

| HE Assessment Procedure for University Programmes | | |
|---|--|--|
| Lead: Steve Mulligan | | Status: |
| Version: 1 2 | | Date of Version December 18 th 2024 |
| Approving Body: Executive Team Higher Education Quality and Standards | | Supersedes: version 1 |
| Approved on: January 6 th 2025 | | Next Review date: December 18 th 2025 |
| Equality analysis tool ¹ | | |
| 1. | Is the policy relevant to the public sector equality duty? | No |
| 2. | Have any concerns previously been raised about this policy or practice? | No |
| 3. | Is likely to result in discrimination against a protected group? | No |
| 4. | Does this policy positively contribute to the participation of under-represented groups in the College's activities? | No |
| Version Control | | |
| Version | Date | Change(s) |
| | | |
| Access | | |
| Location | Yes | |
| Service Centre | No | |
| Document Centre | Group Shared Drive | |
| Public Website | Selby College, Wakefield College | |
| Communication | | |
| Medium | Audience | |
| HE Quality and Standards Committee | All staff who are responsible for the delivery of Higher Education. All Higher Education students. | |

¹ If the answer to any of these questions is yes, please complete the Screening Template provided and include as an Appendix to your policy.

Appendix One: Screening Tool

Public sector equality duty

| |
|---|
| Name of the policy HE Assessment Procedure for University Programmes |
| Author(s): Steve Mulligan |
| |

| |
|--|
| Author(s) of Equality Analysis: |
| Name: Steve Mulligan |
| Job title: Head of Higher Education |
| Date: 18 th December 2024 |
| Signature:  |

1. What are the main aims, purpose, and outcomes of the policy?

The purpose of this HN Assessment Policy is to ensure that staff and learners on Higher National programmes are fully aware of the criteria and standards against which learner progress and success will be judged.

2. Will these aims affect our duty to:

| | Yes / No | How? |
|--|----------|------|
| Advance equality of opportunity? | No | |
| Eliminate discrimination? | No | |
| Eliminate harassment? | No | |
| Foster good relations between people from different groups? | No | |
| Tackle prejudice and promote understanding between people from different groups? | No | |

3. What aspects of the policy, including how it is delivered, or accessed, could contribute to inequality?

None

4. Will the policy have an impact (positive or negative) upon the experience of people, including those who share a protected characteristic?

4.1 Please complete the following table:

| Protected characteristic | Meet needs of people with this characteristic | Encourage participation (if under-represented) | Remove or minimise disadvantages | Possible negative impact |
|-------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Race | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Gender | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Disability | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Religion / belief | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Sexual orientation | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Gender reassignment | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Pregnancy /maternity | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Age | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |
| Marriage / civil partnership* | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | No |

Evidence:

4.2 In addition, please consider whether this policy may indirectly discriminate against young adult carers (16-24). Although not a legally protected group, this group often suffers disadvantage due to their caring responsibilities and we have a moral duty to protect them.

Evidence: N/A

4.3 What different needs, experiences or attitudes are particular communities or groups likely to have in relation to this policy?

None

Declaration

The policy does not have a significant impact upon equality issues and therefore does not require any further action.

Author(s) of Equality Analysis:

Name: Steve Mulligan

Job title: Head of Higher Education

Date:

18th December 2025

Signature:



Date:

December 2024

Name: Steve Mulligan Head of Higher Education

HE Assessment Procedure for University Programmes

1 Scope

This policy applies to all university validated higher education programmes and it applies only where the validating Higher Education Institute (HEI) devolves policy on these matters to the Heart of Yorkshire Group (the Group), or is otherwise silent, and in all other circumstances the policy of the validating HEI will apply.

2 Purpose:

2.1 The purpose of an assessment policy is to ensure that learners on higher education programmes are made fully aware of the criteria and standards against which their progress and success will be judged.

2.2 The Assessment Policy is that all candidates should be made aware of:

- the timing of assessment, in order that they can prepare work schedules to meet deadlines;
- the criteria against which they will be assessed, in order that they can ensure that they are adequately prepared;
- the standards to be applied to measure success;
- the method(s) by which they will be assessed, to see that these are fair;
- the outcome of assessment and the reasons for that outcome, in order that they can judge their own performance for future reference.

