ASSESSMENT, PROGRESSION AND AWARDING: TAUGHT PROGRAMMES HANDBOOK

2. Setting and Submission of Assessments

2.1   Principles for Setting Assessment

2.1.1   When designing assessments the following principles **must** be applied:

a.   The volume, timing and nature of assessments **must** be designed with the intention of enabling students to demonstrate the extent to which they have achieved the relevant intended learning outcomes.

b.   All intended learning outcomes **should** be assessed.

c.   Information to students about what is expected of them **must** be provided clearly and explicitly at the beginning of each module and/or programme.

d.   Assessments **must** support student learning as well as measuring achievement.

e.   Information on any arrangements for re-assessment **must** be made available to students at the beginning of each module.

2.1.2   When setting assessment(s) consideration **should** be given to the need to eliminate opportunities for academic misconduct.

2.1.3   There **should** always be more than one assessment for a module although it is permitted to have only one summative assessment element.

2.1.4   Guidelines on the use of assessment methods, criteria and feedback **should** be made available by Faculties (or delegated Schools) to all staff involved in the assessment and feedback process.

2.2   Timing

2.2.1   All undergraduate students **should** have an opportunity to undertake at least one assessment in the first six weeks of the commencement of their programmes.

2.2.2   Students **must** be informed of the submission dates of all assessments. This **should** be done by the end of the first week of the start of each module. Where this is not possible, students **should** be given at least four weeks' notice of the deadline for submission.

2.2.3   Students may only change their optional choice modules during the first two weeks of the teaching period for that module, where programmes permit module change. After this initial two-week period, changes are not permitted.

Exceptions to this rule may only be made under exceptional circumstances and require the approval of one of the following The Director of Education and Student Experience, Head of Department or Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education (or nominee). Approval for an exception is contingent upon the following conditions:

- No summative assessments related to the module have been completed.
- Less than 50% of the module's teaching sessions have taken place.

2.3   Information to be Made Available to Students

2.3.1 Students **should** have access to the marking criteria that will be applied to their assessment(s).

2.3.2 Information for students **should** make it clear to whom, and how submission takes place. In order to provide unambiguous evidence of the date and time of submission, the methods of submission **must** include a mechanism for recording the submission. It **should** also include a mechanism for asserting on the part of students that the work in question is their own.

2.3.3 Functions of Assessment

a.   Formative Assessment: An assessment item for which the mark does not contribute to the final mark for a module. Formative assessment **may** or **may not** be compulsory and penalties for non-completion may not apply. Formative assessment has a developmental purpose. It **should** indicate what is good about a piece of work and why this is good; it **should** indicate how the work could be improved.

b.   Summative Assessment: An assessment item for which the mark contributes to the final mark for a module. For summative assessments the module descriptor **must** indicate the percentage weighting of the final mark. Summative assessment is used to gauge the extent to which students can demonstrate attainment of the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme in relation to published marking criteria.

2.3.4 When setting assignments the following information must be provided to students, as applicable:

a.   Word count, including details on what should be included within this.

b.   Referencing style and guide. Only the university's approved referencing guidance should be used – no other versions should be provided. University guidance is available at: Referencing Guidance

c.   Link to Academic Conduct and Practice (Chapter 12, Assessment Progression and Awarding Handbook).

d.   Style guide (if the department does not have their own guide students should be asked to use the University guide for taught students – see supporting information below).

e.   Method of submission.

f.   Marking criteria.

2.3.5   The information under 2.3.4 **must** be available through the ELE page for the module (except where inappropriate), either through links to other documents or as part of an assignment brief. (An example assignment brief can be found under supporting information below)

Supporting Information:

Style Guide (see Annex 1)

Assignment Brief (see Annex 2)

2.4   Methods of Assessment

2.4.1   Over the course of a programme of study a diverse range of areas of knowledge and skills should be assessed to mark achievement of a diverse range of intended learning outcomes, and utilising a diverse range of forms of assessment. When designing assessment(s), consideration **should** be given to the most appropriate method of assessment to support student learning and ascertain whether students have manifested attainment of intended learning outcomes. Advice on setting appropriate methods of assessment can be sought from the University's Academic Development team.

