students to demonstrate their abilities. This **must** not change the purpose of the assessment but may alter the method. Further information can be obtained from the Student Services Directorate.
  2. The Student Services Directorate **must** contact 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 explaining any necessary reasonable adjustments that can be made in teaching, learning and assessment.
  3. Student Services Directorate **must** advise faculties of any reasonable adjustments a student may need. This **should** be managed through the Student Information System.
  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. 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. Where possible student anonymity **should** be retained.
  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.

## Application to Collaborative Provision

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

# ANNONYMOUS ASSESSMENT

* 1. All forms of summative assessment **must** be marked anonymously where this is practicable. Where it is considered that anonymity is not practicable it **should** be declared in the module specification and approved as part of the usual module approval process.

# FEEDBACK ON ASSESSMENT

* 1. Faculty policies **must** adhere to the Inclusive Assessment, Marking and Feedback Policy and as such address the following principles:

1. A clear statement **must** be given on the period of time in which student work will be returned with feedback. The period **should** be calculated to begin with submission and end with the return of student work and **should** not exceed 20 working days\*/\*\*.
2. The 20 working days noted above **must** include all first and second marking.
3. Students **must** be provided with an opportunity to act on the feedback in preparing for further assessments in the same or other related modules.
4. Feedback **must** be clear, and where written, legible.
5. Feedback **must** include specific reference to module learning outcomes/competencies or to clear grading criteria derived from learning outcomes/competencies and **should** indicate specifically whether each outcome/competency has been achieved, and if not the reasons for this judgement.
6. Learning outcomes/competencies **should** be stated on the feedback, rather than students being referred to their module handbooks or to other separate documents.
7. The principles on which work is being marked **must** be made clear to students, whether this is via learning outcomes/competencies or grading criteria.
8. Feedback **should** be balanced, to include strengths as well as areas for development.
9. Feedback **must** include some targets for future development (relevant at both mid- and end-module). These targets could include:
10. General academic features / study skills,
11. Presentation, style, structure,
12. Range and use of reading,
13. Criticality,
14. Focus on the question / establishment of a key and relevant question.
15. Feedback **must** include not only areas for development, but also practical ways to improve these areas.
16. At the point of submission students may request targeted feedback on specific learning outcomes/competencies assessed.
17. Clarification relating to feedback **must** be made available to students on request.

*\* working days refers to University working days.*

*\*\*the 20-day rule includes examination marks.*

# ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

* 1. Heads of Academic Units are responsible for ensuring that the marking of summatively assessed work is undertaken using discipline/assessment task specific assessment criteria which are informed by the generic assessment criteria.

Students **must** be informed, for example through academic unit or module handbooks, of the criteria applicable to each assessment task.

# Pass/fail modules

* 1. Assessment components that are concerned with demonstrating professional competency, where attaching a numerical mark is inappropriate, may be marked pass/fail. 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.

# OVERLENGTH ASSESSMENTS

* 1. Overlength assessment applies to all forms of assessment with a stipulated length or size, for example timed performances, presentations or lab work; word count for essays, reports, or other documented/written tasks.
  2. For summative assessed work, the University will normally not mark beyond the stipulated assignment length. This **must** be made clear in student handbooks, the VLE, assignment briefs and where they are used submission pro forma.
  3. Where a learning outcome/competency of working to an assignment brief includes adhering to a word count, presentation time or other stipulation, this **must** be explained, and a rationale made clear to students on the VLE and/or in module handbooks.
  4. NOTE: where appropriate, the assignment brief **must** make clear the distinction between a guide (write/present up to x words/minutes; write/present between x and y words/minutes) and a precise expectation (write/present x words/minutes).
  5. Overlength assessments:

1. Assignment length does not include the assignment title or instructions.
2. Unless otherwise specified the published word count **must** exclude charts, graphs, tables etc included in the assignment.
3. Unless otherwise specified the published word count **must** exclude references in footnotes, appendices, references lists and bibliographies but **must** include other footnotes, quotations and in text references and citations.
4. 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 as a learning outcome/competency.
5. An erroneous word count 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.