2.3 This policy is underpinned by the following principles:

- that all assessment will be carried out in fair and equitable ways, without prejudice or favour;
- that any deviation from this policy in favour of one candidate must be fair to all other candidates;
- that it is the responsibility of the candidate to ensure understanding of the assessment criteria and standards before presenting for assessment;
- that the candidate has the right of appeal against any outcome of assessment or against the process as long as any appeal falls within the Group's Appeals Procedure;

Responsibility

3.1 It is the responsibility of the Programme Leader and teams to ensure that this policy is applied accurately, and that all appropriate information is made available to Examination/Assessment Boards. Review and evaluation of the policy will be the responsibility of the Higher Education Quality and Standards process on an annual basis. Tutors must refer to University guidelines where mandatory.

Policy and Procedure

4.1 Where a full qualification may be graded above a straightforward “pass” then the criteria for achieving higher levels must be clearly communicated to candidates in writing at the start of the programme (e.g. in a programme handbook).

4.2 All Programme Leaders/course tutors must set and publish deadlines for the submission and return of internally and externally assessed work as part of the assessment planning process. Deadlines for submission must be included in learner assessment calendars and on assignment briefs, which should be available in hard copy and on the designated digital platform for the Group. All deadlines must be set according to the needs of the course/programme of learning and the individual learner’s needs. Deadlines will recognise the time required to ensure accurate assessment and moderation. Deadlines must not exceed the duration of the course/programme funding/tuition fee period.

4.3 Assessments must be balanced across a course or programme to provide a balanced workload for both learner and staff.

4.4 Any penalties imposed as a result of late submission, over length coursework or unfair means must be clearly explained to learners and may be made available to Examination Boards.

4.5 All candidates will be made aware of the request for extensions and additional consideration procedure for the relevant programme

4.6 Any candidate dissatisfied with the process or outcome of an assessment has the right of appeal within the College’s Academic Appeals Procedure. It is the duty of Course Leaders to ensure that candidates are aware of this, to give appropriate guidance to the candidate and co-operate in the appeals process.

This policy and procedure will be made available on the relevant Group site website.

5 Assessment Tasks

5.1 Assessment tasks for Degree programmes should reflect the fact that they are industry-linked programmes, with a focus on employability, that prepare learners for work. Assessment tasks for the CertEd/PGCE are prescribed by the University.

Assessments tasks for all programmes should:

- Provide a relevant scenario
- Give clear task guidance

- Use a variety of assessment methods (e.g. work-based projects, case studies, performance observation, etc.)
- Utilise practical skills
- Clearly demonstrate links to the assessment requirements of the University Module
- Utilise a variety of assessment activities which provide learners with accessible opportunities to demonstrate their achievement of the assessment grading criteria

University of Hull

5.2 Before issuing assessment tasks to learners, they **must** be approved by the academic contact at the University and sent to the External Examiner for comment. All assessments for a module should be submitted together for approval **at least 4 weeks** before the first assignment is due to be issued to learners. Advice on the use of assignments from one year to the next must be sought from the University.

University of Huddersfield

5.3 All University prescribed assessment tasks must be used to assess learning.

Leeds Beckett University

5.4 We ensure that the academic standards of assessment are rigorous, of comparable standing with the rest of the sector and meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.

We ensure that all summative assessments are subject to internal scrutiny, approval, and moderation, and where appropriate (i.e. above Level 4 and/ or leading to a recognised H.E. award of the University at Level 4 and above/ and or required by a professional body) are scrutinised by external examiners.

6 Procedure for Coursework Submission and return

6.1 For submission of work the following procedures apply:

- a. The candidate must sign a plagiarism declaration on submission of coursework
- b. For University of Hull programmes, assignments must be submitted anonymously
- c. Work must be submitted electronically via Turnitin

If the work is not suitable for submission via Turnitin candidates may hand in a copy of coursework to a designated person or area which has been already agreed and obtain a receipt. It is the candidate's responsibility to obtain a signed receipt for all work handed in.

