Policies on Submission of Assessed Work, Feedback on and Return of Assessed Work

Core Requirements Checklist

NOTE: The Checklist of Core Requirements, approved by Senate in June 2012, is an integrated summary of the three policies on the Submission of Assessed Work, Feedback on and Return of Assessed Work. It defines and explains the core set of steps that all Academic Units are expected to have in place.

1. As established in the Newcastle University Student Charter, academic units must set specific and firm deadlines, naming the date and time of submission, for all summative coursework assessments.

2. All deadlines must be clearly communicated to staff and students within or before the second week of teaching each academic term/semester. Academic units must maintain internal evidence of deadline dates and the means by which staff and students are notified of them.

3. Academic units must have reliable and consistent procedures in place to record the date and time of the submission of assessed work and to provide evidence of submission times/dates if and when requested.

4. Requests for extensions must be managed through the University Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC) Application [Appendix 1] and not through module leader discretion, so as to encourage uniformity and equitability within Schools/Institutes and across the University. Academic units must have consistent and transparent arrangements in place for the submission and management of PEC extension requests, and students must be informed of the application procedure well in advance of any submission deadlines. Academic units must keep a central record of all PEC applications received and extensions granted for annual review by Boards of Studies.

5. The normal maximum allowable extension is two weeks for all full-time undergraduate and taught postgraduate students, with proportionate allowance for part-time taught students. The length of extension granted will vary according to individual circumstances as evidenced by a PEC application.

6. Academic units must record any summative assessment submitted after the published deadline as late (unless an extension has been granted or alternative procedures have been set and announced for that particular assessment). University-wide penalties must be applied to late submissions, including that work submitted late after an agreed upon extension. For those assessments marked according to the University marking scale, late work submitted within 7 calendar days after the deadline must be given a maximum mark of 40% for undergraduate modules and of 50% for postgraduate modules; work submitted after 7 calendar days must be given a mark of zero.

If the piece of work is marked on a non-discriminatory marking scale or given a categorical grade (i.e., pass/fail or merit/pass/fail), then work submitted past the set deadline will receive a mark of zero. If a student fails to submit a re-sit assessment by the established deadline, academic units must record the mark as zero.

7. Staff recognise the importance of providing good quality feedback on assessments in a timely manner. In some cases this may take time if a moderator is involved, but we still commit to providing feedback to students early enough to influence the next assessment task. All feedback on coursework must be returned to students within 20 working days (i.e. normally four weeks) of the submission date, including non-term/semester periods but excluding closure periods and Bank Holidays.
8. We are committed to providing quality feedback on examinations. Feedback and provisional marks on examinations must be returned to students within 20 working days (i.e. normally four weeks) from the end of the exam period. When this date falls within the summer holiday, then exam feedback must be provided by the start of the next semester/term. In the latter case, if whole-class feedback is not provided until the start of the next semester/term, then feedback must be provided to those students who are re-sitting exams at least 4 weeks before their re-sits so as to inform their preparation.

9. Academic units should devise procedures to release provisional marks awarded on any summative assessment to students as soon as they are available and within the stated turnaround deadline. Provisional marks should be disclosed to students, whenever practicable, as an integer on the appropriate University common mark scale.

10. Academic units must maintain student confidentiality in the disclosure of marks, regardless of whether marks are distributed electronically (e.g. Blackboard, NESS, email) or physically (e.g. on scripts or mark sheets, posted in a central location according to student numbers).

11. Academic units must retain any summative examination scripts and coursework submissions that contribute 30% or more of a final module mark for a period of one year after the award of the degree or qualification, for quality assurance purposes and in case of any appeals.

12. Boards of Studies are responsible for reviewing records of submission and feedback turnaround to monitor the consistency and equivalency of practice. Heads of Schools will monitor and log the implementation and maintenance of key requirements, with Faculty-level discussion of this evidence to be considered at FLTSECs and at FEB meetings at minimum once per semester/term. A scorecard recording and commenting upon Faculty-level evidence will be submitted to EB for review.

13. Internal and external review processes will ensure that academic units have developed and are maintaining policies and practices that incorporate all applicable core requirements. Annual Monitoring and Review (AMR) processes will examine the internal evidence listed above, and Learning and Teaching Reviews (LTRs) will include random module checks to ensure implementation of the core requirements at the level of individual modules.

