



Quality Assurance Code of Practice

Assessment, Marking and Feedback

Contents

1. Purpose and Scope	3
2. Principles	3
3. Definitions	4
4. Assessment	6
5. Assessment Strategies	6
Summative Assessment	6
Formative Assessment	7
End Point Assessment (EPA)	8
6. Setting of Summative Assessment Tasks	8
Group assessment	9
7. Submission deadlines	11
8. Extensions for coursework	11
9. Penalties for late or non-submission and un-invigilated, remote online examinations	12
10. Word Counts	14
11. Marking and Moderation	15
Marking Criteria and Grade Descriptors	15
Anonymity	15
Orals/Presentations	16
Checking of Marking	16
Double Marking	16
Moderation of marking	17
Providing a written commentary on initial marking	18
12. Feedback on Summative Assessments	18
Feedback Policies	18
Individual Feedback on Summative Assignments	18
Deadlines	20
Transcripts and Records of Assessment	20

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

13. Boards of Examiners	20
14. Monitoring and evaluation of assessment and feedback practice	21
Appendix 1 - Table of penalties for late submission of an un-invigilated remote Inspira exam	23
Appendix 2- Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy and Procedure	27

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 courses of study leading to an award of the University, including apprenticeship courses.
- 1.3 The procedures may be varied under the terms of an Institutional Agreement where a course of study is delivered as a collaborative initiative with a partner institution.
- 1.4 The procedures may be varied under the terms of a [Subcontractor Agreement](#) where a course of study is delivered as subcontracted provision with a partner organisation.
- 1.5 This statement should be read in conjunction with:
 - [the assessment regulations for undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses](#)
 - the University [Strategy](#)
 - [QA3 Approval of new courses of study](#) (including the Academic Framework)
 - [QA53 Examination and Assessment Offences](#)
 - [QA12 External Examining \(Taught Provision\)](#)
 - [Rule 2 – Conduct of Examinations](#)

2. Principles¹

- 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 courses
 - 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

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

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

3. Definitions²

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 considered 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.

² These definitions are based upon those included in the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#)

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.

End Point Assessment (EPA): the synoptic assessment (to include any resits of that assessment) of a Student Apprentice's knowledge, skills and behaviours at the end of the apprenticeship, carried out by an End-Point Assessment Organisation (EPAO), to confirm that the Student Apprentice has met the requirements of the relevant approved Apprenticeship Standard.

End Point Assessment Organisation (EPAO): any organisation on the Apprenticeship Provider and Assessment Register (APAR) selected by an Employer and contracted by a Training Provider to carry out End-Point Assessment. Where the apprenticeship is an integrated apprenticeship, the Training Provider will also be the End Point Assessment Organisation.

EPA Assessment Plan: the scheme of assessment approved by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IfATE) in relation to an approved Apprenticeship Standard which End Point Assessment Organisations use to develop assessment tools and deliver End Point Assessments.

Integrated Apprenticeship: an approved Apprenticeship Standard in which the EPA is incorporated into the main learning aim (usually a degree or other full higher education qualification) and the Training Provider is responsible for delivery of both the period of on-programme training and assessment and EPA.

Non-Integrated Apprenticeship: an approved Apprenticeship Standard where the Training Provider is responsible for the delivery of on-programme training and assessment and a separate, independent EPAO is responsible for the delivery of EPA.

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.

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, considering 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 course, 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: the term used for the two types of assessment attempt possible (deferred assessment or reassessment) after failing a unit.

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 \(Taught Provision\)](#)).
- 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 and the [Assessment for Learning Design Principles](#).

5. Assessment strategies

Summative assessment

- 5.1 The summative assessment regime for each course will be set at the point of course approval. A summary will be recorded in the course specification and the detail recorded in the individual unit descriptions (see [QA3](#)). A map of assessments across the course will be presented at the point of approval.
- 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 course 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 courses may also develop because of units being withdrawn and new units being approved. The assessment map for the course should be updated when changes are made.