# Non-attendance/non-submission

* 1. Following failure to attend an examination or submit a piece of assessed work without receiving the approval of the Additional Consideration Committee, a mark of zero **must** be recorded for that examination/piece of assessed work.

# PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION

* 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.
  2. The following penalties **must** be adhered to:

1. Penalties are a percentage of the **maximum mark** available for the assessment component which has been submitted late.
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, and this submission time **must** be communicated effectively to students.
3. Academic Units delivering non-standard modules may apply to FESEC for exemption from 9.2(b).
4. The late submission penalties which **must** be applied to coursework submitted after the published deadline are:
5. Up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10%.
6. More than 24 hours and up to and including 5 working days after the deadline; either a penalty of 10% or the mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark, **whichever results in the lower mark.**
7. Where work is submitted outside of the stipulated late period (greater than 5 working days late) it **should** not be marked and a mark of zero awarded.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *9.2b: 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 under 9.2c. Deadlines on Friday, Saturday and Sunday* ***should*** *be avoided, because students submitting on these days will have limited access to support.*  *9.2d: Examples applying the penalties in (d) 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 (so that a mark of 65 will be reduced to 55, a mark of 48 will be reduced to 38 and so on).* * *If the maximum mark for the assessment is 50 and a student submits the assessment 2 hours after the deadline, the student’s mark will be reduced by 5 (so that a mark of 40 will be reduced to 35, a mark of 36 will be reduced to 31 and so on).*   *Examples applying the penalties in (d) 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*   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Student*** | ***A*** | ***B*** | ***C*** | ***D*** | ***E*** | | ***Pre-penalty mark*** | *100* | *50* | *45* | *40* | *30* | | ***10% penalty of the maximum mark – in this case 100*** | *90* | *40* | *35* | *30* | *20* | | ***or*** |  |  |  |  |  | | ***Mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark*** | *40* | *40* | *40* | *40* | *40* | | ***Outcome (the lower mark)*** | *40* | *40* | *35* | *30* | *20* |  * *These penalties* ***should*** *be taken into account when deciding submission dates.* * *Where multiple submissions (hardcopy and electronic copy) are required, guidance* ***must*** *make clear to students whether failure to submit in only one format constitutes ‘non submission’.* |

# SECOND MARKING

## Terminology

* 1. The following definitions inform the University’s expectations for grading moderation:

1. *Marking*: a process by which a numerical score is attached to a student's work,
2. *Single marking*: students’ work is marked by a single internal examiner,
3. *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,
4. *Moderation*: 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.

## Requirements

* 1. Summative examinations and coursework that contribute to the overall degree classification are subject to internal second marking/moderation (in line with 10.4 – 10.12), extended to all levels for those with no previous marking experience. Moderation is not required for formative assessment tasks.
  2. Subject areas may determine and publish policies on the appropriate use of different forms of second marking/moderation within the disciplinary context over and above those of the University minimum requirement set below e.g., in accordance with PSRB standards. In all cases, the Associate Dean for Education of the relevant faculty **must** be informed.

## Second Marking

* 1. An appropriate member of academic staff **must** undertake all second marking within a module.
  2. For assessment tasks that contribute 70% or more to a module equal to or greater than 30 credits, second marking **must** be undertaken.
  3. Where marks agree (within a 10% margin) then either:

1. a final grade is agreed through discussion between the 2 markers, or
2. an average of the two marks awarded is taken.
   1. Where there is a greater than 10% discrepancy in marks, a third marker **must** be employed (10.17 – 10.19).
   2. Feedback **should** be agreed or given separately.
   3. Clear records of any discussions and final mark.

## Second marking of ‘live’ assessment

* 1. Where an assessment is conducted ‘live’ e.g., presentations, performance, competency checking etc. a provision for internal moderation **must** be made where the task accounts for >10% of the module overall assessment burden. This may involve having two or more markers present or the use of video recorders if appropriate. In all cases, first and second markers **should** arrive at a mark independently in the first instance and agree a final mark following discussion.