**Submission of Assessed Work Policy**

**14. Purpose and Objectives**

This policy has three specific objectives:

a. To provide a framework designed to ensure consistent and equitable arrangements for the submission, recording and confirmed receipt of summative assessment.

b. To ensure that students and staff have a clear recognition of the importance of assessment deadlines, while also making sure that students and staff are aware of the methods by which extensions can be granted.

c. To provide clear guidance on how academic units should handle the recording and marking of late submissions.

**Scope**

15. This policy applies to all summative coursework that contributes to undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes of study, to include the following assessment components: essay, report, practical/lab report, poster, case study, design or creative project, computer assessment, dissertation, research proposal, research paper, portfolio, reflective log, problem solving exercise, written exercise and professional skills assessment. It
does not apply to any written or practical examinations, with the one potential exception of an oral presentation; if any visual aids are submitted and assessed as a separately marked aspect of an oral presentation, this policy does apply to those submitted aspects only. This policy does not apply to formative assessments. This policy applies equally to coursework submitted for block- and linear-taught courses/modules and to submissions by full-time, part-time and distance learners. Exemptions from the core requirements established by this policy may only be granted by the relevant Dean.

Responsibilities

16. Academic units are responsible for devising, maintaining and reporting on the local implementation of this policy. All arrangements and practices relating to the submission of work must incorporate the core requirements set out below. Procedures for monitoring the appropriateness of these policies will be established in a later section.

Core Requirements

Submission Procedures

17. Academic units must set specific and firm deadlines, naming the date and time of submission, for all summative coursework assessments. These deadlines can be closing dates or specified hand-in dates; it is possible that early submissions would be allowed in the case of the former. Where an academic unit requires students to submit work in both hard copy and electronic format, the normal expectation would be that both versions would be submitted before the deadline. However, units may use discretion in determining whether one or both versions must be submitted by the deadline to be considered “on time.” The versions submitted in hard copy and electronic format should be identical; if they are not, units should use discretion in determining which version is most reflective of the student’s work in advance of the deadline. In all cases, units should take care to develop practice that will ensure that students are treated equitably and that no student is given undue advantage.

18. The schedule of deadlines and examination dates/times should be coordinated by the School/Institute Office or Degree Programme Director before the start of the academic year to prevent conflicts or congestion in the office. Submission deadlines should not be set for closure days or Bank Holidays, and units are discouraged from setting deadlines during student holiday periods. It is acceptable to the University to have submission deadlines during the assessment period, although individual Faculties and units may decide that such deadlines will not be permitted. All deadlines should take into account University policy on feedback turnaround times. It is recommended that Schools/programmes have standardised submission times when possible (e.g. 12 p.m. on Wednesdays) to prevent confusion, and times of submission should be set prior to the close of the working day to allow for unexpected closures as well as for the prompt recording of submissions. Specified times of submission should adhere to the University time zone and provide guidance for distance learners if appropriate.

19. All deadlines must be clearly communicated to staff and students within or before the second week of teaching each academic term/semester. A central schedule or calendar should be held in the School/Institute Office and made available to academic and administrative staff. In addition, it is good practice to inform students of the dates by which assessment guidelines and instructions will be set and of the deadlines for the return of feedback.

20. Details of the submission of assessed work policy’s core requirements should be published in degree programme handbooks, and specific assessment deadlines published on an appropriate VLE as part of the threshold standard (and in module guides if they are used). Academic units should ensure that students from other schools or
faculties, but registered for their modules (as Combined Honours or Joint Honours students, or as optional modules), are made explicitly aware of the School/Institute arrangements for submission and late submission of assessed work.

21. Academic units must have reliable and consistent procedures in place to record the date and time of the submission of assessed work and to provide evidence of submission times/dates if and when requested. The date and time of physical submissions to the School/Institute office or to module leaders should be recorded (e.g. a supervised sign-in sheet, time-stamped cover sheets); email and electronic submissions (e.g. Blackboard, Turnitin, NESS) should be set to contain a date/time stamp that can be recorded. Schools/Institutes must set procedures for providing evidence of submission time/date, which might include the following possible options: physical receipts issued to students by the School/Institute office, email or electronic receipts issued by a VLE or Turnitin, or a centralised database listing received submissions.