6.2 Coursework should be returned to the learner once a mark is assigned/agreed by the Exam Board.

Plagiarism/Unfair Means

Course Leaders must ensure that learners are fully informed about the use of sources and the penalties for plagiarism. Where Turnitin is used, departments must ensure that learners receive:

- appropriate guidance and support regarding good academic practice
- instructions for the use of Turnitin UK
- guidance on the interpretation of originality reports

See Procedure for dealing with breaches of assessment regulations: academic dishonesty and plagiarism.

7 Drafting/Number of submissions

University of Hull

7.1 For University of Hull programmes, unless specified otherwise by the Programme Leaders, learners are entitled to one formative and one summative submission opportunity for each element of module assessment:

- after formative submission, the work will be marked and given detailed written feedback designed to guide learners towards optimum achievement
- After summative submission, all work comprising the module assessment will be marked and graded. Any feedback/feedforward given will be in accordance with area protocols

University of Huddersfield Sally/Gabs to check

7.2 In the Cert Ed/PGCE:

The number of drafts permitted varies according to the level of the module and the year of study (see Sections 1.6 and 1.7 of the University Strategy). In the Cert Ed/PGCE:

For the Foundation level modules, trainees are entitled to feedback on one complete draft for each assignment.

At the discretion of the module tutor, feedback on further drafts may be given if the trainee appears to be at risk of failure in one or both of these modules.

For the modules at Intermediate, Honours and Masters level grouped under the headings *Policy and Professional Issues* and *Being a Subject Specialist Teacher*, feedback should be more limited but should also take into account that the programme is a practice-based course and therefore trainees may require practice-specific support and guidance.

In the Being a Subject Specialist modules, trainees are entitled to feedback on the following elements of the Teaching File:

In the Being a Subject Specialist modules, Specialist Conference Tutors will give feedback on a draft of the Conference Paper

Module 4 Professional Issues Assignment - all learners have an equal opportunity to either submit a writing frame or a full draft for feedback but should not expect detailed feedback on both. It is tutor

discretion if students are given further formal formative feedback on further developed draft submissions after either the writing frame or a full draft.

7.3 At the discretion of module tutors, **one** tutor re-assessment per module will apply if a final submission is not of Pass standard but appears to be retrievable in time for the tutor to re-mark the work and submit the result before the credit deadline for the main Course Assessment Board.

7.4 Tutor Reassessment in the CertEd/PGCE

Tutor Reassessment (TR) is where a student is given a single opportunity to re-submit an eligible piece of work and for it to be remarked prior to the meeting of the Course Assessment Board. Tutor reassessment will only be offered if a student submits a piece of work for the original assessment and achieves a mark within the specified referral range.

An Extenuating Circumstances claim cannot be submitted for an assessment that has been offered as a Tutor Reassessment.

The full regulations for tutor reassessment can be found in at

<https://www.hud.ac.uk/policies/registry/regts-taught/>

[Leeds Beckett University](#)

7.5 Feedback on Assessed Coursework

Students will be informed of:

- the feedback they can expect;
- the date by which this will be provided;
- the format in which the feedback will be communicated. Feedback will vary with the assessment task in question.

Forms of feedback on assessed work may include the following:

- oral feedback.
- written comment.
- provisional marks indicated on scripts/submission.
- the final ratified mark.
-

Retention of Assessment Records

7.6 Period of Retention

A sample of major coursework assessment will be retained until one academic year after the student or students have finished their course in the University.

7.7 Submission of Assessment

The arrangements for the submission of assessed work will be clearly notified to students. Arrangements may vary across the University. The University requirement is that they

should be secure and prevent, in so far as possible, a student being able to claim that a piece of work was handed in without such a claim being verifiable.

<https://www.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/our-university/public-information/academic-regulations/>

8 Late Submission

8.1 Penalties for late Submission University of Hull

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

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

All coursework assessments **must** have a published submission time, and this submission time **must** be communicated effectively to students.

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

Up to and including 24 hours after the deadline, a penalty of 10%.

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**.

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.

