

## University Code of Practice Assessment Procedures

**Document Reference:** Assessment Procedures  
**Version:** 1 12 **Date:** June 2018

**Date coming into force:** Sept 18

**Approved by:** ULTC  
**Originator:** Learning and Teaching Enhancement

**Application to collaborative provision:** **Mandatory**

**Responsibilities:** Programme/module developers  
Heads of Schools  
Partner institutions  
Student Services Directorate

**Contacts:** lte@hull.ac.uk

**Applications for exemptions to:** ULTC

**Report Exemptions to:** ULTC

**Further information:** UK Quality Code for Higher Education –  
Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the  
recognition of prior learning (Oct 2013)

### **Summary/ Description:**

**Version 1 12** (June 2018) introduces the following changes:

- Amendments relate to Chapter XV Retention and Archiving of Summative Assessed Work (paras 68-81). In particular, the methods for retaining and archiving student work (para 73) and the requirement to maintain detailed records of all archived materials (para 79).
- Housekeeping amendment to make clear the university definition of a working day. A working day is a day when the university is open (para. 29).
- Substantive amendments to second marking procedures (para 35-43).

**Version 1 11** (Feb 2018) introduces the following changes:

- Changes LEAP to Learning and Teaching Enhancement
- Makes clear that both first and second marking must be completed within 20 working days

**Version 1 10** (Apr 2017) introduces the following changes:

- Clarifies the requirement for second marking (chapter IX, Reg. 38 & 39)
- A new chapter on reassessment (chapter XI)
- Confirms the duration for examinations (Reg. 17, 18, 19 & 20)

- Replaces Registry Services with Student Services Directorate

**Version 1 09** (Sept 2016) introduces the following changes:

- Replaces department and Head of Department with school and Head of School
- Replaces Student Administrative Services with Registry Services
- Replaces Unfair Means with Academic Misconduct
- Replaces Faculty Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee with Faculty Education Committee
- Other minor amendments

**Version 1 08** (June 2015) introduces the following changes:

- Amendments relate to Chapter XIV Retention and Archiving of Summative Assessed Work (paras 61-74). In particular the distinction between assessed coursework and examinations in terms of archiving has been removed.

**Version 1 07** (May 2014) introduces the following changes:

- Removes Chapter VIII – Principles for the Use of TurnitinUK (paras 33-40). This Chapter is replaced by a *Policy on Staff Use of TurnitinUK* which is published on the ‘policies’ area on section F of the Quality Handbook.

**Version 1 06** (Feb 2014) introduces the following changes:

- Unless otherwise specified the published word limit excludes references in footnotes, appendices, references lists and bibliographies but includes other footnotes, quotations and in text references and citations (para. 30 (iii)).

**Version 1 05 (Sept 2012) introduces the following changes:**

- Replaces “access to the ‘Playpen’ facility” with “the ability to submit draft assignments to TurnitinUK” (para. 38)
- Mandatory requirement for departments to make clear to students the process for utilising draft submissions to TurnitinUK (para. 38)

**Version 1 04 (May 2012) introduces the following changes:**

- Standardised penalties for late submission and overlength assessment (paras. 29-32)
- A new chapter on the use of TurnitinUK (paras. 33-40)
- A new chapter on the treatment of students who do not follow the examination rubric (paras.66-68)
- Explanatory note added to further clarify the role of second markers (para. 41)

**Version 1 03 (11/12) introduced the following changes:**

- Examinations which are centrally organised and held in central examination venues will be invigilated by a team of people external to the University and/or postgraduate students (paras.53-54)
- A new chapter on checking student identity (paras.60-65)

**Version 1 02 (11/12) introduced the following changes:**

- Proportion of summative assessment permitted during the first semester of a long-thin amended to no more than 50%, (para.19)
- Strengthens the requirements for feedback to students on assessed work – that it should be returned within no more than 4 semester weeks; that feedback refers to module learning outcomes or grading criteria derived from LOs and that it contains targets for development.
- Penalties for overlength assessments: students must be consulted on departmental policies.
- Second marking: amended to require that second marking be of a representative sample equally spanning the full range of marks awarded and removes the upper limit of 25 papers.
- Several amendments for clarity.

