P O L I C Y

TITLE:	HE Assessment Policy and Procedure
AIM:	To ensure that assessment on HE programmes meets the requirements of UK Quality Code for Higher Education and that students are made fully aware of the criteria and academic standards against which their progress and achievement will be judged.
RELATED POLICIES & PROCEDURES:	HE Quality Manual Academic Appeals Policy Respective awarding body assessment policies and procedures UK Quality Code for Higher Education
APPROVED BY:	Academic Board
VERSION	4
DATE OF APPROVAL:	October 2016
DATE OF NEXT REVIEW:	October 2019
DISTRIBUTION:	HE Committee

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT		
Phase 1 **Initial Screening completed**	**Date:**	25/11/16
Phase 2 **Full impact assessment completed/ not required**	√ **Not required**	(please tick if appropriate)
	Completed on (if applicable):	
This document is available in alternative formats, please contact reception or, alternatively, e-mail info@eastridingcollege.ac.uk to discuss how we can help you.		

INTRODUCTION

Policy Statement for the Higher Education Assessment Policy and Procedures:

1. This policy specifically relates to programmes validated by the University of Hull and Pearsons. For programmes validated by the University of Huddersfield the mandatory regulations and policies of the university have to be followed as stated in the partnership agreement. However, certain sections of the policy, are internal East Riding College policies which must be adhered to. This is made clear within the policy. Additional information is shown in points 9 to 13. A specific section relating to HNC/HNDs is included within the policy.
2. The purpose of the HE assessment policy and procedures is to is to ensure:
    - the assessment of students is robust, valid and reliable and that the award of qualifications and credit are based on the achievement of the intended learning outcomes.
    - that students have appropriate opportunities to show they have achieved the intended learning outcomes for the award of a qualification or credit.
    - that students are made fully aware of the criteria and academic standards against which their progress and success will be judged.

2. All Students 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 academic 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.

This policy is underpinned by the following principles:

3. That all assessment will be carried out in fair and equitable ways, without prejudice or favour;
4. Assessment is conducted following assessment procedures that are compliant with the requirements of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education and the College's HEI awarding body partners;
5. That assessment practices are constantly monitored for validity, equity and reliability, paying due attention to the relevant subject benchmark statements and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications;
6. That any deviation from this policy in favour of one student must be fair to all other students;
7. That it is the responsibility of the student to ensure understanding of the assessment criteria and standards before presenting for assessment;
8. That the student has the right of appeal against any outcome of assessment or against the process as long as any appeal falls within the College's Academic Appeals Policy or validating body procedures as applicable.

ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE

9. For programmes validated by the University of Huddersfield the mandatory regulations and policies of the university have to be followed as stated in the partnership agreement. University of Huddersfield regulations can be seen in hull here - University of Huddersfield Regulations.
10. For programmes validated by Pearsons the assessment regulations are detailed in the 'BTEC Centre Guide to Assessment: Level 4-7'. This document explains the assessment requirements for BTECs accredited on the Qualification Credit Framework (QCF).
11. For programmes validated by Pearsons additional guidance specific to HNC/HNDs is available at the Edexcel website.

12. For programmes validated by the University of Hull the mandatory requirements of the University Code of Practice: Assessment Procedures must be adhered to (see Section F of the University Quality Handbook):
http://www2.hull.ac.uk/administration/policy_register/quality_handbook/section_f.aspx

13. For programmes validated by the University of Huddersfield the assessment policies and procedures of the Consortium for Post-Compulsory Education and Training (CPCET) must be adhered to:
http://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/index.php/regulations.php,
http://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/regulationsandpolicies/awards/
http://www.hud.ac.uk/registry/regulationsandpolicies/studentregs/

All assessment policy and procedures are intended to conform to the UK Quality Code for Higher Education 'Chapter A6: Assessment of achievement of learning outcomes' and 'Chapter B6: Assessment of students and accreditation of prior learning'.

The guide is intended to help staff involved in assessment to use it effectively, as a means of maintaining both the academic standards of taught awards and ensuring and enhancing the quality of the student learning experience. The guide seeks to clarify the role of teaching and administrative staff in ensuring that the assessment process is effective and secure. It aims to make national expectations concerning assessment - as set out in Chapter B6: Assessment and accreditation of prior learning of the Quality Code - accessible to staff, and to explain to staff their likely roles and responsibilities in designing and running assessments. Staff are required to refer to this policy but are also encouraged to use the established links of support from validating bodies.

PROCESS FOR ASSESSMENT (All Programmes)

14. All higher education programmes must develop their own assessment strategy commensurate with the needs and nature of their particular programme design all of which must meet the requirements of this overall policy, and the regulations of the respective awarding body.
15. Within two weeks of commencing a programme, a Personal Development Plan (PDP), or equivalent if appropriate to the programme are to be completed. This may include key assessment periods. If appropriate this may be accomplished on ProMonitor.
16. Assessment dates and deadlines may be altered by the programme leader according to operational need or re-negotiated with students(s) according to individual circumstance. Any re-negotiation based on individual's circumstances must be fair to all other students. All students should be made aware of the mitigating circumstances procedure for the relevant programmes.
17. The feedback given on work submitted for formative or summative assessment will explicitly take into account the opportunity to improve the work by acting on the feedback, where this is allowed within the respective awarding body regulations.
18. The assessment criteria and how these will be applied will be made known to the students to make themselves familiar with the assessment criteria prior to submission for assessment.
19. Any student dissatisfied with the process or outcome of an assessment has the right of appeal within the College's Academic Appeals Policy, or respective awarding body procedure, whichever is applicable. It is the duty of course leaders to ensure that students are aware of this, to give appropriate guidance to the students and co-operate in the appeals process.
20. Programmes must ensure that students with disabilities are not disadvantaged in the assessment process. This may involve the exploration and implementation of alternative methods of assessment. 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 the School Liaison & Guidance Manager 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
21. Programmes must ensure that students have adequate time to reflect on learning before being assessed.