- 5.3 In approving a course's initial summative assessment regime, and for the purpose of approving any subsequent changes to it, the following factors should be considered where relevant, and as far as is practicable³:
- a. 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.
 - b. assessment methods should be appropriate to the subject being studied, the mode of learning, and to the students taking the unit or course.
 - c. students should experience a range of assessment methods, including methods that encourage them to reflect and synthesise learning from different parts of their course; this may include synoptic assessment which tests all or some of the learning outcomes of more than one unit.
 - d. students should be given formative opportunities to practice different types of assessment.
 - e. For degree apprenticeships, Student Apprentices should be given opportunities to practice the assessment they will undertake during EPA.
 - f. 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 10-credit unit need not be double the assessment for a five-credit unit).
 - g. consideration should be given to the distribution of assessment tasks across the course with appropriate opportunities for formative assessment.
 - h. consideration should be given to the impact on students of the assessment load at different points in the year.
 - i. the impact of failure, and the opportunities for reassessment, especially for units with a high credit value, should be taken into consideration.
 - j. assessment methods should be efficient and excessive amounts of summative assessment or bottlenecks in the timing of assessments should be avoided.
 - k. the amount of summative assessment by means of group work should be proportionate to the aims and learning outcomes of the course (see 6.7-6.10)
 - l. 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 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

³ 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.

appropriate as part of the Annual Monitoring of Units (see [QA51](#)). For units of more than ten credits, or in the case of synoptic assessment which integrates several 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).

Good Practice – examples of formative assessment and feedback

- Feedback on assignment plans, assignment drafts (whole class or individual)
- 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

End Point Assessment (EPA)

- 5.7 The assessment of the EPA for a degree apprenticeship is in the Assessment Plan for the Apprenticeship Standard. The Assessment Plan contains the assessment methodologies and grading criteria.
- 5.8 For a non-integrated degree apprenticeship, the EPA is delivered by an independent third-party End Point Assessment Organisation (EPAO). For an integrated apprenticeship, the University is responsible for delivering EPA.
- 5.9 The Office for Students (OfS) is the body responsible for external quality assurance (EQA) for EPA for integrated standards.
- 5.10 Where the University is responsible for delivering EPA for an integrated apprenticeship, the requirements for the delivery of EPA set out in the OfS EQA Guidance must be followed at all times.

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 several units.
- 6.3 The volume and timing of assessment should support student learning and take the following elements into consideration:
- a. a balance of formative and summative assessment across the course
 - b. a spread of assignments and examinations across the course such that students are not overloaded.
 - c. for units of more than ten credits, or where synoptic assessment spans several units, normally having more than one point of assessment (one of which might be formative only) in the unit.

- 6.4 For this statement, the term 'coursework' includes all assessment tasks which are not formal examinations. The conduct of all examinations is set out in [Rule 2 – Conduct of Examinations](#) and communicated in advance of the examination period.
- 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.

Group assessment

- 6.7 The University is committed to the inclusion, where appropriate, of group work on its courses to support the development of team-working and other transferable skills. Group work and its assessment should be designed in accordance with the University's principles for assessment for learning and course design. Approaches should:
- a. Be proportionate, aligned to course and unit intended learning outcomes, and with consideration of the overall impact on students.
 - b. Be strategic with a clear rationale; a course-wide approach should ensure that there are appropriate opportunities to develop the skills for group working throughout the course.
 - c. Promote learning and application of knowledge and skills, assessing the process of group work and the final product (as appropriate).
 - d. Promote academic integrity (particularly the 'boundary between co-operation and collusion' should be made clear to students).
 - e. Be designed to accommodate assessment-related practices that relate to an individual student, e.g., IMCs, academic integrity, extensions, and supplementary assessment.
 - f. Be inclusive and ensure that all group members have an opportunity to contribute to the group work process and product.
 - g. Ensure that individual students can demonstrate that they meet the ILOs of the unit and the course and that their performance is differentiated.
 - h. Be in accordance with the University's Dignity and Respect Policy.
- 6.8 For all course approvals, or Curriculum Transformed course amendments, from 2023/24 onwards, course designers must take account of the approaches in 6.7 and provide:
- a. A narrative on their approach to the assessment of group work in their course assessment strategy that includes: a rationale for the approach; an indication of the overall impact of group assessment on the course, and how it relates to the ILOs; and assurances that students are able to meet unit and course ILOs and that individual performance is appropriately differentiated.
 - b. Evidence of the timing and volume of group assessments in their assessment map.
- 6.9 For non-CT course amendments from 2023/24, points in 6.7 and 6.8 should be taken into consideration in the design, and approval, of group work assessment.

