



## Quality Assurance Code of Practice

### Assessment, Marking and Feedback

**This document is primarily intended for:**

- Heads of Department/ School/ Learning Partnerships Office
- Directors of Studies
- Unit conveners
- Senior and Personal Tutors

**Queries:**

**First point of contact**

- Assistant Registrars (Faculty/School) or equivalent

*Technical/specialist contact:*

- Academic Registry

#### Contents

1	Purpose and Scope .....	2
2	Principles .....	2
3	Definitions .....	3
4	Assessment .....	4
5	Assessment Strategies .....	4
	Summative Assessment .....	4
	Formative Assessment .....	5
6.	Setting of Summative Assessment Tasks .....	6
7	Deadlines for Submission of Assessed Work and Penalties.....	7
8	Requests for Extensions and Penalties for Late Coursework.....	8
9	Word Counts and Penalties for Exceeding the Word Count .....	8
10	Marking and Moderation .....	9
	Marking Criteria and Grade Descriptors .....	9
	Anonymity.....	9
	Orals/Presentations .....	10
	Checking of Marking .....	10
	Double Marking.....	10
	Internal Moderation .....	11
	Providing a Written Commentary on Initial Marking.....	11
11	Feedback on Summative Assessments .....	11
	Departmental Policies .....	11
	Individual Feedback on Summative Assignments .....	12
	Transcripts.....	13
12	Boards of Examiners.....	14
13	Monitoring and evaluation of assessment and feedback practice.....	14

## 1. Purpose and Scope

---

- 1.1 This statement sets out principles and procedures relating to the design and development of assessment and feedback strategies, the setting and marking of assessments, and the evaluation and monitoring of assessment and feedback practice.
- 1.2 The principles and procedures relate to all taught programmes of study leading to an award of the University.
- 1.3 The procedures may be varied under the terms of an Institutional Agreement where a programme of study is delivered as a collaborative initiative with a partner institution.
- 1.4 This statement should be read in conjunction with:
- the [New Framework for Assessment](#)
  - the University [Education Strategy](#)
  - [QA3 Approval of new programmes of study](#) (including the Academic Framework)
  - [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#)
  - [QA53 Examination and Assessment Offences](#)
  - [QA12 External Examining \(Taught Programmes\)](#)

## 2. Principles<sup>1</sup>

---

- 2.1 The University is committed to ensuring that:
- it has effective procedures for:
    - designing, approving, monitoring and reviewing appropriate assessment and feedback strategies for units and programmes
    - implementing rigorous assessment and feedback policies and practices, ensuring that the standard for each award and award element is set and maintained at the appropriate level, and that student performance is properly judged against this
    - evaluating how academic standards are maintained through assessment practice.
  - everyone involved in the assessment of students understands and is effective in undertaking their roles and responsibilities
  - information and guidance on assessment is clear, accurate and accessible to all relevant parties including students, assessors and external examiners
  - assessment practice promotes effective learning by providing appropriate and effective formative assessment and feedback opportunities
  - the amount and timing of assessment enables effective and appropriate measurement of students' achievement of intended learning outcomes
  - academic assessment practices permit a diverse student body to demonstrate the achievement of learning outcomes and competence standards
  - students are encouraged to adopt good academic conduct in respect of assessment and are aware of their responsibilities
  - mechanisms for marking and moderating are transparent and fair, such that students and markers are aware of and understand the assessment criteria and any grade descriptors that will be used to mark each assessment task
  - assessment decisions are recorded and documented accurately and systematically and that the decisions of examination boards are communicated in a timely manner
  - students are provided with appropriate and timely feedback on assessed work in a way that promotes learning and facilitates improvement but does not increase the burden of assessment

---

<sup>1</sup> These principally incorporate, with some adaptations, principles articulated in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education

- assessment is conducted with rigour, probity and fairness, and with due regard for security.

### 3. Definitions<sup>2</sup>

---

**Assessment:** any process that appraises a student's knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills.

**Assessment task:** the activity a student is required to undertake leading to output(s) that will be assessed, a task can be either formative or summative.