22. School/Institute offices and/or module leaders should check submissions of assessed work against a central list of students expected to submit work at that given date/time. A list of late or non-submissions should be compiled and the names of those students not submitting or submitting late on a regular basis passed on to stage co-ordinators for monitoring purposes. Students’ personal tutors should also be informed.

23. Submission procedures should, whenever possible, facilitate anonymous marking. Physical submissions should include student numbers alongside or in place of personal names, and academic units should take care to preserve or secure anonymity when circulating assessments to markers (e.g. removing or obscuring student names). When possible, provisions should be made on VLEs to ensure that markers can view electronic submissions only by candidate number rather than by student name. It is acknowledged that anonymity may be difficult to maintain for some types of assessment (e.g. dissertations, professional skills assessments) and when cohort sizes are small.

**Extension Requests**

24. Requests for extensions must be managed through the University Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC) Application [Appendix 1] and not through module leader discretion, so as to encourage uniformity and equitability across Schools/Institutes and across the University. Academic units must have consistent and transparent arrangements in place for the submission and management of PEC extension requests, and students must be informed of the application procedure well in advance of any submission deadlines. It is recommended that this information be drawn to students’ attention at the beginning of each module and reinforced when assignment details are circulated. If a student is registered for a module outside his or her home School, PEC decision rights are vested in the home School and not in the School that owns the module. It is good practice for the home School to consult with the module-owning School with regard to the granting of extensions as the former may not be aware of specific module requirements (e.g. placement considerations).

25. The normal maximum allowable extension is two weeks for all full-time undergraduate and taught postgraduate students, with proportionate allowance for part-time taught students. The length of extension granted will vary according to individual circumstances as evidenced by a PEC application. PEC Committees are authorised to approve extensions within—and in exceptional circumstances, beyond—these guidelines. A revised submission date can fall within closure or holiday periods, as long as alternative arrangements are in place to secure recording of submission.

26. Provided that academic units meet the two key aims of being equitable to all students and clearly communicating necessary information to them, it is possible to have some assessments that do not allow for late
submission (e.g. assessments undertaken through the regular submission of a large number of small assignments such as lab reports or reflective logs). Exemptions from the University’s core requirements relating to the late submission of work must be sought from the relevant Faculty Dean. In such cases, staff should make a particular effort to inform students of guidelines for the given assessment well in advance of the deadline.

27. Academic units must keep a central record of all PEC applications received and extensions granted; Boards of Studies are responsible for reviewing these records annually to monitor consistency and develop effective practice.

Late Submissions:

28. Academic units must record any summative assessment submitted after the published deadline as late (unless an extension has been granted or alternative procedures have been set and announced for that particular assessment). No flexibility is allowed on either the date or time of submission, and deadlines must be regarded as firm to ensure consistency and fairness. Distance learners must meet the date and time of the submission deadline in line with UK time and not in their local time zone. Academic units must not reject late submissions entirely, but rather ensure that they are recorded and marked as late. A problem with an individual student’s computer or transport is not considered to be an acceptable excuse for late submission; however, discretion should be used when University systems are at fault (e.g., when NUI confirms a system-wide computer outage).

29. When a student fails to submit a summative assessment prior to the published deadline and without an approved extension, the following policies apply. Note that these policies apply to all summative assessments regardless of whether they constitute all or part of the final mark.
   a. Work submitted within 7 calendar days after the assessment deadline is regarded as late and will, for the assignment in question, be given a maximum of 40% for undergraduate modules and of 50% for taught postgraduate modules.
   b. Work submitted more than 7 calendar days after the assessment deadline will be given a mark of zero.
   c. If the piece of work is marked on a non-discriminatory marking scale or given a categorical grade (i.e., pass/fail or merit/pass/fail), then work submitted past the set deadline will receive a mark of zero.

30. Group coursework is subject to the policy on late submissions, and any late submissions will receive a capped mark unless a prior extension has been granted. An individual PEC application may make reference to group coursework and may result either in an extension for the entire group or for an individual student’s component of the project. Groups may also, in applicable circumstances, file joint PEC applications.