ASSESSMENT RELATED DOCUMENTS (All Programmes)

Coursework assignments:

22. Students are required to meet the clearly stated criteria for assessment submission as stated by in the programme and module handbooks for each programme. The submission process may vary based on the assessment format, programme leader, validating body and feedback format.
23. Copies of all assignments should be kept for a minimum of one year after graduation with a sample (10%) to be kept until 3 years after graduation representing a cross section of <40%, 40-70% and >70%.
24. Tutors must refer to the respective awarding body guidelines where mandatory. Procedures are indicated by the HE Quality Manual.

METHODS OF ASSESSMENT (All Programmes)

25. Where possible, modules should involve more than one method of assessment and programmes should involve a variety of methods. It is acknowledged that there will be cases where a single method of assessment can be justified, either by essay, exam, or other method of assessment.
26. There is a range of assessment methods that can be utilised, such as:
    • presentations, written reports, accounts, surveys
    • log books, production diaries
    • role play
    • observations of practical tasks or performance
    • articles for journals, press releases
    • production of visual or audio materials, artefacts, products and specimens
    • peer and self assessment
    • conference papers/posters
    • examinations
    • peer review/grading
27. Where appropriate, tutors will use online submissions allowing 'assessment windows' around deadlines via TurnItIn. In the unlikely event of a technical issue preventing submissions online it is the students responsibility to contact their programme or module tutor within 24 hours to report the technical issue.
28. New methods of assessment should be avoided wherever possible in the final stages 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.
29. Where assessment is practical in nature, evidence collected by the tutor must meet the requirements of validating institute.

LATE SUBMISSION (applicable to University of Hull validated programmes only)

30. Strict penalties apply for late submission of assessments. The following policy will apply:
    (i) Penalties are a percentage of the maximum mark available for the assessment element which has been submitted late

    (ii) All coursework assessments must have a published submission deadline

    (iii) The late submission penalties which will 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 7 days after the deadline; either a penalty of 10% or the mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark (i.e. 40), whichever results in the lower mark

- More than 7 days after the deadline, a mark of zero is awarded.

> Examples applying the penalties for coursework submitted up to and including 24 hours after the deadline:
>
> - If the maximum mark for the assessment is 100 and a student submits the assessment 2 hours after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 (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 for coursework submitted more than 24 hours and up to and including 7 days after the deadline:
> - If the maximum mark for the assessment is 100 and a student submits the assessment 2 days after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 and then capped at 40 if this is lower (so that a mark of 90 will be reduced to 80, and then reduced to the pass mark of 40 as this is lower).
> - If the maximum mark for the assessment is 50 and a student submits the assessment 6 days after the deadline, the student's mark will be reduced by 5 and then capped at 40 if this is lower (so that a mark of 40 will be reduced to 35 and will remain at 35 as this is lower than the pass mark).

OVERLENGTH ASSESSMENT (applicable to University of Hull validated programmes only)

31. Students are required to adhere to the specified assessment limits as indicated in the assessment criteria, for example, word count or time limits. The risk of 'overlength' is that a student can gain unfair advantage by submitting work longer than the maximum permitted.

32. There is a College standard system of penalties which programme teams must apply to summatively assessed work which is deemed to be 'overlength'.

33. The following penalties must be adhered to:

   I.   Penalties are a percentage of the maximum mark available for the assessment element which is overlength
   II.   Overlength assessment penalties apply to word counts and excludes charts, graphs, tables etc.
   III. Unless otherwise specified the published word limit excludes references in footnotes, appendices, references and bibliography lists
   IV.   Coursework assessment rubrics must instruct students to declare a word count on the coversheet where a word limit is specified
   V.   An erroneous word count declaration must be dealt with as suspected use of unfair means. The case must then be followed up according to the Regulations on the Use of Unfair Means
   VI.   Exceeded time limits, for example a presentation or demonstration, will received the equivalent penalty to overlength word counts
   VII. The penalties which must be applied to assessments which are overlength are:

- 10-20% over the specified word limit or time limit, a penalty of 10% of the total marks available
- more than 20% over the published word limit or time limit, the work will be awarded a mark of zero

VII.   Other penalties must not be applied.

Examples applying the penalties for time limits. For presentations and practical assessments with a specified time limit, students are required to adhere to the time allocated. A two minute warning will be given before reaching the time limit. The practical assessment or presentation will be stopped after allowing an extra 10% of time. For example, if the time specified for a presentation assessment is 15 minutes a two minute warning will be given after 13 minutes. The student will then be allowed an extra 10% which would be 90 seconds. The presentations will be stopped after 16 minutes and 30 seconds and the student assessed on this basis. Clear details on each presentation assessment must be stated in the module handbook.

34. On BTEC HNC/HNDs the above penalties do not apply, although students on these programmes are expected to work within the word guidance which will be listed on all assignment briefs. Grading descriptors should be used to deal with late work and overlength assessment. Whilst word limits are not permitted, word guidance is advisable.

FEEDBACK ON ASSESSMENT (All Programmes)

35. Students will receive formative and summative feedback on assessed work, feedback **must** be clear and, where written, legible.
36. Feedback **must** include specific reference to module learning outcomes or to clear grading criteria derived from learning outcomes, and should indicate specifically whether each outcome has been achieved, and if not the reasons for this judgement.
37. Formative feedback **must** allow students to further develop their work which is timely to meet the internal and external moderation deadlines. Summative feedback will detail the required developments in their academic practice to achieve higher marks in the next assessment.
38. Feedback should be balanced, to include strengths as well as areas for development.
39. Feedback **must** include some targets for future development (relevant at both mid- and end-module). These targets could include:
    i.   General academic features/study skills
    ii.   Presentation, style, structure
    iii. Range and use of reading
    iv.   Criticality
    v.   Focus on the question/establishment of a key and relevant question
40. Clarification relating to feedback must be made available to students on request.
41. **Provisional** feedback should be available to students within **15 working days.**
42. It is critical that students are made aware that final marks and penultimate feedback is only available after the relevant module and programme boards.