**Summative assessments** are defined within approved schemes of studies to test the achievement of learning outcomes. They are assessments used to determine progression, or eligibility for an award.

**Formative assessments** are not defined in approved schemes of studies but contribute to the student's learning experience. (Note: in some instances assessment may be both formative and summative. For example, a component of assessment submitted during a unit may be summative in the sense that it contributes to the final mark for the unit, but may also be formative in the sense that it helps students to improve their performance in subsequent assessments in the same unit).

**Synoptic assessment:** Assessment through a task that requires students to draw on different elements of their learning and show their accumulated knowledge and breadth and depth of understanding, as well as the ability to integrate and apply their learning.

**Anonymous marking:** the identity of students is not revealed to markers. To protect both staff and students from bias and the perception of bias, the University has adopted a principle of employing anonymous marking, where practical, on all summative assessment.

**Assessment criteria:** the knowledge, understanding and skills markers expect a student to display in successfully completing an assessment task and which are taken into account in marking the work, based on the learning outcomes being assessed.

**Checking of marking:** ensuring that all the output has been assessed, e.g. no answers are overlooked by examiners and scores are correctly aggregated.

**Double marking:** student work is independently assessed by more than one marker. Double marking is blind where the second marker, when assessing the work, does not have access to the comments or grades/marks of the first marker.

**Assessment feedback:** any indication or information provided to students about their performance in an assessment.

**Grade descriptors:** indications of levels of achievement required in relation to bands of marks.

**Marking scheme:** a detailed framework for assigning marks, where a specific number of marks is given to individual components of the answer.

**Model answer:** the assessor's explicit view of what the output of an assessment task should contain.

---

<sup>2</sup> These definitions are based upon those included in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education and/or the University's [New Framework for Assessment](#) – Assessment Regulations (NFAAR)

**Moderation of assessment tasks:** a process intended to assure that a proposed assessment task is consistent with the unit description currently in force, tests the learning outcomes accurately and fairly, and is capable of fairly and effectively differentiating levels of student achievement where required.

**Moderation of marking:** a process intended to assure that marking is of an appropriate and consistent standard, taking into account any marking criteria, marking schemes/model answers, and grade descriptors. Forms of moderation include:

- sampling
- additional marking, for example of borderlines, firsts and fails, or where there is significant difference between the marks of different markers that cannot be resolved without the opinion of another marker
- review of marks where there is a significant difference between several assessment marks, within or between parts of a programme, which indicate the marks may need to be reconsidered.

**Significant contribution:** a summative assessment task is considered to make a significant contribution if its mark contributes 7% or more towards the calculation of the degree classification.

**Supplementary assessment:** a further assessment for a particular unit, which may involve, for example, retaking an examination, submitting a new piece of coursework or undertaking some other form of work.

## 4. Assessment

---

- 4.1 Heads of Department and Directors of Administration are responsible for
- identifying appropriate resources for ensuring the timely processing and approval of assessment marks
  - ensuring the setting of all assessments takes place in a timely way including, where required, the involvement of the External Examiner(s) (see [QA12 External Examining \(Taught Programmes\)](#)).
- 4.2 Unit Convenors are responsible (in consultation, where appropriate, with Directors of Studies) for the setting and marking of and feedback on unit assessments in accordance with the requirements and expectations of this statement.

## 5. Assessment Strategies

---

### Summative Assessment

- 5.1 The summative assessment regime for each programme will be set at the point of programme approval, with the detail recorded in the individual unit descriptions comprising the programme (see [QA3](#)).
- 5.2 Subsequently, the assessment regime may change as the assessment for individual units is amended under the procedure set out in [QA4](#). This could be in response, for example, to the outcomes of unit and/or programme annual monitoring, periodic review (such as Degree Scheme Review or equivalent), the changing requirements of professional regulatory or statutory bodies, enhancement initiatives at University/Faculty/School/LPO/Department level, external examiner advice or other similar factors. The assessment regime of programmes may also develop as a result of units being withdrawn and new units being approved.