2.4.2   The required submission method should be explicitly stated.

2.4.3   **For Group Work Assignments:**

a.   Programme Directors should ensure that students have the opportunity to carry out group work within their programme, to aid their development of core graduate attributes. This should be reviewed as part of the Quality Review and Enhancement Framework, during Department Level Scrutiny

b.   Clear guidance should be provided to students about how they will be evaluated for their group work, and who will take part in the evaluation process (the lecturer, students, or both).

c.   It should be clear to students how the group work activity contributes to the Intended Learning Outcomes of the modules, and their programme of study. Intended Learning Outcomes relating to assessed group work should distinguish between evaluating the product and evaluating the process of group work

d.   Clear guidance should be provided to students about their role within a particular task, whether this will be assigned by the module lead or to be decided within the group. Expectations should be set by the Module Lead about how they expect the group to work together. Basic ground rules for the conduct of an assessed group work activity should be established at the onset of the activity, including the means of any conflict resolution (what students should do if there is conflict within the group) and what is expected of the group members in terms of treating others with dignity and respect.

e.   Where there is more than one submission method, it should be clear what will happen in the event that the student/group only submits to one.

f.   Where group assessment makes up 100% of a modules mark, the students should be provided with an opportunity to complete an individual reflection on their experience.

g.   It should be explicitly stated whether all students must submit, or just one per group. If one per group students should be advised that late submission penalties will apply to all students in the group, regardless of who was responsible for submission. Clear guidance should be given on whether the group's process is also being taken into account.

h.   When a new group work assessment is introduced, the External Examiner for the module should give approval on the nature and content of the group work prior to the assessment going ahead.

i.   Further information on group work assignments and strategies for Learning and Teaching which provide an inclusive experience for all students is provided in the Education Toolkit, including a (non-mandatory) template assignment brief and examples of evaluating Intended Learning Outcomes, please see Guidance for Assessed Group Work on the University's EduExe Toolkit.

2.5   Setting Re-assessments

2.5.1 Students who have been referred in an assessment, or have been given permission to defer an assessment, **must** be assessed on the original syllabus.

2.5.2 Where there are practical reasons why the original form of assessment on a module cannot be replicated for referral or deferral purposes, an alternative form of assessment **must** be used. Examples of when this approach is justified include where the original assessment relied on fieldwork, group work, access to specialist equipment, or input from visiting staff; or where the process of assessment throughout the module was intricate, involving many assessments. The method of reassessment **should** address as many of the module's intended learning outcomes as is possible. The rationale for using alternative forms of assessment **should** be explained to students when their assessments are referred or deferred.

2.5.3 Where reassessment in the form of an exam is via the same format as the original assessment, any questions/ tasks set **should** be different.

2.6 Setting Examination Papers and Rubrics

2.6.1 Assessments are an integral part of the learning process and should therefore be planned with appropriate care and rigour. The process for the setting of assessments is outlined below. The Director of Education and Student Experience should inform the Head of Department and Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education (or nominee) of any issues or obstacles to meeting processes or timescales; at the end of the process, any outstanding issues will be reported to the Pro-Vice Chancellor and Executive Dean of Faculty.

2.6.2 For each module, a member of academic staff should be nominated as a Module Moderator. The nominated staff member should be from the same department as the module to which they have been assigned, but not involved in teaching on this module; the Module Moderator will be required to review all examination papers and instructions for coursework associated with this module.

2.7 Role of External Examiners

2.7.1 External Examiners must approve the methods of assessment, assessment criteria and feedback processes for all summative assessments which contribute to the final award classification. For assessments delivered within a limited timeframe, during which students have no recourse to immediate academic assistance (i.e. examinations), External Examiners should approve the form and content of prepared questions/tasks. For assessments delivered over a longer timeframe, during which it is possible for

students to submit and receive responses to academic enquiries, it is sufficient that External Examiners review the form of the assessment only.

2.8   Instructions for Setting Assessments

2.8.1 **Instructions for Assignments**; Assessments not undertaken under controlled and timed conditions e.g. essays, fieldwork, lab reports etc.

a.   All instructions for assignments must be reviewed by the Module Moderator. Normally, improvements/revisions to the instructions for assignments will be finalised and agreed with the Module Convenor/ Leader in advance of the term in which the module is taught. However, in some modules, the nature of the assignment requires co-construction by both staff and students; in such cases, the instructions will be finalised and agreed by a date agreed with the Director of Education and Student Experience.

b.   All assignment deadlines set should be reviewed by the Director of Education and Student Experience before publication to students to check for potential overlap between modules and review of assessment deadline bunching within a programme or cohort.