- 6.10 This policy applies to assessments where:
- A group of 2 or more students are assessed by a single, jointly produced assignment (whether this is a product or process); and
 - Students are set individual assignments that evidence learning derived from group work and where the quality of the assignment is impacted by the effectiveness of the group work.

Moderation

- 6.11 All summative examination papers and summative coursework tasks should be moderated internally.
- 6.12 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 contribution⁴ 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 \(Taught Provision\)](#)).

Information to students

- 6.13 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.
- 6.14 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 section 10 below)
 - any specific requirements of professional, regulatory or statutory bodies
 - for student apprentices, the requirements of the EPA as set in the End Point Assessment (EPA) Assessment Plan
 - any special presentation or referencing preferences/requirements.
 - the date and time 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 (e.g., open-book) or other specific requirements.
 - whether the work is to be submitted anonymously.
- 6.15 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

⁴ 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

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 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.

- 6.16 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. Submission deadlines

- 7.1 Coursework submission dates and time deadlines should be set by Unit Convenors in consultation with relevant Directors of Studies and after considering, so far as is reasonably practicable, the following:
- a. submission dates should be at appropriate points, considering the organisation and delivery of the curriculum, and the desirability of providing students with an opportunity to reflect on their learning.
 - b. avoiding clashes and excessive assessment burdens for students and staff
 - c. ensuring that those involved in marking student work have enough time to complete it satisfactorily considering the date at which the results are required, either by the student or the institution
 - d. 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.
- 7.3 Exam submission deadlines are set according to the examination schedule. For remote, uninvigilated remote online examinations the University has in place a late exam submission process, set out in paragraph 9.

8. Extensions for coursework

- 8.1 Academic Registry will publish guidance agreed by Education, Quality and Standards Committee (EQSC), on acceptable reasons for an extension and the type of evidence required to support each request.
- 8.2 The Department/Faculty/School will communicate its procedure and expectations for extensions to students. These procedures and expectations will apply on a unit basis. Departments/Faculty/School can set the length of extensions (including maximum lengths), the process by which students apply and the types of assessment that can have an extension.

- 8.3 Students can request an extension to a deadline using the procedure published by the Department/Faculty/School.
- 8.4 Students must submit an extension request prior to the original submission deadline, otherwise late penalties and non-submission penalties will apply (refer to section 9 for further details).
- 8.5 Departments will notify students in advance where extensions will not normally be permitted for a specific coursework assessment. This will normally be agreed by the Faculty/School, in terms of types of assessment where this would apply.
- 8.6 If an extension isn't suitable for the individual students' circumstances or the type of assessment, the Individual Mitigating Circumstances (IMC) procedures will apply, or an individual scheme of study may be appropriate.
- 8.7 Extension durations will consider the student's circumstances and the nature of the assessment, paying particular attention to whether the deadline for that assessment task can be extended to a date beyond the return of coursework to the rest of the cohort.
- 8.8 If required, the Associate Dean (Education) (in consultation with the Director of Studies/Director of Teaching) will take a decision on suitable maximum length of extension from the original submission date. After which point IMC procedures will apply or an individual scheme of study may be appropriate.