*Deadlines on Friday, Saturday and Sunday **should** be avoided, because students submitting on these days will have limited access to support.*

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'.*

- 8.2 The full version of the University of Hull's regulations relating to assessment is available via the University's Quality and Standards website under the assessment section. Cases of persistent late submission shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Examiners or Examination Committee. External Examiners will be informed where a learner's work shown to them has had marks reduced because of late submission.
- 8.3 In exceptional circumstances Exam Boards may modify decisions that have been implemented even when they have been done so in accordance with standard procedures and yet seem excessively harsh. For example, a learner who repeatedly submits late assessments for previously unknown reasons may need some specific form of assistance or supportive intervention; in such instances it may only be at the Exam Board that the consistency of lateness across modules is identified.
- 8.4 Persistent late submission may be classified as a disciplinary offence and may result in disciplinary action.

University of Huddersfield

- 8.5 Assessed work which is submitted late but within five working days of the agreed submission date will be accepted and the maximum mark available for that piece of assessment will be capped at the minimum pass mark. Please note that loss of data or printing error are not deemed to be acceptable reasons for the late submission of work.

Leeds Beckett University

- 8.6 Students are expected to submit work on time, but where a student has failed to submit assessment(s) by the prescribed date without good cause they will be penalised as given below. Any work not submitted within these limits may not normally be submitted at that opportunity.
- 8.7 "Days" include weekdays and include vacations, but exclude weekends, bank holidays and other days when the University or designated collaborative institution is closed.

Full-time Students

1 day late: 5 marks will be deducted from the mark achieved by the student.

2 to 9 days late: a further 5 marks will be deducted from the mark achieved by the student for every day on which the work remains unsubmitted.

(Should these penalties bring the final mark below 40% for Levels 4-6 or 50% for Level 7, then the work will normally be capped at the threshold pass mark.)
10 days late: a mark of zero will normally be recorded.

Part-time Students

1 to 2 days late: 5 marks will be deducted from the mark achieved by the student.

3 to 10 days late: a further 5 marks will be deducted from the mark achieved by the student for each two days on which the work remains unsubmitted (i.e. 5 marks for days 3-4; 5-6; 7-8; 9-10). (Should these penalties bring the final mark below 40% for Levels 4-6 or 50% for Level 7, then the work will normally be capped at the threshold pass mark.) 11 days late: a mark of zero will normally be recorded.

8.8 Cases of persistent late submission will be brought to the attention of the Progression and Award Board or Module Board by the Module Leader. Where work for reassessment is submitted late, the work will be marked, a late penalty applied in accordance with the conventions above and then the work will be capped for

9 Extensions to Deadline/additional consideration

9.1 Any requests for extension to deadline/additional consideration by the candidate should be submitted on an approved form. This will be available on the Group intranet, the appropriate digital platform or from the tutor/Programme Leader. Extensions to deadline/additional consideration will be considered at Group level by the Extensions Panel comprising the Programme Leader, Module/Unit tutor and the Head of HE and Access. The Extensions Committee must meet in advance of the Exam Board and should make recommendations to the Board which has final decision on all cases. The meetings of the Committee should be minuted and a copy available for reference at the Exam Board

9.2 Extension Requests

It is the responsibility of the student to manage their time according to the assessment schedule and ensure that assessments are completed by the published deadline. Missing a deadline will generally mean that work is subject to a penalty and may not be marked at all. If a student is unable to complete a piece of assessment by the date published, they may apply for an extension request, **this does not apply to assessments that are held on fixed dates such as on-campus examinations**. An application can only be approved if applied for no later than 48 hours after the original deadline and supported by appropriate documentary evidence and/or details of the circumstances. Examples of acceptable forms of evidence are listed in Annex 1.

An extension request should be completed by the student and submitted to the programme leader. The student will receive notification via their campus email if the request is approved or not. The completed form **should** be received no later than 48 hours after the original submission deadline for that assessment.

If the request is approved, an extension of **ten working days** will be applied from the original date of submission. If a student requires more than ten working days, they would be

advised to make a request for additional consideration. It will be the responsibility of the student to meet the new deadline.

A student **should** seek support and guidance from their Programme Leader if they feel an extension will still not offer sufficient time to complete the assessment in the extended timeframe.

An application for an extension will be considered by the relevant Group staff with the student notified of the outcome through their Group/College email. Generally, extension requests are dealt with at the time of application, the Group/College **should** be able to advise students about expected decision timeframes.

9.3 Although extending a submission deadline may help a student ease the current impact of the assessment workload, it is important the student is aware this could impact on other submission deadlines which could affect overall performance.