31. If a student fails to submit work by an agreed upon extension date/time, academic units must record the submission as late. The PEC Committee has authority to extend agreed upon extensions if there are valid reasons presented (see PEC Guidance for Staff for further information). Markers should apply the policies for late submitted work, i.e. a maximum mark of 40% for undergraduate modules and of 50% for taught postgraduate modules for the assessment in question, with a mark of zero given after seven days.

32. If a student fails to submit a re-sit assessment by an established re-sit deadline, without an approved extension, he/she must receive a mark of zero.

33. In marking late submissions, markers are required to note for internal records the mark that would have been achieved had the work been submitted on time as well as the capped mark. In the vast majority of cases, it is unlikely that a Board of Examiners would routinely take uncapped marks into account as late submissions.
should, in fairness to other students, be penalised; however, when a candidate is borderline, the BoE may wish to take into account the ability evidenced by the uncapped mark. This evidence would be one of a number of factors that the Board may consider to support the award of a higher classification. Feedback to students should be given in the usual way, in accordance with University policy, and should include reference to the level of mark that would have been achieved had the submission been on time. In the case of submissions that are more than seven days late and receive a mark of zero, Schools/Institutes should exercise discretion as to the amount and type of feedback given.

**Monitoring**

34. Academic units must maintain internal evidence of deadline dates and the means by which staff and students are notified of them as well as of the times/dates of submissions (including late submissions), as stated above. Boards of Studies are responsible for reviewing these records annually to monitor the consistency and equitability of practice. Heads of Schools will monitor and log the implementation and maintenance of key requirements, with Faculty-level discussion of this evidence to be considered at FLTSECs and at FEB meetings at minimum once per semester/term. A scorecard recording and commenting upon Faculty-level evidence will be submitted to EB for review.

35. Internal and external review processes will ensure that academic units have developed and are maintaining policies and practices that incorporate all applicable core requirements. Annual Monitoring and Review (AMR) processes will examine the internal evidence listed above, and Learning and Teaching Reviews (LTRs) will include random module checks to ensure implementation of the core requirements at the level of individual modules. External examiners will assess the handling of late submissions and examine module evaluations to test adherence to core requirements as well as equitability of practice.
Appendix 1
PEC Applications for Extensions

1. All applications for extensions must be submitted in accordance with the University’s Personal Extenuating Circumstances policy and guidance. Students should submit PEC applications to their home School (that is, the School that owns the programme) regardless of which School offers the module.

2. The following notes outline the responsibilities involved in PEC extension applications:

Students

3. Completion and submission of PEC application as soon as possible and in advance of deadline (if application is not based on an emergency absence or extension).
4. Compilation of evidence to prove legitimate circumstances for extension request. Self-certification may be sufficient for a short extension but not for longer extensions.
5. Provision of evidence of grounds for a late PEC application (if applicable).

Academic Units

6. Publication of consistent and transparent arrangements for the submission and management of PEC extension requests.
7. Maintenance of a central record of PEC applications and extensions granted.
8. Contacting the student, degree programme director and module leader to let them know the outcome of PEC extension requests.
9. Establishing alternative arrangements, if necessary, for the submission and recording of approved late submissions.
10. Communicating with the academic unit that owns the module, if necessary.

PEC Committees (or designees)

11. Review of student PEC extension applications and determination of appropriate outcomes.
12. Acceptance of late or retrospective PEC applications in the case of emergency circumstances.

Boards of Studies

13. Annual review of extension requests received and granted to monitor consistency and equitability.

Policy on Feedback on Assessed Work

Purpose and Objectives

14. To facilitate effective feedback practice across the University as informed by the Principles of Assessment and Feedback and the Newcastle University Student Charter.
15. To ensure that staff and students have a clear understanding of University policies on required feedback turnaround times, minimum feedback standards and the monitoring of feedback.
Scope

16. This policy applies to feedback provided on any formative or summative assessment that contributes to an undergraduate or postgraduate taught programme of study. Feedback is understood to include all evidenced verbal, electronic, and written commentary provided both to individuals and to groups of students. This policy applies equally to feedback on examinations and on coursework; to feedback provided to full-time, part-time and distance learners; and to feedback issued in block- and linear-taught courses/modules. For the purposes of this policy, oral presentations should be treated as coursework and not as examinations (as specified in the KIS assessment categories). Exemptions from the core requirements established by this policy may only be granted by the relevant Dean.