9. Penalties for late or non-submission of coursework and un-invigilated, remote online examinations

Coursework

- 9.1 The deadline for an assessment is as communicated.
- 9.2 Only the following penalties for the late or non-submission of coursework are possible:
 - a) Coursework submitted up to five working days after the deadline will normally receive the relevant pass mark and a grade of L (late submission).
 - b) Coursework that is submitted more than five working days after the deadline will normally receive a mark of zero and a grade of LL (late submission).
 - c) Non-submission of coursework will receive a mark of zero and a grade of NS (non-submission).

Un-invigilated, remote online examinations

- 9.3 Extensions are not permitted for an exam. Late submission of an exam attempt is permitted for un-invigilated remote and online exams sat using the University's Assessment Platform (Inspera).
- 9.4 A late exam attempt may only be submitted in Inspera up to 29 minutes and 59 seconds after the exam deadline. It will be accepted and marked, and the student does not need to provide a reason for submitting their attempt after the exam deadline.

- 9.5 If an attempt is submitted after the final deadline and before the end of late submission time, a penalty will be applied. The application of a penalty is calculated using the submission time recorded in Inspira and the pre-BEU mark, as follows:

Time submitted after final deadline...	Penalty	Note
1 second to 4 mins, 59 seconds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5% reduction of original mark. • Marked with a grade of late against assessment. 	A % penalty will not take an originally passing mark below the pass mark.
5 minutes to 9 minutes, 59 seconds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% reduction of original mark. • Marked with a grade of late against assessment. 	A % penalty will not be applied to an originally failing mark but will still be marked as late.
10 minutes to 29 minutes, 59 seconds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark capped at no higher than a pass. • Marked with a grade of late against assessment. 	
30 minutes or later	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempt not accepted and to be considered a non-submission. • Attempt recorded as ONS. 	This is not a penalty so cannot be reviewed as part of the process set out in this document.

- 9.6 A table outlining how this penalty will be applied is set out in Appendix 1.
- 9.7 If an attempt is not submitted by the end of late submission time the student will receive a mark of zero and a grade of NS (non-submission). It will not be possible for a student to request that an attempt be accepted beyond this point.
- 9.8 Exams attempts will only be accepted and marked if submitted in Inspira before the end of late submission time (i.e., formally submitted by pressing 'Submit now'). Any attempt or files not submitted by this point will not be accepted or marked.
- 9.9 Students must review their exam attempt before it is submitted to Inspira. Files cannot be replaced or appended once an attempt has been formally submitted, even if late submission time has not ended. This includes where:
- a student has uploaded an incorrect exam attempt file or answer to a question,
 - a file has been uploaded in an incorrect format not specified on the Exam Instruction Sheet
 - a file did not fully upload, or was not uploaded by the student,
 - a file cannot be opened by the marked because it is corrupt or similarly affected.
- 9.10 A student may request a late submission penalty review ("penalty review") if they have evidence of a valid and extraordinary technical failure that could not reasonably have been anticipated that accounts for the late submission of the attempt. A valid and extraordinary technical failure is one of the following circumstances:
- Loss of internet/Wi-Fi connection, where no alternative was available,
 - Unexpected power outage,
 - Equipment failure,
 - File upload failing (where not due to poor time management).

- 9.11 More detailed guidance, examples of extraordinary technical failure and evidence will be published on the University's website in advance of each assessment period.
- 9.12 A request for a penalty review will be considered where all three of the following criteria are met:
- a. A valid and extraordinary technical failure occurred either:
 - Within file preparation and upload time (where the exam required file upload), or
 - At the point of submission - i.e., when 'submit now' has been pressed (for exams with no file upload answered directly in Inspira).
 - b. The student successfully submitted an attempt to Inspira by the end of late submission time.
 - c. The student provides date and time stamped evidence that shows the issue occurred within the appropriate time period.
- 9.13 If the student cannot meet these criteria, then the student is not eligible to request a penalty be removed and a penalty review will be rejected.
- 9.14 The decision whether to remove a penalty will be made by a panel of all Associate Deans (Education) or a nominated delegate, with relevant expert representation from Professional Services as appropriate. Academic Registry is responsible for the logistical operation of this process, and the panel will make final decisions.
- 9.15 The process and timings to request a penalty review will be agreed by the panel and published to the University's website by Academic Registry before each formal assessment period. The student will be told the outcome of their penalty review within 7 working days of the end of the assessment period.
- 9.16 The decision of the panel regarding whether to maintain or remove a penalty is final and the process is then completed.