2.8.2 **Instructions for Examinations**: Assessments undertaken under controlled and timed conditions e.g. exams, in-class tests, presentations etc.

a.   All draft examination papers (including full rubric) should be completed no later than twelve weeks before the start of the relevant exam period.

b.   All draft examination papers must be reviewed by the Module Moderator and improvements/revisions agreed with the Module Convenor/ Leader. An example of good practice is the use of an internal 'scrutiny group' to review the content of the draft papers and the associated process ahead of submission to the External Examiner.

c.   Once agreed internally, draft examination papers must be sent to the External Examiner for review and approval.

d.   Following any required revisions determined by the External Examiner, examination papers must be returned to the Module Convenor/ Leader for further amendments if required.

e.   Where any revised papers (with rubric) include any complex calculations or data analysis, these papers must be subject to appropriate checking by an impartial academic colleague as a trial exercise, with a worked answer provided for assistance.

f. Once the Module Convenor/ Leader is satisfied that the above checks have been appropriately completed, a PDF must be generated, checked against the original and provided in electronic form to the Exams Office no later than 6 weeks before the relevant exam period. To check that all fonts are embedded within a PDF document, please see Annex 3: Checking Embedded Fonts. For those wishing to embed fonts, please see Annex 4: Embedding Fonts.

g. At the point of electronic submission to the Exams Office, the Module Convenor/Leader should indicate whether they require sight of the final printed paper to check the resolution/clarity of graphs, tables or images or to address any issues which may have been generated in the PDF conversion or printing process. Upon receiving such a request, the Exams Office will provide a sample paper for the Module Convenor/Leader to check. This sample will be as close as possible to the version that would be presented to students. Module Convenors/Leaders will be invited to check and sign off the hard-copy sample within a week of the original deadline (i.e. no more than 5 weeks before the relevant exam period).

h. Prescribed timescales for this process for each examination period are included in Table 1 below. Failure to comply with timescales may result in further action as described in 2.6

i. A report confirming completion of the above process is to be submitted to the Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor for Education (or nominee) of the Faculty (or delegated School) one week following the deadline for submission of papers to the Examinations Office. Any issues outstanding at this stage should reported by the Pro Vice-Chancellor and Executive Dean of College to the Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Education) for action and VCEG for record.

j. Any issues which are experienced in the exam itself must be communicated to the relevant markers.

2.8.3 Standardisation of the format and basic layout of examination papers and rubrics throughout the University provides clarity and consistency for students and supports the Examinations Office and its staff in preparations prior to and during examination sessions. Detailed notes on the presentation and preparation of examination papers and rubrics are found in APA Handbook Annex A: Examination Papers and Rubrics.

2.8.4 Examination papers **should** be prepared and stored only on computers which have physical and software security measures that are fit for purpose, i.e., it **should** be

beyond reasonable doubt that examination papers have been kept secure at all stages of their preparation prior to use.

2.8.5 All examination rubrics **should** be available for students to view in advance of the examination.

2.8.6 Past examination papers must be made available via the library and students must be made aware of how to access these via ELE2.

Supporting Information:

Exam Setting Flow Chart (see Annex 5)

Example Exam Setting Approval Form (see Annex 6)

Example Module Moderator and Module Leader/ Convenor Checklist (see Annex 7)

Table 1:

Examination Submission Deadline	
First draft submitted to Module Moderator	No Later than 12 working weeks before the relevant Exam period
Submission to External Examiner	No Later than 8 working weeks before the relevant Exam period
Submission to Examinations Office	No Later than 6 working weeks before the relevant Exam period
Approval of hard copy sample paper (if requested)	No Later than 5 working weeks before the relevant Exam period

2.9 Accessibility

2.9.1 The Equality Act 2010 provides protection against discrimination, harassment, and victimisation on the grounds of disability. In this context, a disabled student is defined as someone with a physical or mental impairment that has a substantial effect on her or his ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities.

2.9.2 The Equality Act also contains the Public Sector Equality duty with which all public sector organisations must comply. This involves removing or minimising disadvantage suffered by people with a disability, and states that compliance with the duty may

involve treating some people differently than others. The Equality Act 2010 continues the existing duty upon higher education institutions to make reasonable adjustments where students with a disability might otherwise be substantially disadvantaged.

2.9.3 The University has an anticipatory duty under the Equality Act (Amendment) Order 2012, which means that consideration **must** be given to how assessment(s) are made accessible to students with disabilities. This consideration forms an essential part of programme and module design, and review. It is the responsibility of all staff members to ensure that their teaching and the process of assessment is accessible. Staff **should** be aware of their anticipatory duty to make reasonable adjustments to any part of the teaching for students with a disability.

2.9.4 Adjustments and suitable adaptation to a student's specific needs **should** be made in dialogue with the student. An Individual Learning Plan (ILP) will often be agreed in collaboration with Access Ability or the Wellbeing Service and includes advice on appropriate adjustments to meet the student's specific needs.