ANONYMOUS ASSESSMENT PROCESS (All Programmes)

43. All forms of summative assessment must be marked anonymously where this is practicable and meets the guidelines of the awarding institute.
44. Where online submissions are not used, a procedure is available via the College reception to receive student work anonymously using the student number and assignment front cover for marking purposes.

MARKING AND GRADING (Univeristy of Hull and Pearsons Programmes)

45. Programmes must publish and implement consistently, clear criteria for the marking and grading of assessments.

46. To affect optimum reliability and validity of marking, where the assessment instrument allows, programmes must implement a system of anonymous marking.
47. Programmes validated by the University of Hull must, where required by the University's Academic Contact, employ a system of second marking, which ensures the equitable treatment of all students. Second marking is not applicable to HNC/HNDs however the Pearsons Internal Verification procedures should be applied as noted in point 11. Normally second marking would include all borderlines and a representative sample from each award classification, or all grades from a lecturer with less than one year's lecturing experience If the marks awarded by the first marker differs from the marks awarded by the second marker by less than 5% the first markers grade will be maintained. However if the first marker grades differs from the second marker grades by greater than 5% then the first and second marker must meet to agree the final grade awarded. If an agreement can't be reached then the work will be remarked by a third marker and discussion will be completed by all parties to determine the final grade.
48. For programmes validated by the University of Hull, modules/handbooks must moderated where requested by the University's Academic Contact
49. Appeals against assessment decisions must be made in accordance with the College's Academic Appeals Policy
50. Programmes must ensure that assessment decisions are recorded and documented accurately and systematically.
51. The College's minimum requirements for second marking for each assessment task are designed to balance rigour with practicality in the time scales for the assessment period:

Assessment type	Marking requirement
Formative assessment	Single marking
Undergraduate Pre-Certificate and Certificate stage summative assessment	Single marking
All other summative assessment	Open second marking of a sub-group of work comprising no less than the work of 8 students or 10% of the whole group (whichever is the larger) and including a representative sample equally spanning the full range of marks awarded. OR a moderation proportion as prescribed by the validating body.
Marking conducted by a member of staff with less than one year's marking experience at the level in question	Open second marking of all work marked by that person
Summative assessment which is not available to post-hoc scrutiny (such as performance, including seminars where part or all of the mark depends on the standard of presentation, musical performances, or the demonstration of practical skills)	Where the performance element constitutes greater than 33% of the assessment for the module simultaneous independent second marking. Additional evidence should be use in this process (e.g. video, witness statements) as required by the awarding institute.
Assessment of practice modules where the theoretical assessment is linked to practice and where the practice element must meet the competency standard set by professional statutory bodies	Students must be observed on separate but not necessarily successive occasions

52. The following definitions inform the University's expectations for second marking:
   - *Marking:* a process by which a numerical score is attached to a student's work
   - *Formative marking*: refers to marks awarded solely in order to provide the student with feedback on assessment where the marks do not contribute to the overall module mark
   - *Summative marking:* refers to marks awarded that contribute to the overall module mark
   - *Single-marking:* students' work is marked by a single internal examiner
   - *Second-marking:* a process whereby the awarded marks are checked and validated by a second marker. The guidance given to the second-marker should include necessary information on assessment criteria and learning outcomes. There are two types of second-marking:

      Open second-marking: at the time of marking, the second marker knows the marks awarded by the first marker

      Independent second-marking: at the time of marking, the second marker does not know the marks awarded by the first marker

   - *Whole-group second marking:* In some cases the work of every student in a group is second marked, also termed module moderation
   - *Sub-group second marking:* Alternatively, samples of work of a sub-group may be second marked. Such work should be a representative sample equally spanning the full range of marks awarded with a minimum of 10 scripts or 10% of the whole group (whichever is the larger).

53. Second marking is a verification procedure. The role of the second marker is to check that the first marking has been carried out appropriately. The second marker is commenting on the marking standards of the first marker and is not expected to provide feedback to students (which is provided by the first marker).

BTEC HNC/HND ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS (Pearsons Programmes)

54. The specification for each BTEC qualification is the document that Programme Leaders and teams must use as first point of reference for all planning and assessment. Specifications are accompanied by important assessment and delivery guidance which provide instructions and advice for each unit in the qualification.

55. HNCs/HNDs, validated by Pearsons, follow the College internal verification procedures for BTEC, which are outlined in the Internal Quality Assurance Policy and the Internal Quality Assurance Procedure. A minimum IV sample is between 10-25%, although more often than not it will exceed these quanities on HE Programmes. More details are included within the relevant policies and procedures.

56. Internal verification is the quality assurance system you use to monitor assessment practice and decisions. Internal Verifiers conduct quality checks on assessment processes and practice to ensure that they meet national standards and that all students have been judged fairly and consistently. The BTEC Centre Guide to Internal Verification is the key document produced by Edexcel giving additional guidance on the IV process. The process ensures that:
   o assessment plans and schemes of work are in place to ensure full coverage of the qualification
   o assessment instruments are fit for purpose
   o assessment decisions accurately match student evidence to the unit grading criteria
   o and assessment guidance
   o Assessors are standardised and assessment and grading is consistent across the Programme

57. It is essential that internal verification is planned for at the start of a programme. An internal verification schedule must be agreed, ensuring that:
   a. all assignment briefs are internally verified before distribution to students
   b. a sample of assessment decisions is internally verified, covering every unit, every Assessor and a range of student achievement (e.g. Ungraded, Pass, Merit, Distinction)

58. An Internal Verifier can be anyone involved in the delivery and assessment of the programme who is able to give an expert "second opinion". Where there is a team of Assessors, it is good practice for all Assessors to be involved in internally verifying each other. Please note that an Internal Verifier cannot internally verify their own assignments or assessment decisions.