Responsibilities

17. Academic units are responsible for maintaining and publicising to students a clear statement on the delivery of feedback, to cover the following points: the various ways in which students will receive feedback on their assessed work, the schedule for the return of feedback on assorted types of assessments, and guidance on how students should make effective use of feedback. This statement should be incorporated into programme handbooks, posted on a VLE as part of the VLE threshold standard and made explicitly known to any students from other schools or faculties, but registered for their modules (as Combined Honours or Joint Honours students, or as optional modules). All policies on feedback must be in complete accordance with the core requirements listed below.

Core Requirements

18. Feedback must be provided to students for all assessments, summative and formative, including written and practical examinations. Feedback should be appropriate to the type of assessment and should explicitly address the assessment criteria, both to justify the mark awarded and to demonstrate what improvements would enable better performance on future assessment tasks. When whole-class (generic) feedback is provided, students must be made aware of the opportunity to receive individual feedback on request.

19. In the case of regular formative assessments (e.g. lab reports or case studies), it is acceptable if feedback is provided only on a sample of the work submitted by an individual student. In the case of coursework on which a final mark is given only at the conclusion of multiple terms/semesters, feedback should be provided on draft submissions within the turnaround time noted below. In the case of ongoing projects (in which multiple pieces of work are submitted for component marks), feedback should be provided on the component pieces within the stipulated deadline.

20. Academic units must devise and maintain feedback practices that encourage students to become more self-reflective and independent learners. Guidance should be provided in programme handbooks on what students are expected to do in response to feedback, and academic units are encouraged to provide additional guidance on the use of feedback through induction sessions, e-Portfolio and the tutorial system. It is good practice to emphasise opportunities through which students can seek clarification and further advice on feedback that has been provided.

21. The University recognises the importance of providing good quality feedback on assessments in a timely manner, even while it is acknowledged that feedback may take time if a moderator is involved. Feedback must be received by students early enough to influence the next assessment task, and all feedback on
Coursework must be returned to students within 20 working days (i.e. normally four weeks) of the submission date, including within non-term/semester periods. In the case of official University closures, turnaround deadlines should be extended for the same number of days as the number of closure days. (For example, when the University is officially closed for two working days over Easter weekend, the turnaround deadline would be pushed back two working days to account for the holiday.) Due to the inherent difficulty in issuing physical feedback during non-term/semester periods, it is recommended that course/module leaders plan in advance to provide electronic feedback whenever possible, make concerted efforts to encourage students to make use of any feedback received, and provide methods for students to follow-up on feedback either over the non-term/semester period or at the start of the next academic term/semester.

22. UG and PGT dissertations and final-stage projects constituting 40 or more credits are a special exception to this requirement. As long as students have received timely feedback on drafts or on earlier components of the work, and as long as some feedback is provided on the final submission, then the dissertation/project submission is exempt from the standard turnaround time; no specific exemption from the relevant dean is required in this instance.

23. Academic units should take into account any administrative time needed to process marked assessments and return feedback to students to ensure that the turnaround requirement is met.

24. We are committed to providing quality feedback on examinations. Feedback and provisional marks on examinations must be returned to students within 20 working days (i.e. normally four weeks) from the end of the exam period. When this date falls within the summer holiday, then exam feedback must be provided by the start of the next semester/term. In the latter case, if whole-class feedback is not provided until the start of the next semester/term, then feedback must be provided to those students who are re-sitting exams at least 4 weeks before their re-sits so as to inform their preparation. At minimum, whole-class (generic) feedback must be issued to cohorts within these deadlines, and students must be informed that they have the option to request individual feedback.

25. Academic units are encouraged to return feedback on late submissions at the same time that feedback is provided to the rest of the cohort (i.e. within 20 working days – normally four weeks – of the deadline) to ensure that students consistently use feedback to influence the next assessment task. When this is not possible, academic units must return feedback on late coursework within 20 working days (i.e. normally four weeks) from the actual date of submission. Students who submit work before the deadline should be informed that no feedback will be returned early; academic units should return feedback on any early submissions with the rest of the cohort.