9.4 Requests for Additional Consideration

A student **should** only submit a request for a further attempt at assessment if they feel their performance or ability to complete the assessment has been affected by specific circumstances and that an extension would still not enable them to meet the deadline. In their application, they **should** describe the circumstances and state how the circumstances have affected them, providing evidence to support the request.

Making an application for additional consideration provides long-term mitigation for an assessment if a student will not be able to submit an assessment even with a revised extension deadline.

The possible outcome from an approved application for additional consideration would be one of the following:

- The student will be given the opportunity to complete the affected assessment with a revised deadline for submission (e.g. the next available opportunity, exam period or submission date).
- If an attempt at the affected assessment or examination has been made, the student, after having received the mark, will be offered the opportunity of a further attempt*.
- Where a student is offered a further attempt, they shall be informed of the mark achieved in the module, notwithstanding the request for additional consideration, and shall be permitted to accept or decline the offer within a time limit.
- Where the student accepts the offer of a further attempt, the mark for the original attempt shall become void. Where the student declines or does not reply to the offer, the mark for the original attempt shall stand and no further action shall be taken.

**A further attempt shall be interpreted to mean, in the case of a first attempt, that the candidate is offered a new first attempt, and in the case of a reassessment, that the candidate is offered a reassessment with a capped mark. The original mark will be void.*

A student **should** submit a separate request for each assessment event in which their performance has been affected. The request **must** be submitted within ten working days of the assessment deadline for a further attempt at the next assessment opportunity.

A request for additional consideration **should** be submitted via the Programme Leader. The online form has been designed to ensure that submitting a request is simple and straightforward for the student. They will be taken through the process, step by step, to ensure that all relevant information is collected, and all relevant sections of the form have been completed.

9.5 Deadlines, Additional Consideration Committees and Outcomes

All requests for additional consideration will be considered by the Additional Consideration Committee (ACC), which sits at Course level, normally within 15 working days of the request being made.

The student **should** always try to provide evidence to support their request as this will often provide additional information about the seriousness of the situation and its impact. However, the Group recognises it may not always be possible to provide evidence, so a student **should** still submit the request and provide as much detail about how they have been or being affected, including the timing of the impact.

All supporting evidence **should** be submitted to the Programme Leader. This may require students to scan original documents or provide screen shots (please note that in some cases, the Additional Consideration Committee may request sight of original copies of supporting evidence). If the evidence is not available at the time of the request (i.e. waiting for receipt of a medical certificate), then it is still possible to submit a request without supporting evidence in the first instance.

If the request for additional consideration is declined, it is likely to be for one of the following reasons:

- It has been submitted late (more than ten working days from the submission deadline);
- There is insufficient evidence to support the reported circumstances;
- It is not deemed to be a valid reason.

A student has the right to appeal a decision made by the ACC, such appeals **must** normally be submitted within 15 working days of the publication of the decision of the ACC, providing legitimate grounds for appeal.

The student will receive an email informing them of the outcome of their request after the ACC has convened, and to ensure that key staff are aware, the outcome will also be sent to the Programme Leader and Module Leader/s of the modules affected.

Where a Board of Examiners takes place in a Partner Institution, the associated Additional Consideration Committee or similarly named panel will take place in the Partner Institution.

If a student submits a request for additional consideration after the ten working day deadline, the ACC will review the request to consider the reasons for the lateness. Where there is evidence to support the reason for lateness, the ACC can consider the request as if submitted within time.

Requests for additional consideration submitted after meetings of the Programme Board have already taken place will NOT be accepted under any circumstances. A student **should** instead follow the University Code of Practice: Academic Appeals (UG/PGT) procedure located [here](#). Such appeals **must** normally be submitted within 15 working days of the publication of the decision of the Programme Board, and students will be required to demonstrate they had good reason for not submitting a request for additional consideration prior to the relevant deadline.

University of Huddersfield

9.3.1 A candidate may request a short extension to a deadline, but this request has to be made no later than two working days after the published submission date. Late requests for extensions are not accepted.