59. External examination is the form of standards verification undertaken for BTEC programmes at Level 4-7. Standards verification is the process Edexcel use to check that the centre is operating quality assurance and assessing to national standards. More details relating to the external examination and standards verification processes can be found at the Pearsons website in the Guide to [BTEC Quality Assurance](#).

GUIDELINES ON ASSESSING GROUP WORK ON BTEC HNC/HND PROGRAMMES (Pearsons Programmes)

60. Group projects should be included in the assessment schedule for a unit only where one or more learning outcomes of the unit indicate that they might be appropriate. QAA expects a variety of assessment methods and consequently where appropriate group working skills should be developed. Students should be informed, in detail and in advance, of the basis for assessment of group projects, including the methods to be used to measure the extent of individual contributions

61. If the group project or its assessment places on students an obligation to exercise skills or judgements beyond those required for the subject (e.g. peer assessment), then adequate training should be provided to assist students to exercise that judgement

62. If there is to be peer assessment of the contribution of the students to a group project, then the process for collecting feedback should be confidential between the individual student and the Assessor. If peer assessment includes the measurement of the contribution, the method should be clear and simple to use and self assessment should also be included

63. A common group grade should not be assigned to all members of the group; individual contributions should be measured and graded against the learning outcomes, the assessment and grading criteria

64. Evidence of observation of presentations and discussions (with peers, with Assessors etc.) should be detailed and mapped to criteria in order to provide evidence of achievement of individual contributions

65. It is good practice to encourage students to reflect on what they have learnt from the group work experience and produce a written evaluation

66. In some cases, presentations may provide evidence only sufficient for pass criteria for a HNC/HND unit, for example where a presentation contained no corroborated detail of individual tasks undertaken by members of the group. In such cases, evidence for higher grades may be achieved through formalised questioning of individual students mapped to the assessment criteria, or having the students produce a supplementary report of their activities

67. Feedback can be directed to the group with reference to individual contributions and achievement

68. For graded programmes, the achievement of the merit and distinction grade descriptors should be measured against individual contributions and the method of measurement should be clear within the assignment brief.

TIME CONSTRAINED ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES ON BTEC HNC/HND PROGRAMMES (Pearsons Programmes)

69. The word 'test' is used below to describe any type of time limited assessment activity on a BTEC programme.
70. The widespread use of time limited assessment activities (e.g. tests) is not encouraged within QCF BTEC qualifications, but appropriate limited use is permitted. Where tests are used, the programme team should ensure that their use can be justified and that they are valid for the purpose stated. The guidance within the BTEC Centre Guide to Assessment: Level 4-7 must be adhered to.

FORMATIVE AND SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENT ON BTEC HNC/HND PROGRAMMES

Formative assessment

Formative assessment involves both the Assessor and the student in a two-way conversation about their progress and takes place prior to summative assessment. It does not confirm achievement of grades, but focuses on helping the student to reflect on their learning and improve their performance. The main function of formative assessment is to provide feedback to enable the student to make improvements to consolidate a Pass, or attain a higher grade. This feedback should be prompt so it has meaning and context for the student and time must be given following the feedback for actions to be complete. Students should be provided with formative feedback during the process of assessment and be empowered to act to improve their performance. Feedback on formative assessment must be constructive and provide clear guidance and actions for improvement.

Though we don't prescribe any hard and fast rules for higher level BTECs relating to the nature of formative assessment, the role of feedback in motivating students must not be underestimated. We recognise that informal verbal feedback is an ongoing process and is an important part of the Assessor / student relationship. However, it is good practice to plan for at least one formal opportunity to provide written formative assessment feedback on each assessment, at a point when students will have had the opportunity to provide evidence towards all the assessment criteria targeted. This should be built into the Assessment Plan and be formally recorded. This will help Assessors to manage their assessment work load by avoiding multiple assessments, and also reduces the risk of malpractice.

Following formative assessment and feedback, students are able to:
• revisit work to add to the original evidence produced to consolidate a Pass grade or to enhance their work to achieve higher grade
• submit evidence for summative assessment and final unit grade

Summative assessment

Summative assessment is a final assessment decision on an assignment tasks in relation to the assessment criteria of each unit. It is the **definitive assessment** and recording of the student's achievement.

Assessors should annotate where the evidence supports their grading decisions against the unit grading criteria. It is not expected that students are offered opportunities to revisit assignments at this stage of the assessment process unless approved by the Programme Leader.

Students will need to be familiar with the assessment criteria to be able to understand the quality of what is required. They should be informed of the differences between grading criteria so that higher skills can be achieved.

SUBMISSION OF LATE WORK AND REFERRALS ON BTEC HNC/HND PROGRAMMES (Pearsons Programmes)

71. Programme teams should consider carefully how to coordinate assessment deadlines, including re-sits to avoid clashes and excessive assessment burdens for students and staff as per indicator 6 / 8 of the QAA code of practice (Chapter B6).

72. Students should be provided at the start of the programme with a clear assessment schedule giving details about the timing of individual assessments and how they relate to one another and to the overall programme assessment, where appropriate. The programme team need to ensure that students have adequate time to reflect on learning before being assessed. It is particularly important for students to have opportunities to practise skills.