10. Word counts

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 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.
- 10.3 Where a policy on penalising non-compliance with word limits and word ranges is not stated in accordance with 10.2 then the following 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.

10.4 Word count penalty policies should be consistently applied as stated.

11. Marking and moderation

Marking criteria and grade descriptors

- 11.1 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.
- 11.2 Assessment should be marked against its specific marking criteria, any model answers/marking 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.
- 11.3 EPA assessment will be marked according to the grading criteria in the EPA Assessment Plan.

Anonymity

- 11.4 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 Courses, 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.
- 11.5 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.
- 11.6 Coursework is 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 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.

- 11.7 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.
- 11.8 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 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.
- 11.9 Students will 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

- 11.10 Orals/presentations which make a significant contribution⁵ 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

- 11.11 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

- 11.12 All final projects/dissertations that make a significant contribution to the final classification should be blind double marked.
- 11.13 Each marker should make a record of all mark(s) awarded, together with written comments indicating their rationale for awarding marks.
- 11.14 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.
- 11.15 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:

⁵ 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

- 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 based on 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.

11.16 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.

11.17 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.

Moderation of marking

11.18 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.

11.19 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.

11.20 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.

11.21 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.

11.22 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.

11.23 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

- 11.24 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.
- 11.25 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 set out in the Feedback section 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.
- 11.26 Such commentary will be written with reference to the assessment criteria, marking scheme or model answer.

FEEDBACK

12. Feedback on Summative Assessments

Feedback Policies

- 12.1 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 12.5 – 12.9 below. Departments/ The School/LPO are advised to take account of the breadth of units in their courses, especially where they include units from other Departments or courses, in order to ensure appropriateness for learning.
- 12.2 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.
- 12.3 Feedback policies will be included in course handbooks. Specific guidance should be given to Continuing Professional Development students who may take units separately and therefore not have access to course level information.
- 12.4 Department/School Learning, Teaching & Quality Committees should review their Feedback Policies periodically. If 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 the Courses and Partnerships Approval Committee (CPAC) only.

Individual Feedback on Summative Assignments

- 12.5 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 Director(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.

- 12.6 Feedback should ensure that the student understands how best to improve their 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 course and that these are clearly communicated to students.
- 12.7 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. 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.
- 12.8 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.
- 12.9 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.
- 12.10 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.
- 12.11 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 course, change of mode of study, progression to an undergraduate Masters course 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).
- 12.12 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

12.13 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 unit marks will be released to students. These will have been determined by the Board of Examiners for Units.
- For degree apprenticeships, Boards of Examiners and Boards of Studies must take place in time for Student Apprentices to re-sit or re-take an assessment, where needed, within the EPA period set out in the EPA Assessment Plan.

12.14 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

12.15 Transcripts 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.

12.16 Academic Registry provides all graduating students with a physical 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.

12.17 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.

12.18 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.

12.19 Further information and [guidance](#) on Transcripts and Records of Assessment is available.

13. Boards of Examiners

13.1 Arrangements for the conduct of Boards of Examiners for Units and Courses are described in [QA35 Assessment Procedures for Taught Courses of Study](#).

14. Monitoring and evaluation of assessment and feedback practice

- 14.1 The monitoring and evaluation of assessment practice arises in a range of ways, including:
- the process for the annual review and enhancement of units and courses (see [QA51](#)).
 - the process of Degree Scheme Review or equivalent (see [QA13](#)).
- 14.2 The evaluation of assessment practice may encompass as appropriate:
- considering the extent to which assessment is effective in measuring student achievement of course/unit learning outcomes
 - checking that assessment is responsive to external developments, including professional, regulatory, or statutory bodies requirements,
 - checking the extent to which the End Point Assessment for an apprenticeship course is robust, fair and a high-quality, independent End Point Assessment for all Student Apprentices (see Appendix 2 Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy)
 - 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.