A candidate may request extenuating circumstances (EC) if there is sufficient evidence to support a request. The regulations for ECs can be found in Section 5 at <http://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/regulationsandpolicies/studentregs>

Leeds Beckett

9.3.2 The length of the extension given will normally be: • For 5 working days only – “working days” includes weekdays and vacations. Saturday, Sundays, Bank Holidays and other days when the University is closed are not classed as working days. If the student requests a longer period of time and the member of staff considering the request finds this to be justified, the length of the extension given may be exceptionally extended to 10 working days. Such an extension, when permitted, will normally be the sole form of mitigation allowed in respect of these particular extenuating circumstances.

All extensions, where granted, must be reported to the School mitigation panel and recorded in the University’s student record system. An extension will not normally be given after the date on which the coursework should have been submitted. The member of staff considering such requests can exceptionally allow a student to submit a request for an extension up to one working day after the submission date.

10 Over/Under Length Assessment

University of Hull

10.1 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.

For summative assessed work, the Group will normally not mark beyond the stipulated assignment length. This **must** be made clear in student handbooks, the relevant digital platform, assignment briefs and where they are used submission pro forma.

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 relevant digital platform and/or in module handbooks.

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).

Overlength assessments:

Assignment length does not include the assignment title or instructions.
Unless otherwise specified the published word count **must** exclude charts, graphs, tables etc. included in the assignment.

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.

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.

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.

10.2 Non-attendance/non-submission

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.

University of Huddersfield

10.3 Module specifications and assignment briefs provide approximate word counts. These indicate both the expected depth of treatment of each component of assessment, and the economy of language to be used. You should endeavour to meet the stated word counts and should not normally submit work significantly below the word count. In some cases, a minimum required word count is stated.

The ability to structure written work, and to write with appropriate concision having regard to the assessment guidelines, are important academic skills. It should be noted that where word limits are exceeded beyond a tolerance of 10 per cent this will impact negatively on the grade/mark awarded, having regard to the related assessment criteria.

11 Marking of Learners' Work

11.1 University of Hull

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. Assessment criteria and marking schemes should be fair and transparent. Formative assessments where used, should include guidance for learners on strengths and areas for improvement.

First Marking

Formative and summative assessments should in every instance be first marked using Gracemark in Turnitin or the College template. Learners and staff should be made aware that grades awarded on the feedback sheet are provisional until ratified at the Assessment/Exam Board and therefore may change.

Second Marking

Terminology

The following definitions inform the expectations for grading moderation:

- **Marking:** a process by which a numerical score is attached to a student's work,
- **Single-marking:** students' work is marked by a single internal examiner,
- **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,
- **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.

11.2 Requirements

Summative examinations and coursework that contribute to the overall degree classification are subject to internal second marking/moderation extended to all levels for those with no previous marking experience. Moderation is not required for formative assessment tasks.

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

11.3 Second Marking

An appropriate member of academic staff **must** undertake all second marking within a module. For assessment tasks that contribute 70% or more to a module equal to or greater than 30 credits, second marking **must** be undertaken.

Where marks agree (within a 10% margin) then either:

- a final grade is agreed through discussion between the 2 markers, or an average of the two marks awarded is taken.
- Where there is a greater than 10% discrepancy in marks, a third marker **must** be employed feedback **should** be agreed or given separately. There should be a clear record of any discussions and final mark.

11.4 Second marking of 'live' assessment

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.

11.5 Moderation

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

Moderation by sampling of the cohort

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:

- All fails,
- A representative number from across the full range of marks awarded,
- Any falling just below a grade boundary (e.g. 49, 59, 69),

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). 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.*

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

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 Head of HE **should** be made aware, and they **should** oversee the process; **should** the Head of HE involved in the marking or mitigation process either the Curriculum Director or Head for the area **should** be consulted. Any recommendations that involve a scaling of marks **must** be agreed with the relevant External Examiner(s).

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).

Colleagues acting as moderators **should** also employ an arithmetical check and ensure that calculation transcription of marks is correct.

11.5.1 Use of third markers

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.

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

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

11.5.2 Automated Assessment

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.

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

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

11.6 Collaborative Provision

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.

11.7 University Requirements

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

- 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,
- a working day is defined as any weekday but excluding bank holidays and those falling within the Group defined Christmas closure period or any other extraordinary Group closure period.