73. Students should be encouraged and expected to submit work on time as per the assessment schedule. Students should be aware that failure to submit an assessment on time may result in strict penalties. It is important that students are assessed fairly and consistently and that some students are not advantaged by having additional time to complete assignments. Time management is a key skill required in terms of future employability. Students must be encouraged to develop good habits that will stand them in good stead in the future.

74. If a student fails to submit an assessment by the stated deadline the work may still be submitted upto 15 working days after the deadline but the maximum grade available will be a Pass. If a student fails to submit the work within the 15 working days after the deadline an overall Fail will be awarded for the assemment.

75. The opportunity to resubmit late work will still be available at the descrecion of the Programme Leader but all work submitted late will be capped at a Pass. See the section on BTEC HNC/HND Resubmissions.

76. If a student fails to meet a stated assessment deadline due to legitimate reasons (e.g. Illness, personal issue) it is the students responsibility to notify their Programme Leader as soon as possible, submit a mitigating circumstances form to their Programme Leader within 5 working days, and if possible submit the assessment as soon as possible. Where the Programme Leader concludes the circumstances legitimate the students assessment will be marked as normal and the final grade will not be capped at a Pass. Where the Programme Leader concludes insufficient evidence is available to justify the late submission the final grade will remain capped at a Pass.

77. Students should be made aware that there may be delays in assessing and internally verifying work when it is not submitted as per the assessment schedule. Students must be made aware of the consequences of failing to meet deadlines at the start of the programme.

BTEC HNC/HND RESUBMISSION (Pearsons Programmes)

78. Because every assignment contributes to the final qualification grade, it may be appropriate for the Programme Leader to authorise one opportunity for a student to resubmit evidence to meet the assessment criteria targeted by an assignment. A student may be offered a resubmission if they have achieved a Pass or Merit, or not met the Pass criteria. The assessment board, consisting of the Programme Leader and Unit Tutor, can only authorise a resubmission if all of the following conditions are met:
    a. The student has met initial deadlines set in the assignment, or has met an agreed deadline extension
    b. The assessor judges that the student will be able to provide improved evidence without further guidance
    c. The assessor has authenticated the evidence submitted for assessment

79. If the Programme Leader approves a resubmission the following conditions will apply;
    a. The resubmission must be recorded on the assessment form
    b. The student must be given a deadline for resubmission within 15 working days of the student receiving the results/feedback of the assessment
    c. The resubmission must be undertaken by the student with no further guidance
    d. Only one opportunity for reassessment of the unit will be permitted
    e. The original evidence submitted for the assessment can remain valid and be extended, or may be need to replaced partially or in full

   f. Arrangements for retaking the assessment should be planned in such a way that does not adversely affect other assessments and does not give the student an unfair advantage over others

80. All resubmissions must be monitored via the assessment tracker and Programme Leaders should maintain a summary that is available to External Examiners and during the annual programme moderation.

81. Programme Leaders have the option to conduct a retake of the assignment under supervised conditions, even if this was not necessary for the original assessment. For example, this may be necessary to ensure that plagiarism cannot take place.

MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES PROCEDURE (All Programmes)

82. Mitigation is circumstances that have occurred in a students life that could have had a significant impact on the ability to complete an assessment (e.g sit exams, submit coursework, make a presentation) or affected academic performance during the build up to an assessment period.

83. Students should be aware of support mechanisms in College to assist in any issues that may arise during the period of study. These include information available from the College Learner Services and Programme Leaders.

84. A student can only make a mitigating circumstances application if they have not attempted the assessment. Students should be made aware that by attempting an assessment (e.g. arrive and start an examination, or submit coursework) they are declaring themselves fit and able to do so. The only exception to this is if a student falls ill during the period of assessment, they must notify the appropriate invigilator.

85. Students who feel they have mitigating circumstances impacting an assessment must complete a mitigating circumstances application via the document included in annex 1a.

86. A definitive list of mitigating circumstances is not available and each application will be investigated with accompanying evidence. Students should understand that mitigating circumstances are generally issues beyond their control (e.g. mental health issues, illness of dependants or bereavement). Circumstances within a students control will not generally be considered (e.g. holidays, not making adequate travel arrangements, lost work).

87. All submissions should have the necessary documentary evidence included (e.g. a letter from a doctor, counsellor/therapist, the police) to support the application.

88. It is the student's responsibility to submit all mitigating circumstances applications to their Programme Leader 5 working days before an assessment deadline. Programme Leaders must feedback an outcome to the application within 5 working days of receiving the application. The outcome of the mitigating circumstance application will be ethier;
   a. **Approved** – Programme Leader and student to confirm a new deadline if appropriate, or the mitigating circumstance will be discussed at the Exam Board.
   b. **Not Approved** – Student to submit by the required date if possible or appeal the outcome as noted below. If the deadline is missed with no appeal a grade of 0 will be awarded.

89. Submissions for mitigating circumstances within 5 working days of the assessment deadline or upto 5 working days after the deadline student must be sent to the Programme Leader for review with details of the lateness. The outcome of the late mitigating circumstance application will be ethier;
   a. **Approved** – Valid reason for lateness is determined. Programme Leader and student to confirm a new deadline if appropriate, or the mitigating circumstance will be discussed at the Exam Board.
   b. **Not Approved** – No valid reason for lateness. Student to submit by the required date if possible or appeal the outcome as noted below. If the deadline is missed with no appeal a grade of 0 will be awarded.