Statement Details		
Issue Version:	3.16	
Date:	August 2024	
Antecedents:	<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
	<i>Education, Quality and Standards Committee</i>	12 March 2021 Minute 47 12 October 2021 Minute 150 March 2022 – Minute 276 May 2022 – Chair’s Action November 2022 – delegated to Director of Academic Registry

		Approved by EQSC September 2023 (via correspondence) February 2024, Minute 311 July 2024
Related Documentation:	QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance: Assessment Assessment regulations QA35 Assessment Procedures for Taught Courses of Study University of Bath Strategy	
Author:	Academic Registry	

Appendix 1 – Table of penalties for late submission of an un-invigilated remote Inspira exam

The tables below set out how a penalty will be applied to the mark of an exam attempt submitted late. A summary of this is set out in para. 9.5.

- A % penalty will not take an originally passing mark below the pass mark.
- A % penalty will not be applied to an originally failing mark but will still be graded as late.

Table 1 - Pass mark is 40%

<i>Time submitted</i> Penalty to be applied:	<i>1 second to 4 mins 59 secs late</i> 5% deduction	<i>5 mins to 9 mins 59 secs late</i> 10% deduction	<i>10 mins to 29 mins 59 secs late</i> Capped at pass
100	95	90	40
99	94	89	40
98	93	88	40
97	92	87	40
96	91	86	40
95	90	86	40
94	89	85	40
93	88	84	40
92	87	83	40
91	86	82	40
90	86	81	40
89	85	80	40
88	84	79	40
87	83	78	40
86	82	77	40
85	81	77	40
84	80	76	40
83	79	75	40
82	78	74	40
81	77	73	40
80	76	72	40
79	75	71	40
78	74	70	40
77	73	69	40
76	72	68	40
75	71	68	40
74	70	67	40
73	69	66	40
72	68	65	40
71	67	64	40
70	67	63	40
69	66	62	40
68	65	61	40

<i>Time submitted</i> Penalty to be applied:	<i>1 second to 4 mins 59 secs late</i> 5% deduction	<i>5 mins to 9 mins 59 secs late</i> 10% deduction	<i>10 mins to 29 mins 59 secs late</i> Capped at pass
67	64	60	40
66	63	59	40
65	62	59	40
64	61	58	40
63	60	57	40
62	59	56	40
61	58	55	40
60	57	54	40
59	56	53	40
58	55	52	40
57	54	51	40
56	53	50	40
55	52	50	40
54	51	49	40
53	50	48	40
52	49	47	40
51	48	46	40
50	48	45	40
49	47	44	40
48	46	43	40
47	45	42	40
46	44	41	40
45	43	41	40
44	42	40	40
43	41	40	40
42	40	40	40
41	40	40	40
40	40	40	40
39	39		
38	38		
37	37		
36	36		
35	<i>And so on...</i>		

Table 2 – Pass mark is 50%

<i>Time submitted</i> Penalty to be applied:	<i>1 second to 4 mins 59 secs late</i> 5% deduction	<i>5 mins to 9 mins 59 secs late</i> 10% deduction	<i>10 mins to 29 mins 59 secs late</i> Capped at pass
100	95	90	50
99	94	89	50
98	93	88	50
97	92	87	50
96	91	86	50
95	90	86	50
94	89	85	50
93	88	84	50
92	87	83	50
91	86	82	50
90	86	81	50
89	85	80	50
88	84	79	50
87	83	78	50
86	82	77	50
85	81	77	50
84	80	76	50
83	79	75	50
82	78	74	50
81	77	73	50
80	76	72	50
79	75	71	50
78	74	70	50
77	73	69	50
76	72	68	50
75	71	68	50
74	70	67	50
73	69	66	50
72	68	65	50
71	67	64	50
70	67	63	50
69	66	62	50
68	65	61	50
67	64	60	50
66	63	59	50
65	62	59	50
64	61	58	50
63	60	57	50
62	59	56	50
61	58	55	50
60	57	54	50