- 5.3 In approving a programme's initial summative assessment regime, and also for the purpose of approving any subsequent changes to it, the following factors should be taken into account where relevant, and as far as is practicable<sup>3</sup>:
- the assessment method(s) should have the capacity to test relevant learning outcomes for a unit or a collection of units, accurately and fairly, and differentiate between levels of student performance
  - assessment methods should be appropriate to the subject being studied, the mode of learning, and to the students taking the unit or programme
  - students should experience a range of assessment methods, including methods that encourage them to reflect and synthesise learning from different parts of their programme; this may include synoptic assessment which tests all or some of the learning outcomes of more than one unit
  - students should be given formative opportunities to practice different types of assessment
  - the volume of assessment should be appropriate to the size of the unit but need not be directly proportionate (i.e. the assessment on a 12 credit need not be double the assessment for a six credit unit)
  - consideration should be given to the distribution of assessment tasks across the programme with appropriate opportunities for formative assessment
  - consideration should be given to the impact on students of the assessment load at different points in the year
  - the impact of failure, and the opportunities for reassessment, in particular where units exceed 12 credits should be taken into consideration
  - assessment methods should be efficient and excessive amounts of summative assessment or bottlenecks in the timing of assessments should be avoided
  - the amount of summative assessment by means of group work should be proportionate to the aims and learning outcomes of the programme
  - the University has adopted a principle of anonymous marking.

### Formative Assessment

- 5.4 The provision of appropriate formative assessment and feedback opportunities can significantly enhance the learning experience and development of students, and their performance in summative assessment.
- 5.5 Accordingly, there is a requirement that every unit should include at least one formative assessment and feedback opportunity associated with it, subject to a waiver for individual units where approved by the relevant Associate Dean/ Head of Learning Partnerships on the advice of the relevant School/Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee, and after consultation with students. In units where the summative assessment regime comprises more than one item of assessment, the earlier piece(s) of summative assessment may fulfil this expectation.
- 5.6 Formative assessment opportunities need not be recorded in unit descriptions but must be communicated to students on the unit. They should be reported and evaluated as appropriate as part of the Annual Monitoring of Units (see [QA51](#)). For units of more than 6 credits, or in the case of synoptic assessment which integrates a number of units, consideration should be given to including appropriate formative assessment tasks to support achievement of the learning outcomes of the unit(s) and to recording these in unit description(s).

---

<sup>3</sup> These factors principally comprise elements of guidance from the UK Quality Code for Higher Education; Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and Recognition of Prior Learning.

### Good Practice – examples of formative assessment and feedback

- Feedback on assignment plans, assignment drafts (whole class or individual)
- Feedback on lab practicals and lab reports
- Responses/exchanges using wikis and distance learning resources
- Activities on Moodle that encourage students to reflect upon their reading/work with feedback from tutors (and sometimes peers)
- MCQs on paper or in Moodle to check understanding with class feedback

## 6. Setting of Summative Assessment Tasks

- 6.1 The assessment regime for each unit is found - broadly defined - in the relevant unit description.
- 6.2 All the learning outcomes for each unit must be assessed but, where appropriate, assessment tasks may integrate all or some of the learning outcomes of a number of units.
- 6.3 The volume and timing of assessment should support student learning and take the following elements into consideration:
- a balance of formative and summative assessment across the programme
  - a spread of assignments and examinations across the programme such that students are not overloaded at particular points in the year
  - for units of more than 6 credits, or where synoptic assessment spans a number of units, normally having more than one point of assessment (one of which might be formative only) in the unit.
- 6.4 For the purpose of this statement, the term 'coursework' includes all assessment tasks which are not formal examinations.
- 6.5 Unit Convenors are responsible for setting pieces of assessment that are fully consistent with the current unit description and test the learning outcomes rigorously, accurately and fairly. Any changes to a unit's assessment regime must be first formally approved as described in QA4.
- 6.6 Unit convenors are also responsible for ensuring that assessment tasks are capable of fairly and effectively differentiating levels of student achievement, including exceptional ability and therefore, other than in pass/fail assessments, grade criteria can be used to differentiate between students' performance.
- 6.7 Where a group work assessment makes a 'significant contribution'<sup>4</sup> the Unit Convenor must ensure there is an element of individual assessment and the boundary between cooperation and collusion is made clear to students at the outset. Setting an assessment where the same mark is awarded to all members of the group will not normally be appropriate. Similarly individual feedback should be provided where appropriate.
- 6.8 All summative examination papers and summative coursework tasks should be moderated internally.