90. Appeals on outcomes of the mitigating circumstances application can be made in writing to the Heads of Curriculum Area. Where a Programme Leader is also a Head of Curriculum Area appeals should be submitted to the Assistant Director of Quality and Teaching Standards and HE. Appeals must be submitted within 5 working days from the date of notification sent from Programme Leaders and where possible should include additional information as to why the

initial outcome is not acceptable or additional evidence. The outcome of the appeal relating to mitigating circumstances application will be ethier;

    a. **Approved** – A review of information and evidence confirmed a valid reason for mitigating circumstances. Programme Leader and student to confirm a new deadline if appropriate, or the mitigating circumstance will be discussed at the Exam Board.

    b. **Not Approved** – No valid reason for lateness remains. Mitigating circumstances to be discussed at Exam Board

THE USE OF TURNITINUK (All Programmes)

91. TurnitinUK is a tool to detect potential instances of plagiarism and incorrect source referencing. Academic judgement is an essential element in the process of detecting plagiarism and the interpretation of TurnitinUK reports.
92. This section sets out the College's expectations regarding the use of the TurnitinUK software. The College is committed to ensuring that all students are treated equitably and consistently and to upholding the highest level of academic integrity and rigour.
93. All instances of unfair means are regulated by the respective awarding bodies Regulations (e.g. for the University of Hull this is principally Regulations on the Academic Misconduct).
94. The production and submission of any piece of assessed written work, whether via TurnitinUK or otherwise, remains the sole responsibility of the student. That is, students are expected to ensure all sources are appropriately acknowledged within their own work and in line with departmental practices.
95. TurnitinUK can be used as a developmental tool to support students in gaining a greater understanding of good academic practice.
96. HE Programme Leaders must ensure that students receive a range of appropriate guidance and support regarding good academic practice, instructions for the use of TurnitinUK (for example during induction for both new and returning students) and guidance on the interpretation of originality reports.
97. All forms of summative written assessment must be screened using TurnitinUK where this is practicable. Where it is considered that screening via TurnitinUK is not practicable it should be declared in the module specification and approved as part of the usual module approval process.
98. TurnitinUK may be used as a feedback method for electronically submitted work

PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH BREACHES IN ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS: ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (Univeristy of Hull and Pearsons Programmes)

Introduction

99. Assessment, in any form, is the means by which the College tests whether a student has achieved the objectives of a programme of study and the standards of an award. It is fundamentally important that students are assessed fairly and on equal terms with each other for the same award. Any attempt by a student to gain unfair advantage over another student in the completion of assessment, or to assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, is cheating.
100. The College has a duty to ensure that appropriate academic standards are maintained in the conduct of assessment and the proper discharge of this duty is essential to safeguard both the legitimate interests of its students and the College's reputation. Alleged academic misconduct which threatens the integrity of the College's assessment procedures and the maintenance of its academic standards, is viewed as a serious offence and will be thoroughly investigated.
101. Certain Professional bodies place upon students, registered for a programme to which they give professional recognition, an obligation to adhere to principles or standards of professional conduct. Failure to meet these standards may lead to a student not gaining professional recognition, irrespective of the standard of his/her academic performance.

Definition

102. Academic misconduct may be defined as any attempt by a student to gain an unfair advantage in any assessment.

103. It may be demonstrated by one of the following:

- AIDING AND ABETTING a student in any form of dishonest practice.
- BRIBERY – paying or offering inducements to another person to obtain an advance copy of an unseen examination or test paper or to obtain a copy of a coursework assignment in advance of its distribution to the students concerned.
- COLLUSION - where two or more students collaborate to produce a piece of work which is then submitted as though it was an individual student's own work. Where students in a class are instructed or encouraged to work together in the pursuit of an assignment, such a group activity is regarded as approved collaboration. Where there is a requirement for the submitted work to be solely that of the individual, collaboration is not permitted. Students who improperly work collectively in these circumstances will be regarded as being guilty of collusion.
- COMMISSIONING another person to complete an assignment which is then submitted as your own work.
- COMPUTER FRAUD – the use of the material of another person as if it were your which is own stored public device or open source.
- DUPLICATION – the inclusion of coursework or any material which is identical or similar to material which has already been submitted for any other assessment within the College or elsewhere e.g. submitting the same piece of coursework for two different modules.
- FALSE DECLARATIONS in order to receive special consideration by Examination Boards.
- FALSIFICATION OF DATA – the presentation of data in projects, laboratory reports etc based on work purported to have been carried out by the student which have been invented by the student or altered/copied or obtained by other unfair means.
- MISCONDUCT IN EXAMINATIONS OR TESTS such as:
  - taking crib notes or other unauthorised material concealed in any manner into an examination or test;
  - taking into an examination or test an unauthorised computer disk containing pre-coded data;
  - the use of an unauthorised dictionary;
  - the use of unauthorised material stored in the memory of a pre-programmable calculator, watch, organiser, mobile telephone, or pager;
  - obtaining an advance copy of an 'unseen' written examination or test paper;
  - communicating or trying to communicate in any way with another student sitting the same examination or test;
  - copying or attempting to copy from another student sitting the same examination or test;
  - being party to impersonation where another person sits an examination or test in the place of the actual student or a student is knowingly impersonated by another;
  - leaving the examination or test venue to refer to concealed notes;
  - taking rough notes, stationery or examination or test papers which indicate that they are not to be removed from the examination or test venue.
- PLAGIARISM may be defined as the representation of another person's work, without acknowledgement of the source, as the student's own for the purposes of satisfying formal assessment requirements. Examples of plagiarism are:
  - the use in a student's own work of more than a single phrase from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the course;
  - the summarising of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement;

- the use of ideas or intellectual data of another person without acknowledgement of the source, or the submission or presentation of work as if it were the student's own, which are substantially the ideas or intellectual data of another person;
- copying the work of another person;
- the submission of work as if it were the student's own, which has been obtained from the internet or any other form of information technology;
- the submission of coursework making significant use of unattributed digital images such as graphs, tables, photographs, etc taken from books/articles, the internet or from the work of another person;
- the submission of a piece of work which has previously been assessed for a different award or module or at a different institution as if it were new work;
- a student who allows or is involved in allowing, either knowingly or unknowingly, another student to copy another's work including physical or digital images would be deemed to be guilty of plagiarism.