<i>Time submitted</i> Penalty to be applied:	<i>1 second to 4 mins 59 secs late</i> 5% deduction	<i>5 mins to 9 mins 59 secs late</i> 10% deduction	<i>10 mins to 29 mins 59 secs late</i> Capped at pass
59	56	53	50
58	55	52	50
57	54	51	50
56	53	50	50
55	52	50	50
54	51	50	50
53	50	50	50
52	50	50	50
51	50	50	50
50	50	50	50
49	<i>And so on...</i>		
48			
47			
46			
45			

Appendix 2 – Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy and Procedure

Purpose

The Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest policy supports the University, as End Point Assessment Organisation (EPAO) for the delivery of End Point Assessment (EPA) for integrated standards, to meet the Office for Students (OfS) external quality assurance requirement to deliver a robust, fair and high-quality, independent End Point Assessment for all Student Apprentices.

The policy sets out how the University will ensure there is no actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest that would compromise the independence of the EPA process.

Scope

This Policy applies to Independent Assessors for EPA, as well as staff, consultants and partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of EPA, where the University is EPAO for integrated standards.

Definitions

A **conflict of interest** for EPA is a situation in which Independent Assessors, or other staff, consultants and partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of EPA, have competing interests or loyalties that could compromise, or appear to compromise, the outcome of an End Point Assessment if not appropriately managed.

End Point Assessment (EPA) is an independent assessment of an apprentice's Knowledge, Skills and Behaviours (KSBs) set out in the relevant, approved Apprenticeship Standard at the end of their apprenticeship.

Integrated standards are approved Apprenticeship Standards in which the EPA is incorporated into the main learning aim (usually a degree or other higher education qualification) and the Training Provider is responsible for delivery of both on-programme training and assessment and EPA.

Roles and responsibilities

The University is ultimately responsible for any conflict of interest that may arise in its role as EPAO for EPA for integrated standards.

Education, Quality and Standards Committee (EQSC) approves this policy and makes changes to it on delegated authority from Senate. EQSC reviews this policy on a cyclical basis.

The Degree Apprenticeships Quality and Standards Group is responsible for reporting conflicts of interest to EQSC on an annual basis.

Academic Registry is responsible for the maintenance and dissemination of the Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy.

Associate Deans for Education (ADEs) within the University's Faculties / School delivering integrated apprenticeships are responsible for:

- communicating the Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy to all individuals within their areas of responsibility.
- giving appropriate attention to reports of actual, perceived or potential conflicts of interest

- disclosing any conflicts of interest to the Chair of the Degree Apprenticeship Quality and Standards Group (DAQSG).

The Head of the EPAO is responsible for:

- reviewing Apprenticeship EPA Conflict of Interest risks and setting out the actions required to avoid potential conflicts of interest in their EPA plan
- ensuring that all Independent Assessors and any staff, consultants and partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of EPA have read the policy and are clear on the impact of the policy on their roles prior to EPA
- managing actions and reporting actual, perceived or potential conflicts of interest and actions taken, including issues that cannot be resolved at this level, to the ADE in their Faculty
- ensuring that reports of actual, perceived or potential conflicts of interests and actions taken are appropriately documented.

Independent Assessors and any staff, consultants and partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of EPA are responsible for:

- ensuring that they are familiar with the Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy
- completing any required conflict of interest declaration when asked to do so by the University
- disclosing any activity where there may be a conflict of interest to the Head of the EPAO prior the start of EPA using the Declaration of Interest Form (Annex A)
- notifying the Head of the EPAO where a conflict of interest may arise that has not previously been disclosed using the Declaration of Interest Form (Annex A).

Principles

Central to this policy is the need to ensure there is a clear separation between the delivery of on-programme training and assessment and EPA.