<sup>4</sup> a summative assessment task is considered to make a significant contribute if its mark contributes 7% or more towards the calculation of the degree classification.

- 6.9 All draft examination papers, the assessment of which contributes to a final award of the University, and other summative assessment tasks that make a significant contribution to a final award, should be sent, with clear marking criteria and model answers/marketing schemes appropriate to the discipline, to an External Examiner for moderation and advice following the internal moderation procedure (Section 7, QA12 External Examining (Taught Provision)).
- 6.10 Students will normally receive the following information about an assessment task:
- its weighting in calculating the mark for the unit
  - the assessment criteria, and any grade criteria relevant to the subject
  - the timing, nature and extent of feedback they can expect and whether this is to be accompanied by the return of assessed work.
- 6.11 Students will receive clear and accurate information which sets out the expectations of the assessment task(s). This will normally include: :
- the requirements of the assessment task(s)
  - the word limit/range, and the penalty for non-compliance. If a penalty policy is not stated in writing the University default policy will apply (see paragraph 10 below)
  - any specific requirements of professional, regulatory or statutory bodies
  - any special presentation or referencing preferences/requirements
  - the date for submission of the work
  - the dates when any further detailed information about the individual task(s) will be communicated and how they will be communicated
  - for in-class tests, information on the conditions under which the test will be conducted (eg open-book) or other specific requirements
  - whether the work is to be submitted anonymously.
- 6.12 Unit Convenors may also, where appropriate, remind students of the penalties for late submission of assessments and provide a warning regarding plagiarism and other academic offences. All assessed coursework must be accompanied by a declaration from the student that the work is their own and that any re-use of their own work, or use of the work of others, is referenced appropriately.

### **Good Practice – Assignment Briefs**

These comprise a *complete* statement of the items in 6.9 above in a single document.

Especially for first or unusual tasks on a new unit, consider also offering links to examples of excellent and poor work with feedback comments in relation to the criteria. Such examples also present new students with a model of the academic format expected of them in the (UK) HE environment.

- 6.13 Where it is proposed that assessment be conducted in a language(s) other than that used for teaching and/or study, advice should be sought from the Academic Registry.

## **7. Deadlines for Submission of Assessed Work and Penalties**

- 7.1 Coursework submission dates and time deadlines should be set by Unit Convenors in consultation with relevant Directors of Studies and after taking into account, so far as is reasonably practicable, the following:

- submission dates should be at appropriate points, taking into account the organisation and delivery of the curriculum, and the desirability of providing students with an opportunity to reflect on their learning
- avoiding clashes and excessive assessment burdens for students and staff
- ensuring that those involved in marking student work have enough time to complete it satisfactorily in light of the date at which the results are required, either by the student or the institution
- in the case of work to be sent by distance learners in different time zones, the practicalities of access to the internet for such students.

7.2 Coursework submission dates and time deadlines should be clearly publicised at the beginning of the unit, and where practicable, in the student handbook, showing how they relate to one another and to the overall assessment, where appropriate.

## 8. Requests for Extensions and Penalties for Late Coursework

---

- 8.1 Requests for extensions ([QA16 Form 1](#)) should be submitted by a student to the Director of Studies for consideration in cases where the majority of their units are in the same Department (or equivalent). Where this is not the case, the Unit Convenor should consider the request in consultation with the appropriate Director of Studies.
- 8.2 Agreed late coursework should normally be submitted before the remaining coursework is returned to the main student body.
- 8.3 Coursework submitted after the deadline without prior approval will normally receive a maximum mark of 40% or the relevant pass mark.
- 8.4 Coursework that is handed in after five working days, without prior approval, will normally receive a mark of zero.