**Version 1 00 (07/08) introduced the following changes:**

- This code brought together a number of previously separate codes: Assessment Tariff (formerly F3), Reasonable Adjustments (F14), Class Based Assessments (F15), Anonymous Marking (F6), Late Submission (F11), Invigilation (F12), Second Marking (F7) and Archiving of Assessed Work (F9).
- It also introduced new arrangements governing: Overlength assessments, Feedback on assessment, Assessment criteria for levels 4-7 (replacing the single level generic criteria, F4). Assessment criteria for level 3 will be produced by the Assessment Committee in 07/08.
- Chapter VI Overlength Assessments was new provision which adopted the same approach as for class-based assessments and late submission in requiring each department to establish a policy taking into account University-wide principles set out below, and requiring consultation with students in the development of the policy

The remaining chapters involve at most minor changes to existing requirements.

This University Code has been written in accordance with the approach approved by ULTC to enhance clarity involving the following terminology:

must = mandatory                      should = advisable                      may = desirable.

Where these terms are used they are emphasised in bold.

**This document is available in alternative formats from  
Learning and Teaching Enhancement**

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	5
Authority.....	5
Scope of the code.....	5
CHAPTER I – UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT TARIFF .....	5
Introduction .....	5
Assessment Tariff .....	6
Examinations .....	7
Methods of assessment.....	7
Assessment of long thin (year long) modules .....	8
CHAPTER II – REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS.....	8
Purpose .....	8
Application of Chapter II to collaborative provision .....	8
CHAPTER III – ANONYMOUS ASSESSMENT.....	8
CHAPTER IV – FEEDBACK ON ASSESSMENT .....	8
CHAPTER V – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA .....	9
Application of assessment criteria .....	9
CHAPTER VI – OVERLENGTH ASSESSMENTS.....	9
CHAPTER VII – PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION .....	10
CHAPTER IX – SECOND MARKING .....	11
CHAPTER X – CLASS-BASED ASSESSMENTS .....	14
Definition.....	14
Module Specification .....	14
Prior Notification of Assessments.....	14
Arrangements for Summative Assessments .....	15
Alternative Arrangements .....	15
Anonymity .....	15
CHAPTER XI – REASSESSMENT .....	15
CHAPTER XII – INVIGILATION OF EXAMINATIONS .....	16
CHAPTER XIII – CHECKING STUDENT IDENTITY .....	16
CHAPTER XIV – TREATMENT OF STUDENTS WHO DO NOT FOLLOW THE EXAMINATION RUBRIC.....	17
CHAPTER XV – RETENTION AND ARCHIVING OF SUMMATIVE ASSESSED WORK .....	17
Retention of assessed work .....	18
Archiving of assessed work .....	18
Retention of work for longer periods of time.....	19
General Data Protection Regulations .....	19
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS CODE .....	20

# University Code of Practice Assessment Procedures

## Introduction

1. This code of practice is designed to bring together all matters relating to the process of assessment, complementing the codes governing boards of examiners and external examiners, and should be read alongside the University Programmes Regulations. Its purpose is to make explicit the University's expectations of the conduct of assessment.

## Authority

2. The University Learning and Teaching Committee (ULTC) is the final arbiter of the application and interpretation of this code of practice.

## Scope of the code

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

## CHAPTER I – UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT TARIFF

### Introduction

5. The following chapter codifies the criteria, approved by ULTC with regard to summative assessment tariff requirements for the assessment of taught modules and programmes.
6. The purpose of the tariff is to minimise the risk of assessment overload and inequity. The assessment tariff sets pro rata allowances for 20 credit modules. The tariff applies to all stages of an award.
7. The tariff recognises that credits relate to learning hours, rather than simply to the number of words written or length of an examination or other form of assessment. For example, modules that involve a greater proportion of independent study (e.g. dissertation modules) might reasonably be assessed by a piece of work of greater length than a taught module of the same credit value. The tariff also recognises that fewer words do not necessarily represent less work, especially where a large amount of data has to be organised, prioritised, edited and presented. The tariff is designed, therefore, to provide parameters within which assessment tasks **must** be based, but module designers may exercise academic judgement in determining the size and scale of these tasks.
8. Module providers **must** apply the tariff, in order to meet the learning outcomes of the module, defining precisely the word limits, or equivalent, which will apply to each assessment. Keeping within the limits specified below any piece of work **should** take into account:

- the level of study (level 5 and 6 students might reasonably be expected to have the skills and experience to write in greater depth than level 4 students in the same amount of study time)
  - discipline-specific requirements
9. Module providers **must** communicate precise assessment modes, word limits, weightings, assessment criteria, and the method and timing of feedback to students in writing no later than the start of the module. This information **should** be included in module handbooks.
  10. In designing the assessment strategy for a module, module providers **must** be aware of the impact of the timing of each assessment component on student workload, and make appropriate allowance in that timing to enable students to benefit from feedback received from one piece of assessment in the next subsequent assessment.
  11. Module providers **must** communicate to students in writing the precise nature of the assessments, whether they are summative or purely formative, and whether they must be attempted (and/or passed) in order to pass the module.

### Assessment Tariff

12. Based on academic judgement, a 20 credit module (other than a 20 credit dissertation module) **should** be assessed by either:
  - A 4,000-6,000 word written assignment\*

**Or:**

  - A mixture of modes of assessment, which is evidence-based and commensurate with the allocated learning hours, and which may include, for example:
    - A formal 2-hour written examination
    - A 2,000-3,000 word written assignment\*
    - Presentations
    - Laboratory work
    - Experiments
    - Performances
    - In-class tests
    - Oral examinations
    - Projects
    - Portfolios
    - Computer-based tests
    - E-assessment
    - Exhibition of art works
    - Live performance or outcomes evidenced through digital media

\*word count is subject to the ULTC Task and Finish Group “Moving from Assessment Tariff to Student Workload”

13. Schools **must**, if using a mixture of assessment modes within a single module, ensure that the overall assessment load for each student is not excessive, bearing in mind the requirements above.
14. All candidates on the same module **must** be assessed by the same method(s) of assessment (with the exception where reasonable adjustments are required).

15. Modules of other than 20 credits **must** have an assessment load which takes the above requirements into account.
16. Dissertations by their very nature require independent learning and scope to present an advanced, research based academic argument. For these reasons, dissertations require an extended word limit. Thus for a:
  - (1) 20 credit dissertation module, the limit **must** be within the range 5,000 – 7,500 words (or equivalent).
  - (2) 40 credit dissertation module, the limit **must** be within the range 10,000 – 15,000 words (or equivalent).
  - (3) 60 credit dissertation module, the limit **must** be within the range 15,000 – 20,000 words (or equivalent).

It is acknowledged that in some disciplines, a 'dissertation' module is not solely a textual piece of work, but may include other single, large pieces of work such as, for example, design/exhibition of art works or musical/dance arrangement or performance. These tasks **must** be commensurate with the workload involved in producing dissertations to the word counts above.

### **Examinations**

17. The default length for all formal University examinations is 2 hours. Faculty Education Committees have the authority to permit variations where there are professional body requirements, or where the form of assessment does not require 2 hours, (for example where the examination takes the form of a multiple choice test), or where there are other sound academic reasons. The length of the proposed assessment should be clearly stipulated on the examination paper coversheet that is submitted with the proposed paper to Student Services Directorate.
18. Where an exam is solely multiple choice, the standard length shall be one hour unless Faculty Education Committee have agreed otherwise.
19. Where an exception to the standard duration is approved by Faculty Education Committees, the reasons for this shall be communicated to the Student Services Directorate so that a central record of all such examinations can be maintained. This authorisation should accompany the examination paper when it is submitted to Student Services Directorate in the first trimester of each academic year.
20. No other durations are permitted for University examinations.