***Note: For all other assessment tasks moderation is required.***

## Moderation

* 1. An appropriate member of academic staff **must** undertake all internal second moderation within a module.

## Moderation by sampling of the cohort

* 1. The moderator samples work carried out by the marker 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 no less than 10% (or 10 pieces whichever is the higher)** of all assessed work is reviewed and **must** include:

1. All fails,
2. A representative number from across the full range of marks awarded,
3. Any falling just below a grade boundary (e.g., 49, 59, 69),
4. The sample **must** be increased to 20% (or 20 pieces whichever is the higher) in the case of a new mode of assessment\* or where the marker is inexperienced (not previously marked at the level),
5. In those instances, where more than one person has carried out the initial marking process, at least 10% or 5 pieces of work **must** be included from each marker involved in the process.

\**New mode of assessment - intended to be used where a new mode of assessment has been introduced in a programme, e.g., one that the students have not been exposed to so far and, following on from that, that the module/programme team has limited experience of assessing. It is designed to support enhancement in assessment processes while safeguarding academic standards by ensuring sufficient scrutiny.*

* 1. If the moderator is assured the marking process meets the expectation set out above, the first mark will stand.
  2. 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 **must** take place. At this point, the relevant School Director of Learning and Teaching **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 either the Faculty Academic Manager or Director of Student Experience **should** be consulted. Any recommendations that involve a scaling of marks **must** be agreed with the relevant External Examiner(s).
  3. 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).
  4. Colleagues acting as moderators **should** also employ an arithmetical check and ensure that calculation transcription of marks is correct.

## Use of third markers

* 1. A third marker **should** be used where the first and second markers are unable to agree a final mark. The role of the third marker **should** not be to overrule the existing marks but to contribute to resolving the issues.
  2. Third marking to reconcile differences **must** not be carried out by an External Examiner
  3. Clear records **must** be kept of all discussions between markers and outcome decisions; these **must** be made available to the appropriate External Examiner(s).

## Automated Assessment

* 1. An exemption from the policy 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 checked for accuracy prior to use.
  2. Clear records **must** be kept of all discussions between markers and outcome decisions; these **must** be made available to the appropriate External Examiner(s).

## Resolution of grade difference

* 1. All grading differences **must** be resolved prior to module boards taking place.

## Collaborative Provision

* 1. 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.

## University Requirements

* 1. Where second marking or moderation is undertaken, the following principles **must** be applied:

1. all forms of second marking and moderation **must** be completed in a timely manner so that all feedback is returned to the student within 20 working days,
2. a working day is defined as any weekday but excluding bank holidays and those falling within the University defined Christmas closure period or any other extraordinary University closure period.
   1. In applying university requirements, account **should** be taken of:
3. the significance of the assessment,
4. the experience of the marker,
5. the type of the assessment.
   1. Regardless of the form of marking/moderation used, the first marker **must** provide the second marker or moderator with the following:
6. the assignment brief,
7. where appropriate, outline solutions which indicate how marks within a question have been allocated,
8. the grading criteria used.

# CLASS-BASED ASSESSMENT

* 1. This section sets out the minimum requirements for all class-based assessment. It defines the types of assessment covered, and when these types of assessment can be used.

## Definition

* 1. Class-Based Assessment is defined as any assessment, written or otherwise, organised by an academic unit, either within the usual teaching room or another room booked for the purpose.

## Module Specification

* 1. 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.

## Prior Notification of Assessments

* 1. All summative class-based assessments **must** be communicated to all students in advance and **should** be published in the module handbook and provided at the beginning of the module. It is good practice to reinforce information using other methods of communication to students, such as Canvas, notice boards, email or directly to students in class.
  2. Class-based assessments that are entirely formative, and so do not count towards the final module mark, may be announced in advance to students.