## 9. Word Counts and Penalties for Exceeding the Word Count

---

- 9.1 Written coursework tasks should normally have a word limit or a word range, and require students to declare a word count with their submitted work.
- 9.2 Where a word limit or word range applies then the penalty for non-compliance with the word limit or word range should be clearly stated in writing when the assignment task is distributed.
- 9.3 Where a policy on penalising non-compliance with word limits and word ranges is not stated in accordance with 9.2 then the following default policy will apply:
- the marker(s) will stop reading the work once the student has exceeded a word limit (or the upper figure of a word range) by 10%. If a student writes substantially less than the word limit (or less than the lower figure of a word range) they risk not maximising their potential mark;
  - for the purpose of calculating the word count, footnotes are included, whereas contents pages, executive summaries, tables, figures, appendices and reference lists/bibliographies are excluded.
- 9.4 Word count penalty policies should be consistently applied as stated.



## 10. Marking and Moderation

---

### Marking Criteria and Grade Descriptors

- 10.1 Faculty/School Learning Teaching and Quality Committees are responsible for approving: Department/School generic grade descriptors covering the classifications for undergraduate and taught postgraduate awards. Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees should review the descriptors periodically.
- 10.2 Assessment should be marked against its specific marking criteria, any model answers/marketing scheme, and any relevant generic or specific grade descriptors. As set out in section 5, [QA9 Professional Development and Recognition for All Staff and Students who Teach and Support Learning](#), students will not routinely be approved to undertake the marking of summative assessments that contribute to the final award.

### Anonymity

- 10.3 All written examinations should be undertaken and marked on an anonymous basis. Other forms of summative assessment should be marked on an anonymous basis, where practical. The Head of Department shall determine at which point anonymity for examinations should cease, whether at the Board of Examiners for Units or for Programmes, or at the Board of Studies. Where it is not practical for assignments to be marked anonymously alternative mechanisms should be considered to guard against perceptions of bias and ensure that marking is fair.
- 10.4 Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees are responsible for determining whether it is practical to mark non-examination items of summative assessment anonymously. Where anonymity cannot be maintained mechanisms such as double marking may be used to ensure equity.
- 10.5 Coursework is considered to be impractical for anonymous marking if the student can be easily identified by the marker. The following is an indicative, but not exhaustive, list of types of coursework which may come into this category:
- Observed assessments e.g. practice-based, or performance-based assessment, presentations
  - Portfolios, projects and dissertations;
  - Group work
  - Laboratory work
  - Fieldwork
  - Oral assessments
  - Work done on placement/work experience
  - Linked pieces of assessment where earlier marks or feedback contribute to the marking process for a later piece of work
  - Preliminary work which is used as used as a qualifying hurdle for a later linked piece of assessment e.g. dissertation pre-reports.
- Assessments marked by computer i.e. Multiple Choice Questions and Moodle quizzes do not need to be submitted anonymously.
- 10.6 Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees should endeavour to find ways for work to be marked anonymously if possible. For instance, in relation to dissertations, an alternative marker to the supervisor may be employed where this is considered practical. If the work is to be double marked the second marker will not normally be familiar with the student's work and therefore anonymity might be maintained.
- 10.7 Where practical, anonymity should be maintained during the marking process and the inputting of marks. Following the marking of coursework it may be necessary to lift the anonymity in order to put marks into SAMIS (for instance if work is submitted through

Moodle) and/or to provide personalised feedback to students, and/or if plagiarism is suspected.

- 10.8 Students should be informed of whether their coursework will be marked anonymously by the Unit Convenor. If coursework is to be marked anonymously, students should be reminded that they should not put their name on their work. University candidate numbers and/or the student's University ID number will normally be used instead of the student's name to identify their work. It is advisable for two identifiers to be used (both ID and candidate number) for verification purposes.

### Orals/Presentations

- 10.9 Orals/presentations which make a significant contribution<sup>5</sup> to the final classification should be recorded as appropriate, and such assessments are subject to the same principles of internal and external moderation as written assessments.