### **Methods of assessment**

21. 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.
22. New methods of assessment **should not** be introduced in the final stage of a programme. However, it is acknowledged that project work and dissertations may legitimately involve new approaches to learning and associated new modes of assessment.

### Assessment of long thin (year long) modules

23. Assessment of long thin modules **only applies** to those programmes pre Curriculum 2016 or those programmes which have received exemption from the Programme Management Committee (PMC).

Assessment of long thin modules **must** follow the assessment tariff, whilst also taking into account the following:

- There **must** be no trimester 1 formal examinations.
- The emphasis in trimester 1 assessment (coursework etc) for long thin modules **should** be formative. That is, Schools **must not** require more than 50% of the summative assessment for the module to be submitted during the first trimester, but it is recognised there may be a proportionally higher amount of formative assessment depending on the discipline concerned.

## CHAPTER II – REASONABLE ADJUSTMENTS

### Purpose

24. Reasonable adjustments to examination and assessment arrangements may be made to enable disabled students to demonstrate their abilities. This must not change the purpose of the assessment but may alter the method. Further information can be obtained from the Learning Support Team.

### Application of Chapter II to collaborative provision

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

## CHAPTER III – ANONYMOUS ASSESSMENT

26. 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.

## CHAPTER IV – FEEDBACK ON ASSESSMENT

27. Each Faculty **must** have in place a policy governing feedback on formative and summative assessment which has been developed in consultation with the school's student/staff forum(s) and the external examiners and which has been approved or otherwise determined by the Faculty Education Committee (FEC). The policy **must** be clearly communicated to all students within the school.
28. The policy **must** address the following principles:
- 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 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
- The principles on which work is being marked **must** be made clear to students, whether this is via learning outcomes or grading criteria.
- Where relevant, learning outcomes **should** be stated on the feedback form, rather than students being referred to their module handbooks or to other separate documents
- 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
- Clarification relating to feedback **must** be made available to students on request

\* working days refers to University working days.

## CHAPTER V – ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

### Application of assessment criteria

29. Heads of schools 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.
30. Students **must** be informed, for example through school or module handbooks, of the criteria applicable to each assessment task.

## CHAPTER VI – OVERLENGTH ASSESSMENTS

31. There is a University standard system of penalties which schools **must** apply to summatively assessed work which is deemed to be 'overlength'.
32. The following penalties **must** be adhered to:
  - (i) Penalties are a percentage of the **maximum mark** available for the assessment component which is overlength
  - (ii) Overlength assessment penalties apply only to word counts and exclude charts, graphs, tables etc
  - (iii) Unless otherwise specified the published word limit excludes references in footnotes, appendices, references lists and bibliographies but includes other footnotes, quotations and in text references and citations.
  - (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 academic misconduct. The case **must** then be followed up according to the Regulations governing Academic Misconduct
- (vi) The penalties which **must** be applied to work which is overlength are:
- 10-20% over the specified word limit, a penalty of 10%
  - more than 20% over the published word limit, the work will be awarded a mark of zero
- (vii) Other penalties **must not** be applied.

Explanatory note

- (i) 'Percentage of the maximum mark available' and (vi): for example, if the maximum mark for the assessment is 100 and it is 15% over the published word limit, the student's mark will be reduced by 10 (i.e. 10% of 100). If the maximum mark for the assessment is 80 and it is 15% over the published word limit, the student's mark will be reduced by 8 (i.e. 10% of 80).
- If no word count has been declared, or no coversheet submitted, students should be subsequently asked to declare a word count/submit a coversheet before awarding a mark of zero. If the word count is subsequently not declared/coversheet not submitted, the work must be awarded a mark of zero.
- There is no penalty for work which is less than 10% overlength.
- Academic misconduct previously unfair means

## CHAPTER VII – PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION

33. 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.
34. The following penalties **must** be adhered to:
- (i) Penalties are a percentage of the **maximum mark** available for the assessment component which has been submitted late
  - (ii) All coursework assessments **must** have a published submission time which **should** be no later than 4pm and this time **must** be communicated effectively to students
  - (iii) Schools delivering non-standard modules may apply to FEC for exemption from (ii)
  - (iv) 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.