In applying these requirements, account **should** be taken of:

- the significance of the assessment,
- the experience of the marker,
- the type of the assessment.

Regardless of the form of marking/moderation used, the first marker **must** provide the second marker or moderator with the following:

- the assignment brief,
- where appropriate, outline solutions which indicate how marks within a question have been allocated, the grading criteria used.

12 Feedback on Assessment

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*.

- The 20 working days noted above **must** include all first and second marking.
- Students **must** be provided with an opportunity to act on the feedback in preparing for further assessments in the same or other related modules.
- Feedback **must** be clear, and where written, legible.
- 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.
- Learning outcomes/competencies **should** be stated on the feedback, rather than students being referred to their module handbooks or to other separate documents.
- The principles on which work is being marked **must** be made clear to students, whether this is via learning outcomes/competencies or grading criteria.
- Feedback **should** be balanced, to include strengths as well as areas for development.

Feedback must include some targets for future development (relevant at both mid- and end-module). These targets could include:

- General academic features / study skills,
- Presentation, style, structure,
- Range and use of reading,
- Criticality,
- Focus on the question / establishment of a key and relevant question.

Feedback **must** include not only areas for development, but also practical ways to improve these areas.

At the point of submission students may request targeted feedback on specific learning outcomes/competencies assessed. Clarification relating to feedback **must** be made available to students on request.

** Working days refers to the Group working days.*

13 Assessment Criteria

13.1 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.

13.2 Pass/fail modules

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.

13.3 Class-Based Assessment

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.

13.3.1 Definition

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.

13.3.2 Module Specification

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.

13.3.3 Prior Notification of Assessments

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.

Class-based assessments that are entirely formative and so do not count towards the final module mark, may be announced in advance to students.

13.3.4 Arrangements for Summative Assessments

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:

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

13.4 Alternative Arrangements

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, 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.

13.5 Anonymity

The requirement is 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.

14 Reassessment

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.

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.

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.

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

15 Invigilation of Examination

- 15.1 The Exam department 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.

The invigilation team will be recruited by application from people external to the University and/or postgraduate students. Examinations which are not organised centrally, or not held in central examination venues will continue to be invigilated by internal staff members.

All Invigilators **must** have attended suitable training for the role prior to undertaking any invigilation duties. A Chief Invigilator will be assigned to each examination session, with additional responsibilities.

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.

15.2 Checking Student Identity

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.

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, and b) the Head of Academic Unit of the subject concerned.

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:

- Check that the signature on the exam script matches other recorded signatures within the academic unit.
- Check the handwriting on the exam script against previous work.
- Check the handwriting on the exam script against other documentation held in the academic unit.

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.

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.

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.

15.3 Examinations

Examinations should be organised following the College/University Examinations Policies and in collaboration with the College Examinations Officer.

16 Exam Boards

16.1 For University of Hull programmes, it is the Course Leader's responsibility to organise the chair of Exam Board in liaison with the university faculty. The Exam Board chair must be impartial and have not taught on the relevant programme. Exam Board chairs must have undertaken training with the university.

- Exam Boards are responsible for:
- Monitoring academic standards
- Making recommendations on the grades achieved by students on individual units and confirming the marks to be awarded
- Making recommendations on the progression of students onto the next stage of the programme
- Making recommendations about resit decisions, referrals and deferrals
- Considering additional consideration /extension to deadlines (on receipt of information from the additional consideration Panel)
- Considering cases of unfair means (on receipt of information from the Unfair Means Adjudicating Panel)
- Considering appeals (on receipt of information from the Appeals Panel)

(See full Exam Board Guidance)

For all programmes, Course Leaders and staff should ensure that students are aware that marking decisions are provisional until confirmed by an Exam Board.

16.2 University of Huddersfield

At the discretion of module tutors, one tutor re-assessment per module will apply if a final submission is not of Pass standard but appears to be retrievable in time for the tutor to re-mark the work and submit the result before the credit deadline for the main Course Assessment Board.

17 Retention and Archiving of Summative Assessed Work

17.1 The Head of Higher Education is responsible for establishing a process to ensure adherence to the University's Retention and Archiving Assessment requirements. Heads of Area are accountable for ensuring implementation of that process. Each Faculty **must** submit its process to the Quality Support Service.

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

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

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.