### Checking of Marking

- 10.10 Unit Convenors are responsible for ensuring that all pieces of assessment which are not returned to students and/or which contribute to a final classification are checked to ensure that all the output of the candidate has been assessed i.e. no answers have been overlooked by the markers, and the scores have been correctly aggregated.

### Double Marking

- 10.11 All final projects/dissertations that make a significant contribution to the final classification should be blind double marked.
- 10.12 Each marker should make a record of all mark(s) awarded, together with written comments indicating their rationale for awarding marks.
- 10.13 Where the marks of a first and second marker differ then, in the first instance, the markers should meet to determine whether, through further discussion, they can agree a final mark.
- 10.14 Where a first and second marker cannot agree on the mark awarded, the following approach shall apply unless the Department has agreed an alternative method with the Faculty:
- In instances where the difference is 4% or less, and does not cross a classification boundary, then the average of the marks shall be taken forward to the examination board;
  - In instances where a first and second marker cannot agree, and the difference is more than 4% and/or crosses a classification boundary, a third marker will be appointed by the relevant Head of Department on the basis of their subject expertise. The third marker will receive the marks and comments from the first two markers and discuss the work with them. If the third marker is unable to facilitate the determination of an agreed mark, then the third marker will award a mark anywhere within the range bounded by the marks awarded by the first and second marker, and this mark shall be the mark taken forward to the examination board.
- 10.15 If a Department/ The School wishes to use a different approach to resolving disagreements between markers its approach must be approved by its Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.
- 10.16 Once a mark has been determined all records of the original marks and comments of the first and second marker, and how the final agreed mark was determined, should be provided to and retained by the Unit Convenor.

---

<sup>5</sup> a summative assessment task is considered to make a significant contribute if its mark contributes 7% or more towards the calculation of the degree classification

### **Moderation of marking**

- 10.17 All assessment items that contribute to a final award, and which are not double marked, should be subject to a process of internal moderation, the purpose of the moderation being to ensure that the marking is of an appropriate and consistent standard.
- 10.18 Unless a Head of Department directs otherwise, moderation will take the form of sampling, whereby each piece of student work shall form part of a population from which a sample comprising work with first class/distinction marks, all fails, borderlines (or equivalents) and a representative sample in-between, will be drawn for review.
- 10.19 The moderator(s), who will be identified by the Head of Department, should, where practicable, have appropriate subject expertise and not be directly involved in the delivery of the unit.
- 10.20 Where moderation takes place, a record should be kept of which pieces of student work have been reviewed, and by whom. In the case of examination scripts and other retained written work, this may be achieved, typically by the moderator putting an appropriate marking on each relevant script. In other cases, the record should be made and retained by the Unit Convenor.
- 10.21 Where sample work is sent to an external examiner, the sample should normally comprise the sample or part thereof which has been moderated, with the moderation duly evidenced.
- 10.22 Where an issue arises from moderation which cannot be resolved through discussion between the initial marker(s) and the moderator(s), then the matter should be referred to the Head of Department, who shall provide further directions.

### **Providing a written commentary on initial marking**

- 10.23 Initial examiners should, as far as is reasonably practicable, provide written commentary on their marking to assist moderators and external examiners in understanding the rationale for marks awarded.
- 10.24 In the case of assessment tasks where students are provided with individual feedback e.g. most coursework, the feedback provided to the student will meet the expectations of section 11 below. In the case of other assessments, notably examination scripts, it may not be practicable to require an initial marker to provide a written commentary in terms appropriate for a student to receive, on every piece of work marked. However, consideration should be given to providing some written commentary on pieces of work which are selected for moderation, to assist the moderator to understand the initial examiner's approach.
- 10.25 Such commentary will be written with reference to the assessment criteria, marking scheme or model answer.

## **FEEDBACK**

### **11. Feedback on Summative Assessments**

---

#### **Feedback Policies**

- 11.1 All Departments/ The School/ LPO and its partner organisations (where relevant) are required to develop and maintain explicit policies for feedback on assessment, in particular for examinations, and should include the points listed in 11.5 – 11.9 below. Departments/ The School/LPO are advised to take account of the breadth of units in their programmes, in particular where they include units from other Departments or programmes, in order to ensure appropriateness for learning.