To ensure the delivery of an independent EPA, Independent Assessors must not:

- have any personal, professional or business connections with the apprentices undertaking EPA
- be involved in the delivery of on-programme training and assessment to an apprentice or group of apprentices undertaking the EPA
- have line management responsibility for any apprentices undertaking the EPA
- undertake any on-programme progress reviews for apprentices undertaking EPA.

A conflict of interest may arise (but is not limited to) where the Independent Assessor:

- is employed by the same organisation as the apprentice(s)
- has been involved in training, managing, mentoring or the employment of the apprentice
- has a link to the apprentice or the apprentice's employer (such as via friends or relatives)
- is working for an organisation in direct competition with the apprentice's employer
- has a position of authority within one organisation that conflicts with their interests in another organisation
- is engaged in a current financial or personal relationship with any individual who is involved in the delivery of the apprenticeship
- stands to derive personal or business gain from the outcome of the assessment, including through the acceptance of incentives or inducements
- is a member of a governing body linked to the apprenticeship, or a member of a professional or employer-led body that supports external quality assurance.

The Independent Assessor(s) and any staff, consultants and partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of the EPA must not have any involvement in the creation or distribution of

assessment resources or services used during the EPA or any other activity that could compromise the independence of the EPA.

An Independent Assessor or staff, consultants and partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of EPA may wish to raise concerns in confidence and they are entitled to receive a response to their concerns. Individuals are protected under the University's Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblowing) Policy: [Public Interest Disclosure \(Whistleblowing\) Policy \(bath.ac.uk\)](https://www.bath.ac.uk/policies/public-interest-disclosure-whistleblowing-policy/)

Procedure

Contractual arrangements with staff members or external consultants and partner organisations delivering, taking part in, or supporting the delivery of EPA must clearly set out the obligation to complete a Declaration of Interest (DoI) form (Annex A) when asked to do so by the University, or where conflicts of interest may arise from other activities that they undertake.

Where an actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest is identified, the University must follow whatever action is required to protect the objectivity and integrity of the EPA and may:

- assign an alternative Independent Assessor to deliver the EPA
- enhance the monitoring of an Independent Assessor delivering EPA
- replace staff members, external consultants or partner organisations taking part in or supporting the delivery of EPA.

Failure to seek approval for and/or disclose complete and accurate information on actual, perceived or potential conflict of interests, or to appropriately manage a conflict of interest may:

- **For staff:** constitute misconduct and result in disciplinary action being taken by the University in accordance with the University's Disciplinary Procedure for staff.
- **For non-staff:** result in the termination of their engagement with the University in accordance with the contractual terms of conditions for any individuals or organisations participating in EPA delivery who are not employees of the University.

Record keeping and retention

Declaration of Interest forms must be stored in the Faculty/School and be made available for internal and external audit purposes.

All records in relation to conflicts of interest will be held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018. Personal data will be processed in line with the University [Data Protection Policy](#), and retained in accordance with the [University Records and Retention Schedule](#) for either staff or external engagements.

Monitoring and review

All Faculties/School are required to review their EPA processes annually to ensure that all actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest are managed and resolved as part of the University's internal quality assurance (IQA) for EPA.

The annual review should incorporate analysis of any cases of conflict of interest, breaches of the Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest policy, and a record of the actions taken in response and reported as part of the annual monitoring report to DAQSG.

This will be reviewed by DAQSG, with onward reporting to EQSC and to Senate for noting.

This Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy is subject to approval by EQSC, HR and the Joint University Consultation & Negotiation Committee (JUCNC).

The Apprenticeship End Point Assessment Conflict of Interest Policy should be read in conjunction the following policies:

- [Student Complaints Policy](#)
- [Employer Complaints Policy](#)

Document control information:

Author:	Academic Registry
Version number:	1.0
Approval date:	02 July 2024
Approved by:	EQSC
Contact	Degree Apprenticeships Compliance Manager
Date of next review:	July 2025