## Arrangements for Summative Assessments

* 1. 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:

1. physical environment (heating, lighting, physical space, etc),
2. the security of the assessment, and
3. 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),
4. appropriate arrangements for late arrivals, etc.

## Alternative Arrangements

* 1. The person responsible for the assessment **must** consider appropriately the needs of any student with a particular health or other problem. Students with alternative needs are assessed through Student Services Directorate, and changes to the arrangements of assessments for these students **must** only be made on their advice. This applies equally to summative and formative assessments.

## Anonymity

* 1. The requirement in 3.1 above for anonymised assessment where practicable applies equally to class-based assessments. The academic unit **should** consider using the University’s anonymous examination stationery available from the Student Services Directorate.

# REASSESSMENT

* 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.
  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.
  3. Reassessment **should** be by resubmission of the original work, modified to demonstrate achievement of the failed learning outcomes/competencies. Exceptionally, reassessment **may** be by submission of a new piece of work.
  4. Refer to the relevant University Programme Regulations for clarification of reassessment procedures.

# INVIGILATION OF EXAMINATIONS

* 1. The Student Services Directorate 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.
  2. The invigilation team will be recruited by application from people external to the University and/or postgraduate students.
  3. Examinations which are not organised centrally, or not held in central examination venues will continue to be invigilated by internal staff members.
  4. All Invigilators **must** have attended suitable training for the role prior to undertaking any invigilation duties.
  5. A Chief Invigilator will be assigned to each examination session, with additional responsibilities.
  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. Staff whose examination is taking place are advised to be present in the examination room at the start of the examination and **must** be available to be easily contacted for the duration of the examination, in case of query.

# CHECKING STUDENT IDENTITY

* 1. Students are required to have 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.
  2. The name and registration number of any student unable to provide suitable ID in the exam **must** be noted on the front of the exam packet so that the marker of the exam has an accurate record of those students without suitable ID. The Chief Invigilator is responsible for ensuring that this list is copied and sent to a) the Examinations Officer, Student Services Directorate, and b) the Head of Academic Unit of the subject concerned.
  3. 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:

1. Check that the signature on the exam script matches other recorded signatures within the academic unit. The Student Services Directorate 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.
2. Check the handwriting on the exam script against previous work.
3. Check the handwriting on the exam script against other documentation held in the academic unit.
   1. 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 Services Directorate, that these checks have taken place before the exam is marked.
   2. 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.
   3. 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

* 1. 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.
  2. 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.
  3. 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.

# RETENTION AND ARCHIVING OF SUMMATIVE ASSESSED WORK

* 1. The 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.
  2. There are two main reasons for retaining and archiving students’ assessed work:

1. in case of query, complaint or appeal by, or about, the student,
2. to provide an archive of sample marked work for assurance and enhancement purposes.
   1. 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.
   2. 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

* 1. 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.*

* 1. 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.
  2. 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.
  3. 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.
  4. All assessed work not submitted and marked though the virtual learning environment (including, but not limited to, those marked via grademark in turnitin, paper submissions, large pieces of practice work, artifacts, performances and presentations) **must** be retained and stored by Faculties.
  5. 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 the retained work or have it returned by post.
  6. 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. It **must** be destroyed as confidential waste.
  7. 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

* 1. 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.
  2. 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

* 1. 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:

1. to meet the requirements of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body,
2. to show to future students as examples.
   1. 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.
   2. Note: assessment data stored by third parties, for example TurnitinUK, is subject to the Service Level Agreements with those parties.

## General Data Protection Regulations

* 1. 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.
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Version** | **Author** | **Date approved** | **Relevant sections** |
| 1 21 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Aug 2023, Housekeeping | * Replaces Education Committee with Education Student Experience Committee. * Incorporates version control. |
| 1 19 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service | Sept 2021 | Migrated to new template |
| 1 18 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Lisa Tees, 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 | Jane Iddon, 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 | Jane Iddon, 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 | Jane Iddon, 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. |