- 11.2 Departmental policies on assessment feedback should be based on a pedagogical rationale that is relevant to the discipline concerned, and contain a level of detail deemed adequate for approval by Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees (on the recommendation of Department Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees where appropriate), having been informed by Staff/Student Liaison Committees, and with a view to converging to faculty-wide policies over time.
- 11.3 Feedback policies will be included in programme handbooks. Specific guidance should be given to CPD students who may take units separately and therefore not have access to programme level information.
- 11.4 In 2019/20, there is no requirement for Department/School Learning, Teaching & Quality Committees to conduct a review of Feedback Policies. In the event that an amendment is required to a Feedback Policy, it should be approved by the Director of Teaching and the Associate Dean. For collaborative provision managed by the LPO (excluding validated provision) any changes should be approved by CPAC only.

### Individual Feedback on Summative Assignments

- 11.5 Students should receive prompt feedback on their academic performance in individual summative tasks. This is normally defined as feedback within a maximum of three semester weeks following the submission deadline for the task. Where this aspiration cannot be met, the relevant students should be advised by the unit convenor following consultation with the relevant Directors(s) of Studies, and provided with a revised return date. Where a student has failed to meet the submission deadline, the timescale for the provision of feedback is then at the discretion of the Director of Studies.
- 11.6 Feedback should ensure that the student understands how best to improve his or her performance in future assessments as well as commending them for achievement. The method of feedback should be consistent with the nature of the task and relate to the intended learning outcomes, assessment criteria and any grading descriptors. In some cases, it may be appropriate for students to receive feedback from their Personal Tutor rather than the person who set the task. The Director of Studies is responsible for ensuring that there are appropriate feedback mechanisms in place as part of the overall assessment strategy for the programme and that these are clearly communicated to students.
- 11.7 Feedback on an individual student's work will relate to the relevant assessment criteria but should also offer constructive comment on a student's demonstration of generic skills, such as presentation and communication skills. In order to provide consistent standards of feedback, it is good practice to use a pro forma that can be attached to the students' work. This overarching feedback can be enhanced by annotations on the actual piece of work.
- 11.8 All continuing students should receive feedback on their performance in examinations. As a minimum this should be generic feedback, but does not need to be individual. At the discretion of the Head of Department and in alignment with departmental policies on feedback, students may be given access to their examination scripts e.g. in cases of substantial concern about individual performance, a tutor may give detailed feedback to the individual student which may include reviewing the examination script. ([Regulation 17.2](#) covers students who have concerns over assessment outcomes which have not yet been approved by Board of Studies such as suspected transcription or totalling errors).
- 11.9 Students receive feedback on their level of achievement in each unit studied during an academic year, by viewing their unit marks held in SAMIS. This feedback may take the form of grades or percentages. Students are also entitled to be informed of their level of achievement in any supplementary assessment. Students also receive periodic feedback

on their overall academic performance in the form of credit-weighted averages held in SAMIS.

- 11.10 The provision of feedback via SAMIS should be accompanied by an opportunity to discuss performance with the Personal Tutor or other appropriate members of staff as identified by the Head of Department. This opportunity should be clearly communicated to all relevant students.
- 11.11 Directors of Studies are responsible for ensuring that students receive appropriate academic counselling to support their decisions at key points during their studies, for example, unit selection, transfer of programme, change of mode of study, progression to an undergraduate Masters programme etc. This counselling may be provided by the Personal Tutor, Academic Tutor, Year Tutor or Director of Studies according to the Department/School or partner organisation (where appropriate).
- 11.12 Directors of Studies are responsible for ensuring that there are sufficient mechanisms in place to identify students whose academic performance is giving cause for concern. These students should be offered prompt academic counselling and frequent feedback on their performance.