- PURCHASING – the use and submission of purchased work from any source which is not your own

104.   The above list is not exhaustive and should not be interpreted as such by students. Plagiarism guide is made available to students. Plagiarism within a managed learning environment will be dealt with in the same way as for more traditional learning methods.

Responsibilities

105.   Tutors should take responsibility for ensuring that all students registered on awards are made aware of these regulations and the definitions contained therein. All course handbooks should include clear advice to students on this matter and be cross-referenced to these procedures.

106.   Students should also be made aware of the seriousness with which proven cases of academic misconduct will be dealt and the likely penalties which Boards of Study may impose. Students who are unclear about any of the above definitions should seek advice from their tutor, or from Learner Services. Boards of Study apply to all HE programmes.

107.   A lack of awareness or understanding of these regulations will not constitute grounds for a case of academic misconduct to be dismissed by Disciplinary Hearing.

Procedures for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct

108.   Where an examiner, when marking a piece of work (submitted for summative assessment), identifies parts of the work as plagiarised s/he should indicate in a manner appropriate to the medium in which the work was completed (whether computer program, practical piece or essay) which parts of the work are plagiarised, but should not indicate the source(s) on the original piece of work. Any software used to assist the marker's determination of whether plagiarism has taken place **must** be set to retain the anonymity of the candidate.

109.   The examiner should decide whether the plagiarism is sufficient to warrant further investigation. If s/he decides it is poor academic practice (i.e. not appropriate to investigate) s/he should complete the examining process, and once the anonymity has been removed advise the candidate that the assessment raised suspicion of being plagiarised and showed poor academic practice. The candidate can be referred to appropriate sources of guidance.

110.   Where the examiner suspects plagiarism but believes s/he would have difficulty proving it, once the anonymity has been removed in accordance with the faculty's agreed procedure, the examiner should advise the candidate that s/he has 'concerns' about poor academic practice, refer the candidate to appropriate sources of guidance, but take no other action. In such cases a penalty - including any formal written warning - of any form **must not** be issued.

111.   Where the examiner decides that the poor academic practice is sufficient enough to warrant an allegation of plagiarism s/he **must,** within 15 working days of the assessment event having taken place forward the work to the Programme Leader, with any relevant supporting evidence. In the scenario that a Programme Leader identifies a suspicion of academic misconduct the work should forwarded to the Head of Curriculum Area.

112.   On receipt of an allegation of plagiarism and/or collusion or possessing materials prohibited in the examination room, the Programme Leader **must** determine whether the candidate is eligible for the issue of a Caution as defined below.

THE CAUTION DECISION (Univeristy of Hull and Pearsons Programmes)

113.   Each candidate is eligible for a caution for an initial period of his/her first programme of study at the College as defined below:
- The candidate is at level 4, or undertaking the **Certificate stage** of an **Undergraduate** programme of study – this includes candidates who are repeating that stage or have transferred to it from another programme
- The candidate is undertaking the first semester of a level 5, 6 or 7 programme (e.g. the Diploma, Honours stage, or Masters stage) having been admitted as a direct entrant to that stage
- The candidate is undertaking the first semester of the **Intermediate** stage of a Foundation Degree having been admitted as a direct entrant to that stage

114.   Where a candidate is eligible for a caution the Programme Leader, or Head of Curriculum Area **must** issue the caution in accordance with the wording show in annexe 1b/c of this policy within 20 working days of the assessment deadine. The Programme Leader must record the caution in the learner file or electronically where appropriate.

115.   A condition of the caution is that the candidate is required to resubmit the work – within a deadline prescribed by the Programme Leader – correctly acknowledging the sources used, without otherwise amending the work. The deadline should be appropriate to the mode and location of study but in all cases must be no less than five working days.

116.   When re-submitted the examiner should then mark the work, awarding the standard reassessment pass mark for the piece of work. If sources have still not been satisfactorily acknowledged no **more than 30** may be awarded. If the work is not re-submitted, or not re-submitted within the deadline prescribed by the Programme Leader, **0 must be awarded**. There is **no discretion** to award a mark higher than the limits specified in this paragraph.

117.   The final assessment decision should be noted and taken into account at the Exam Board and although the mark for the individual piece of work is capped, the mark for whole module is not capped. If the module is failed, normal reassessment rules (as specified in the relevant University/Pearsons) shall apply – the 're-submission' of the work does **not** constitute a second attempt.

118.   A candidate may refuse to accept the caution and elect a hearing before a Programme Leader, and where appropriate the Head of Curriculum Area – e.g. because s/he disputes the finding of plagiarism.

PROCEDURES WHERE A CAUTION IS INAPPLICABLE (Univeristy of Hull and Pearsons Programmes)

119.   Allegations of Academic Misconduct **must** be made in writing to the Programme Leader within 15 working days of the assessment event having taken place, and shall be supported by as much evidence as can be provided by those with first-hand knowledge of the alleged misconduct. Where a Programme Leader is proposing allegations of Academic Misconduct information should be sent to the Head of Curriculum Area within 15 working days.