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.

17.2 Retention of assessed work

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.*

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.

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.

All assessed work not submitted and marked through 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.

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.

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.

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.

17.3 Archiving of assessed work

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.

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.

17.3.1 Retention of work for longer periods of time

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 include:

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

Note: assessment data stored by third parties, for example TurnitinUK, is subject to the Service Level Agreements with those parties.

General Data Protection Regulations

In order to comply with the General Data Protection Regulations and the Group'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.

Appendix

Request for Extension or Additional Consideration Form

Undergraduate Taught Students.

This form **should** be used to make either a request for an extension (ten working days) or for additional consideration for all assessments including examinations. For **extensions**, the request **must be submitted no later than 48 hours after the assessment deadline, extensions cannot be used for fixed date assessments such as on-campus examinations.**

For **additional consideration**, the request **must be submitted within ten working days of the assessment deadline.**

Requests submitted after these deadlines may not be considered. Please indicate your choice by ticking one of the following:

Extension Request

(Ten working day extension)

**Additional Consideration
opportunity**

(further attempt at the next available

Before completing this form, please ensure that you have read this Code of Practice and that you have discussed your situation with your Course Leader before submitting any request.

1. Student's Details

Student Name

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Student Name | |
| Student ID Number (e.g. 201912345) | |
| Course Title | |
| Year of Study | |
| Course Leader | |

2. Modules/Units Affected

This section **MUST** be completed to consider your application. Which modules are affected and what action are you requesting as a result of these circumstances, (select only one requested action for each individual assessment)? If you are unsure of your Module details or assessment title, please contact your Course Leader for guidance.

| Module/Unit Title | Module/Unit Code | Assessment Code, Type and Title of Assessment (e.g. assignment, exam, test, lab, presentation) | Assessment deadline | Requested action |
|-------------------|------------------|--|---------------------|------------------|
| | | | | Choose an item. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------|
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |
| | | | | Choose an item. |

3. Duration of Circumstances

| | | | | | |
|------|--|----|--|----------------------|--------------------------|
| From | | To | | Ongoing, please tick | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------|--|----|--|----------------------|--------------------------|

4. Details of Circumstances

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>There are a range of support services available to you across the Group that will be helpful to support the completion of this request. Your Course Leader are usually well-placed to advise you on completing this form and any support that might help with your current circumstances.</p> <p>Have you sought advice and guidance before completing this form?</p> <p>If yes, please provide the name of the member of staff</p> <p>Please provide a thorough explanation of how your circumstances have had an impact on you and how they have prevented you from completing the assessment/s:</p> | |
|---|--|

5. Evidence

Please specify what evidence you are providing in support of your request:

- None, I am self-certifying my absence and have explained the details of the circumstances in Section 4***
- I have a reasonable adjustment already in place with evidence already submitted
- Doctor's note/letter
- Record of hospital admission
- Letter from consultant/specialist
- Police incident report
- Letter from court
- Collective Trauma, traumatic incident
- Other, please specify

Please describe the supporting documentation attached to your claim and how it relates to your situation, supporting documentation should cover the period of time stated in section 3 of this form:

If you are unable to provide supporting evidence, please state why below:

***You can use the self-certification process for a maximum of two requests in a particular trimester and a maximum of three requests in an academic year. If your period of illness is, or will be, longer than seven days, or if you have already used the self-certification process more than the maximum number of times, then you should speak to your Course Leader and submit evidence as appropriate with a request for additional consideration.**

6. Declaration

I certify that the information I have given on this form is correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the University will regard providing false information as a disciplinary offence. I agree to allow the Group/University to hold and use this data for the purposes it was submitted in accordance with the Data Protection Act (2018).

| | | | |
|------|--|------|--|
| Name | | Date | |
|------|--|------|--|

7. Checklist

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Please check that you have fully completed Sections 1 – 6 prior to submitting your request. You should ensure the following is included: | Completed Yes/No |
|--|------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| ✓ Your full details | |
| ✓ Full details of your Module Code/s and Title/s | |
| ✓ Details and dates of each impacted assessment included in your request | |
| ✓ Details of difficult circumstances | |
| ✓ Supporting documentation (where available) | |
| ✓ Declaration section completed | |