2.10   Principles of Submission

2.10.1 Deadlines for submission must be communicated to students; this communication **should** be clear, explicit and easily accessible;

2.10.2 The consequences of late or non-submission **must** be made clear to students;

2.10.3 Methods for the granting of extensions to the submission deadline for assessed work **must** ensure that all students are treated fairly and consistently.

2.11   Late Submission of Coursework and Online Examinations

2.11.1 Coursework

a.   Coursework submitted late:

i.   Coursework submitted within one hour of the deadline, and which has reached the standard of the module pass mark or above, will be awarded a penalty of 5% of the total available marks for the coursework, down to a minimum score of the module pass mark.

ii.   Coursework submitted within one hour of the deadline, which has not reached the standard of the module pass mark, will not be awarded a penalty of 5%.

      iii. Coursework submitted more than one hour after a submission deadline and up to 24 hours beyond a submission deadline must receive a mark capped at the module pass mark, unless an application for mitigation is approved.

      iv. First submissions of coursework submitted later than 24 hours after the deadline will receive a mark of zero. See also the table in 2.11.3 below.

b.   Referred coursework which is submitted beyond the submission deadline must receive a mark of zero, unless an application for mitigation is approved.

c.   Students may apply for mitigation for a one week (7 calendar days) or up to two weeks (14 calendar days) extension.

d.   In exceptional, severe and complex circumstances, a third week may be granted. Please see Chapter 10 - Mitigation: Deadline extensions and deferrals for more information.

      i. Where an exceptional three-week extension has been granted, work submitted at any point beyond the extended submission deadline will receive a mark of zero.

      ii. Any students requiring additional time should submit a further application for mitigation within 24 hours of the extended deadline in order to be granted a deferral.

e.   Work submitted as a result of a Penalty C Academic Misconduct outcome (see: the Tariff of Penalties in Chapter 12 Academic conduct and practice) must receive a mark of zero, unless an application for mitigation is approved. If the Academic Misconduct penalty had been applied to a first submission the student would still have a right of referral on the assessment.

f.   If a student receives an Academic Misconduct Penalty against a piece of work that was submitted late but then submits the resubmission on time, the resubmitted assessment should not receive a late cap.

g.   A set of Late Submission of Coursework FAQs are provided for clarity, see Annex 8.

2.11.2 Online Examinations

a.   The following applies to examinations submitted via Exams ELE 2. These penalties are not relevant to examinations submitted via systems such as Practique where the software will automatically stop the exam as soon as the submission deadline has been reached.

b.   Late penalties for online examinations can be found in the tables in 2.11.3 below. Penalties vary according to the extent to which the submission is late. Penalties are applied to work that has reached the standard of the module pass mark or above.

c.   Referred examinations which are submitted beyond the submission deadline must receive a mark of zero, unless an application for mitigation is approved.

2.11.3 Tables of Late Penalties for Coursework and Online Examinations

a.   The table below relates to first submissions including a submission as a result of a Penalty B Academic Misconduct Outcome.

Important: Online examinations have an additional technical upload time of 15 minutes. Please see <u>Frequently asked questions – Exams, Assessments, Progression and Awarding</u> for more information.

Assessment Type	Time Available for Completing Assessment		Penalty to be applied:		
			Reduce by 5%	Cap at Pass mark	Mark of zero
Online Examination – Option 1	24 Hours		1 min up to 4 mins, 59 secs	5 mins up to 29 mins, 59 secs	30mins or more
Online Examination – Option 2	As set by rubric, typically less than 24 hours.		1 min up to 4 mins, 59 secs	5 mins up to 29 mins, 59 secs	30mins or more
		Where a student submits within the total fixed	1 min up to 4 mins, 59 secs	5 mins up to 29 mins, 59 secs	30mins or more

		duration for their Option 2 examination, but after the end of the 24 hour window, then the following penalties will apply:			
Online Examination – Option 3	Option 3 examinations are no longer in use				
Online Examination – Option 4	Single start time, fixed duration		1 min up to 4 mins, 59 secs	5 mins up to 29 mins, 59 secs	30mins or more
Coursework	Usually at least 4 to 6 weeks		Up to 59 mins, 59 secs	1 hr to up to 23 hrs, 59 mins 59 secs	More than 24 hrs
Short duration coursework / "take home papers"	Typically less than 2 weeks		Up to 59 mins, 59 secs	1 hr to up to 23 hrs, 59 mins 59 secs	More than 24 hrs

b.   The table below relates to referred submissions and submissions as a result of a Penalty C Academic Misconduct Outcome.