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para. 35: Examples applying the penalties in (iv) for coursework submitted up to and including 24 hours after the deadline:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|--|

- 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 (iv) 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
<b>Pre-penalty mark</b>	100	50	45	40	30
<b>10% penalty (of the maximum mark – in this case 100)</b>	90	40	35	30	20
<i>or</i>					
<b>Mark awarded is reduced to the pass mark</b>	40	40	40	40	40
<b>Outcome (the lower mark)</b>	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'.

## CHAPTER IX – SECOND MARKING

### 35. Terminology

The following definitions inform the University's 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.

### 36. Requirements

- Summative examinations and coursework that contribute to the overall degree classification are subject to internal second marking/moderation (in line with sections 2-8), 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. In all cases, the Associate Dean for Education of the relevant faculty must be informed.

### 37. Second Marking

An appropriate member of academic staff must undertake all second marking within a module.

**1. For assessment tasks that contribute 70% or more to a module equal to or greater than 30 credits, blind second marking must be used.**

- The second marker examines the work as submitted by the student (i.e. with no comments or grade from the first marker). Both examiners record their marks separately and where marks agree (within a 10% margin) then either:
  - A final grade is agreed through discussion between the 2 markers
  - 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 (section 4)

*NB: Feedback should be agreed or given separately.*

*Clear records of any discussions and final mark agreements must be kept and made available to the appropriate External Examiner(s).*

**2. 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.

***For all other assessment tasks moderation is required***

**38. Moderation**

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

**Moderation by sampling of the cohort**

- a. 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.

- b. 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 he/she **must not** make changes to individual marks; they should discuss their concerns with the marker and a review of the marking of the full cohort must take place. At this point, the relevant School Director of Learning and Teaching should be made aware and he/she should oversee the process; should the Director of Learning and Teaching be involved in the marking or mitigation process either the School Academic Manager or Director of Student Experience should be consulted. Any recommendations that involve a scaling of marks must be agreed with the relevant External Examiner(s).

- 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.

#### 39. 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).

#### 40. 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).

#### 41. Resolution of grade differences

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

#### 42. 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.

#### 43. 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 University defined Christmas closure period or any other extraordinary University closure period.

In applying university 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

## CHAPTER X – CLASS-BASED ASSESSMENTS

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

### Definition

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

### Module Specification

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

### Prior Notification of Assessments

47. 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 school methods of communication to students, such as Canvas, notice boards, email or directly to students in class.
48. Class-based assessments that are entirely formative, and so do not count towards the final module mark, **may** be announced in advance to students.

### **Arrangements for Summative Assessments**

49. 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.

### **Alternative Arrangements**

50. 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 Wellbeing, Learning and Welfare Support, and changes to the arrangements of assessments for these students **must** only be made on their advice. This applies equally to summative and formative assessments.

### **Anonymity**

51. The requirement in para.22 above for anonymised assessment where practicable applies equally to class-based assessments. The school **should** consider using the University's anonymous examination stationery available from the Student Services Directorate.

## **CHAPTER XI – REASSESSMENT**

52. 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.
53. 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, he/she must only be reassessed in those components of assessment which he/she has failed, except where the programme/module specification specifically prescribes otherwise.
54. Refer to the relevant University Programme Regulations for clarification of reassessment procedures.

## CHAPTER XII – INVIGILATION OF EXAMINATIONS

55. The Student Services Directorate is responsible for recruiting, training, paying and allocating a team to perform the duties of invigilator at centrally organised University examinations within the central examination venues.
56. The invigilation team will be recruited by application from people external to the University and/or postgraduate students.
57. Examinations which are not organised centrally, or not held in central examination venues will continue to be invigilated by internal staff members.
58. All Invigilators **must** have attended suitable training for the role prior to undertaking any invigilation duties.
59. A Chief Invigilator will be assigned to each examination session, with additional responsibilities.
60. Each school **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.