120.   On receipt of the allegation and any supporting evidence, the Programme Leader or Head of Curriculum Area may make, or cause to be made, such further enquiries as he or she deems appropriate, and thereafter shall determine whether there appears to be clear evidence of a breach of the regulations including;
   a. **No case to answer -** the Programme Leader determines that there is no clear evidence to support the allegation then, the matter shall be deemed closed and this shall be reported in writing to the candidate and the person or persons making the allegation within three working days.

b. **Case to answer –** If the Programme Leader determines that there is clear evidence he or she shall inform the candidate in writing, no later than 10 working days from receipt of the allegation:
   i. summarising the allegation and any supporting evidence
   ii. explaining the right of the candidate to respond in writing within 15 working days of the date of the notification
   iii. giving the candidate the opportunity to admit or deny the allegations in any such response, and
   iv. where the allegation is admitted, giving the candidate the opportunity to make any statement by way of explanation or mitigation

121. On receipt of a response form the candidate, or following the expirary of 15 working days with no response received, the Programme Leader shall act as follows;
   a. If the candidate admits the allegation, the Programme Leader will consider the penalty they feel appropriate. If they feel that a penalty in the range up to and including a mark of 0 with reassessment capped at a bare pass is appropriate then they will impose such a penalty. If they feel that a more severe penalty is justified then they shall refer the case to the Assistant Director of Quality and Teaching Standards and HE Developments to complete a Panel.
   b. If the candidate denies the allegation, or no response is received within 15 working days, the Programme Leader shall determine if the allegation is proven and, if proven, the penalty or penalties to be imposed. If they feel that a more severe penalty is justified then they shall refer the case to the Assistant Director of Quality and Teaching Standards and HE Developments to complete a Panel.
   c. If the candidate indicates, or the Programme Leader otherwise has reason to believe, that his/her behaviour may be the result of mental health difficulties, the Programme Leader should consult Learner Services to ensure compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act.

122. If, on receipt of a response from the candidate wherein the candidate does not admit the allegation, the Programme Leader determines that the allegation has been satisfactorily explained, the Programme Leader shall be empowered to rule that the allegation not be proceeded with, and the matter be considered closed. A decision by the Programme Leader under this regulation shall be reported in writing to the candidate and the person or persons making the allegation within three working days.

123. If panel is required to determine a more severe penalty or resolve a student appeal the membership will include;
   a. Chair - Assistant Director of Quality and Teaching Standards and HE Developments or Vice Principal Curriculum and Quality
   b. At least one other independent Programme Leader or Head of Curriculum Area
   c. A secretary or HE co-ordinator

124. Where a panel is to be held, a candidate shall be informed in writing of the time, date and venue of the hearing of the Panel, with at least five working days' notice, such notice to include the details of any witness or other party to be called by the Panel, and a copy of any relevant statement made by the said witness or other party.

125. The candidate shall have the right to be heard in person by the Panel, and to be accompanied by a person of his/her choosing, provided that such person may not speak for the appellant, unless invited to do so by the chair of the Panel.

126. The candidate shall be entitled to waive the right to attend, by notifying the Chair of the panel in writing, in which case the Panel shall proceed in the candidate's absence. If no response is received from the candidate, the Panel shall be empowered to proceed in the candidate's absence. If the candidate responds indicating a legitimate reason for being unable to attend on the specified date, the hearing shall be rearranged. If no legitimate reason (as determined by the Chair of the panel) is given for not attending, the hearing shall take place on the date notified.

127. Outcomes of the Panel, including penalties must be comunciated to the candidate within 5 working days. Minutes of the Panel should be available to revelant module/exam board or external examiners.

PENALTIES (Univeristy of Hull and Pearsons Programmes)

128. Outcomes of the Panel involving penalties must follow regulations provided by the validating body.

129. As a guide, penalities on taught programmes or module should follow the table below. Prior to confirmation of penalities proposed outcomes should always be confirmed by the validating university (this exclude BTEC HNC/HND Programmes).

Penalty	Who can impose the penalty
Warning usually with requirement to resubmit work	Programme Leader, Head of Curriculum Area or Panel
Mark of 0 for the component	Programme Leader, Head of Curriculum Area or Panel
Mark of 0 for module with reassessment right	Programme Leader, Head of Curriculum Area or Panel
Mark of 0 for module without reassessment right	Must be confirmed by the validating institute.
Suspension for a year	Must be confirmed by the validating institute.
Reduction of the classification of the award by one class	Must be confirmed by the validating institute.
Termination of study	Must be confirmed by the validating institute.

130. Penalties for HNC/HND should follow the table below;

Penalty	Who can impose the penalty
Warning usually with requirement to resubmit work	Programme Leader, Head of Curriculum Area or Panel
Resubmission and assessment component grade capped at a PASS	Programme Leader, Head of Curriculum Area or Panel
Fail	Panel

APPEALS (Univeristy of Hull and Pearsons Programmes)

131. A candidate may appeal against the decision and/or penalty imposed by the Panel

132.   The candidate shall notify the College of his or her intention to appeal within 10 working days of the date on which notice of the Panel's decision was formally served on the candidate. Appeals lodged outside this time limit will not be considered other than in exceptional circumstances.

133.   The candidate shall set out in writing, using the approved appeal form, his or her grounds for appeal against the Adjudicating Panel's decision. Such grounds might include:
   a. Circumstances of which the Panel or the Programme Leader, as appropriate were not aware when they made their decision, and had either of them been so aware, it is reasonably likely that they would have reached a different decision;
   b. Procedural irregularties in the conduct of the Panel or the penalty imposed
   c. Evidence of bias or prejudice

134.   On receipt of the statement of appeal and supporting evidence, the appeal will then be forwarded to the Vice Principal of Curriculum and Quality. Or in the event that the Vice Principal of Curriculum and Quality chaired the Panel the information shall be sent to the Director of Learner Services, Planning and Diversity. A response to an appeal will be completed within 10 working days and will result in;
   a. Not Upheld – evidence has been reviewed and the outcome remains the same.
   b. Upheld – where evidence suggests there is grounds for an Appeals Panel to be held which will be completed within 15 working days.

MONITORING, REVIEW AND DISSEMINATION (All Programmes)

135.   The Assistant Director, Quality & Teaching Standards and HE in conjunction with the Higher Education Committee will review this policy every two years or as necessary. The Heads of Curriculum Area are responsible for the dissemination and implementation of this policy with the programme teams responsible for Higher Education within their areas.