### Deadlines

- 11.13 In order that students can view their marks in a timely manner, Boards of Examiners and Boards of Studies must take place in sufficient time to meet the following deadlines:
- Within four weeks of the relevant assessment period, award decisions with classifications will be released to students. These will have been agreed by the Board of Studies.
  - Within six weeks of the relevant assessment period, progression decisions will be released to students. These will have been agreed by the Board of Studies.
  - Within five weeks of the relevant assessment period, provisional assessment item marks and the resulting provisional unit marks will be released to students. These will have been determined by the Board of Examiners for Units.
- 11.14 Directors of Administration and Heads of Department are responsible for identifying appropriate resources for ensuring summative assessment marks and decisions on progression, award and classification are processed on SAMIS.

### Transcripts and Records of Assessment

- 11.15 Transcripts are paper documents which record in detail the academic attainment of each student throughout their period of study for each award. Transcripts will include original marks and the outcomes of any supplementary assessment (see [New Framework for Assessment: Assessment Regulations](#), Appendix 7 of the NFAAR-UG or NFAAR-PGT, as appropriate).
- 11.16 Academic Registry provides all graduating students with a hard-copy of their Transcript. The Transcript contains details of a student's academic performance which will include the unit results for all years of study and award details.
- 11.17 Records of Assessment are available upon request and, in addition to the information contained within the Transcript, provide results for all individual items of assessment.
- 11.18 A 'self-service' facility is available to all continuing students and finalists up to the point of graduation. This enables students to produce 'Student-Generated' versions of their Transcript and Record of Assessment.
- 11.19 Further information and [guidance](#) on Transcripts and Records of Assessment is available.

## 12. Boards of Examiners

---

- 12.1 Arrangements for the conduct of Boards of Examiners for Units and Programmes are described in the appropriate (UG, PG etc.) [New Framework for Assessment](#) document under Assessment Decision-making and in [QA35 Assessment Procedures for Taught Programmes of Study](#).

## 13. Monitoring and evaluation of assessment and feedback practice

---

- 13.1 The monitoring and evaluation of assessment practice arises in a range of ways, including:
- the annual review of Department/School/LPO feedback policies (see 11.4 above)
  - the process for the annual monitoring of units and programmes (see [QA51](#))
  - the process of Degree Scheme Review or equivalent (see [QA13](#)).
- 13.2 The evaluation of assessment practice may encompass as appropriate<sup>6</sup>:
- considering the extent to which assessment is effective in measuring student achievement of programme/unit learning outcomes
  - checking that assessment is responsive to external developments, including professional, regulatory or statutory bodies requirements, where appropriate
  - monitoring and comparing student achievement and academic standards over time
  - analysing trends in results, for example, to analyse mark, grade or honours distributions, or to identify any relation between student entry qualifications and assessment outcomes.

---

<sup>6</sup> This incorporates guidance under UK Quality Code for Higher Education

Statement Details		
<b>Issue Version:</b>	<b>3.8</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	<b>August 2019</b>	
<b>Antecedents:</b>	<i>Senate</i>	Minutes 8773, 9807, 11358, 12740, 12782, 12889, 13005, 13110, 13141
	<i>Quality Assurance Committee</i>	Minutes 318, 742(7), 832(4), 857(7)(8), 918(6), 976(7), 1009, 1096(2)
	<i>Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee</i>	24 May 2011 Minute 92 (i) 10 July 2012 Minute 279 9 July 2013 Minute 428 8 July 2014 Minute 552 7 July 2015 Minute 671 5 July 2016 Minute 807 11 July 2017 Minute 940 22 May 2018 Minute 1040 16 July 2019 Minute 1197
<b>Related Documentation:</b>	<p>QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education <a href="#">Advice and Guidance: Assessment New Framework for Assessment: Assessment Regulations (NFAAR) - University of Bath</a>;</p> <p><a href="#">Individual Mitigating Circumstances</a> and Assessment: Principle and Procedures within and outside the NFAAR:</p> <p><a href="#">QA35 Assessment Procedures for Taught Programmes of Study</a> University of Bath <a href="#">Education Strategy</a></p>	
<b>Author:</b>	Academic Registry	