		Penalty to be applied
Assessment Type	**Time Available for completing Assessment**	**Mark of Zero**
Online Examination	As set by rubric, typically less than 24 hours	Any submission after the deadline
Coursework	Usually at least 4 to 6 weeks	Any submission after the deadline
Short duration coursework / "take home papers"	Typically less than 2 weeks	Any submission after the deadline

2.11.4 Submission Errors - Coursework

a.   Where a student submits the incorrect file, or the file is corrupted, and realises their error, they may choose to submit the correct file late and accept the late penalty that applies at the point at which the replacement submission is made.

b.   Where a student has submitted their assignment on time, but to the wrong location (such as a different assessment submission link) within a University of Exeter system, the student will be responsible for providing details of where the submission can be found, within the relevant timeframe set out in the table of late penalties above. Providing it can be accessed, the piece of work should be marked and a non-capped mark awarded. Where a student does not provide this information and/or the submission cannot be accessed, the relevant late penalty will be applied at the point at which the student submits their assignment to the correct location.

2.11.5 Submission Errors - Examinations

a.   Where a student submits the incorrect file, or the file is corrupted, if a student realises their error, they may choose to submit the correct file late and accept the late penalty that applies at the point at which the replacement submission is made.

b.   Where a student has submitted their examination on time, but to the wrong location (such as a different assessment submission link) within a University of Exeter system, the student will be responsible for providing details of where the submission can be found within the relevant timeframe set out in the table of late penalties above. Providing it can be accessed, the piece of work should be marked and a non-capped mark awarded. Where a student does not provide this information and/or the submission cannot be accessed, the relevant late penalty will be applied at the point at which the student submits their assignment to the correct location.

2.11.6 Faculties (or delegated Schools) must publish the University penalty for the late submission of assessed work in the relevant programme, module or Faculty (or delegated School) handbook.

2.11.7 External Examiners **should** be informed where students' overall marks for modules have been affected because of penalties applied for late submission.

2.11.8 The scheduling of Mitigation Committees **should** allow for the consideration of applications for extensions to submission deadlines in advance of submission deadlines, either through scheduling ad-hoc meetings or through the delegation of such decisions.

2.11.9 For students experiencing disabilities there may be specific requests for exceptions to the above in relation to extensions or the spreading out of deadlines. These will either be detailed within the students' individual learning plans (ILPs) or through discussion at a Health, Wellbeing and Support for Study meeting.

2.11.10 Illegible Scripts

a.   In the event that students hand-write their answers for an examination, it is their responsibility to provide a script that is clearly legible. Candidates who submit scripts which examiners are unable to read will be invited to produce a word-processed transcript. This transcript must be a true copy of the original. If any embellishments are found, this will be treated as suspected academic misconduct following guidance under Chapter 12 – Academic Conduct and Practice.

2.12   Non-submission and Non-attendance

2.13.1   Students are expected to complete all assessments whether they are formative or summative. Failure to attend or submit a summative assessment **should** be accompanied by an application for mitigation with supporting evidence, in accordance with Chapter 10 - Mitigation: Deadline extensions and deferrals.

2.13.2   For students experiencing disabilities there **may** be specific requests for exceptions to the above, in relation to non-submission or non-attendance. These will either be detailed within the students' individual learnings plan(s) (ILPs) or through discussion at a Health, Wellbeing and Support for Study meeting.

2.13   Module Completion Timeframe and Deferral

2.13.1   Modules **must** be completed by the end of the academic year following that in which they were started. Periods of interruption are not included within this timeframe. Exceptions to this rule may be granted in exceptional circumstances and with the authority of the Chair of the Faculty Assessment Progression and Awarding Committee (FAPAC) (the Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor for Education (APVCE)). Records of these exceptions **must** be presented to the University APAC for information and oversight. Please also refer to Chapter 7 (section 3 -Extensions to modules and programmes), Periods of study and changes to registration status for taught postgraduate students, for additional information for PGT students.

2.13.2   If students are prevented from completing an assessment for a module (or modules), and mitigation has been approved, then deferral **may** be recommended. Deferred assessment(s) **should** be taken at the next available opportunity in the official Referral/ Deferral assessment period. As detailed in Chapter 2, a deferred candidate **should** be assessed on the original syllabus, but alternative methods of assessment **may** be employed in certain circumstances, for example, following interruption.

2.13.3   Where a student has successfully completed individual assessment components in a module, these marks will be retained and combined with the marks from any outstanding part(s) of the assessment process for which they have been deferred. If outstanding components remain at the end of the maximum module period (see 2.13.1), students may lose their right to referral and those outstanding components will be given a mark of 0.