## CHAPTER XIII – CHECKING STUDENT IDENTITY

61. 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.
62. The name and registration number of any student unable to provide suitable ID in the exam **must** be noted on the front of the exam packet so that the marker of the exam has an accurate record of those students without suitable ID. The Chief Invigilator is responsible for ensuring that this list is copied and sent to a) the Examinations Officer, Student Services Directorate, and b) the Head of School of the subject concerned.
63. 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:
  - i. Check that the signature on the exam script matches other recorded signatures within the school. The Student Services Directorate holds all the attendance cards completed by students during the examinations (and for 1 year previously) should a copy of a signature from a different exam be required.
  - ii. Check the handwriting on the exam script against previous work.
  - iii. Check the handwriting on the exam script against other documentation held in the school.
64. The Head of School 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 school **must** confirm with the Examinations Officer, Student Services Directorate, that these checks have taken place before the exam is marked.



65. If the marker (or other staff member checking ID in the school) is satisfied that the script has been written by the correct student, the student **must** be contacted by the school, and be made aware of the university requirement in relation to ID at examinations. This warning **should** be recorded for future reference.
66. If the marker (or other staff member checking ID in the school) 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.

#### **CHAPTER XIV – TREATMENT OF STUDENTS WHO DO NOT FOLLOW THE EXAMINATION RUBRIC**

67. Where a student has answered too many questions, markers **must** mark all compulsory questions first and then mark the required number of questions **in the order they appear on the examination paper**, make a note on the script and disregard all subsequent answers.
68. Where a student has failed to answer a compulsory question (whether that be for the whole paper or within a section of a multi-sectioned paper), they **must** be awarded zero for that question. The required number of additional questions **must** then be marked **in the order they appear on the examination paper**, disregarding any extra questions above and beyond what was required.
69. Examination rubrics **should** instruct students to cross out questions attempted that they do not want marked and **must** include a statement on the treatment of students who fail to follow the examination rubric.

#### **CHAPTER XV – RETENTION AND ARCHIVING OF SUMMATIVE ASSESSED WORK**

70. The Dean is responsible for establishing a process to ensure adherence to the University's Retention and Archiving Assessment requirements. Heads of School are accountable for ensuring implementation of that process. Each Faculty **must** submit its process to Learning and Teaching Enhancement.
71. 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

This chapter therefore deals with both of these categories.

72. 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.
73. Archiving is the process of keeping a sample of students' work for a period of 5 years primarily for the purpose of assurance and enhancement.

### Retention of assessed work

74. 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.

Explanatory note:

- 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.

75. 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.
76. 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.
77. All assessed work submitted and marked through the University's virtual learning environment is deemed to be stored securely and confidentially and adheres to retention and archiving guidelines.

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

78. 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.
79. 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 school. It **must** be destroyed as confidential waste (subject to paragraph 72).
80. Where a student is in dispute with the University by way of a query, an academic appeal or complaint by, or about, the student, all assessed work relating to the candidate **must** be kept until the dispute is resolved.

### Archiving of assessed work

81. 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.
82. Faculties **must** maintain detailed records of all archived work. The record **must** include sufficient detail to enable the efficient retrieval of documents and confirm details of when work should be disposed of.

### Retention of work for longer periods of time

83. Schools 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 Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent). Schools granted permission to retain work for longer periods of time **must** make explicit to students the reasons for doing so and **must** ensure that the work is disposed of when that purpose is fulfilled. Reasons for retaining work for a longer period of time include:
- (1) to meet the requirements of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body;
  - (2) to show to future students as examples.
84. The Chair of the relevant Faculty Education Committee (or equivalent) is responsible for keeping a record of those schools with permission to retain work for a longer period of time and for monitoring that the work is disposed of at the end of the permitted extended period.

Explanatory note

- Assessment data stored by third parties, for example TurnitinUK, is subject to the Service Level Agreements with those parties.

### General Data Protection Regulations

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

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS CODE**

PGTS	Postgraduate Training Scheme
ULTC	University Learning and Teaching Committee