26. If feedback on coursework will, because of unforeseen circumstances, be returned after the 20 working day deadline, students must be notified as soon as possible and informed as to when to expect feedback. If feedback is late only on a small subset of student work for a given assessment (i.e. because one marker has failed to return feedback), academic units should use discretion in deciding whether to delay the return of feedback to all students. As a general rule, if the feedback for more than 10% of students has been delayed, units should delay the return of all feedback to the cohort. If less than 10% of students would be affected, feedback should be returned to the rest of the cohort and explanations provided to the impacted students.

27. Academic units must devise and implement procedures for documenting the date of return of feedback to students for each assessment and, when practicable, for retaining a copy of the feedback in accordance with the University Retention Schedule. Boards of Studies are responsible for viewing these records annually and monitoring adherence to core requirements for equitability and consistency. Heads of Schools should
maintain evidence logs to be discussed at Faculty-level by FLTSECs and FEBs at minimum once per semester/term before being collated and submitted in the form of a Faculty scorecard to EB. Learning and Teaching Reviews (LTRs) and external examiners will also test adherence to core requirements by examining the type and quality of feedback as well as documented feedback turnaround times.

Appendix 2

**Guidance on Feedback on Written and Practical Examinations**

28. Core Requirement #1 specifies that feedback must be provided on all assessments, including written and practical examinations. In the case of large cohorts taking written or PC examinations, however, it is possible to offer primarily group feedback (with individual feedback available to students on request). The following is a list of potential strategies for providing group feedback:
   a. Designated times to provide oral feedback to a cohort, highlighting general strengths and weaknesses as well as strategies for improvement
   b. Personal Capture videos, providing oral feedback to a cohort, posted on a VLE
   c. Written feedback posted on a VLE or otherwise distributed
   d. Information on quintiles, sub-section scores and student performance, provided on request through OLAF for computer examinations (Online Assessment and Feedback)

29. Academic units are required to offer individual feedback on written/PC exams on request. It is also good practice, when appropriate, to offer individual feedback to all interested students. The following is a list of potential strategies for providing individual feedback:
   a. Designated times when module leaders are available to provide feedback in their offices or a suitable room
   b. Designated feedback sheets that can be removed from an examination script and returned to students
   c. Designated times when students may, under the direction of a marker or module leader, see their examination script and any comments written therein.

30. Academic units may choose whether or not they wish to return copies of exam scripts to students. Under the Data Protection Act, units are not obliged to provide students with access either to original exam scripts or to copies of those scripts, although they may do so if they wish. Regardless of whether or not they view exam scripts, students have a legal right to request access to the breakdown of marks and to markers’ comments (including separate comments made by each of multiple markers). It is thus good practice to make all markers’ comments on scripts legible and meaningful to students; this practice will also aid external examiners. Academic units might wish to devise a standard set of markers’ notes and symbols, available to students and to external examiners, both to aid in swift marking and to make such comments legible to students.

31. If students are given the opportunity to view examination scripts, or if copies of exam scripts are returned, it should be explained that the aim is to provide feedback and not to provide an occasion to challenge marks or examiners’ comments. Separate guidance should be provided in programme handbooks on the appeals process.

32. Feedback should be appropriate to the type of assessment and should demonstrate what improvements could be made to enable better performance on future assessment tasks. It is good practice to use a wide
variety of feedback types and to encourage ongoing communication with students about future improvement. The following are potential examples for feedback on non-written/PC examinations:

   a. Oral feedback on presentations and oral examinations to demonstrate potential responses and provide in-kind guidance
   b. Visual and/or physical hands-on feedback on practical examinations, performances and observations of professional practice to provide in-kind guidance and demonstrate suggestions for improvement

Policy on Disclosure of Marks and Return of Assessed Work

Purpose and Objectives

33. To provide a framework designed to ensure consistent and equitable arrangements for the timely and efficient disclosure of marks.
34. To provide clear guidance on how academic units should monitor and manage the return and/or retention of all assessed work, including examination scripts.

Scope

35. This policy applies to any formative or summative assessment that contributes to an undergraduate or postgraduate taught programme of study. This policy applies equally to assessments in block- and linear-taught courses/modules and to assessments by full-time, part-time and distance learners. Exemptions from the core requirements established by this policy may only be granted by the relevant Dean.

Responsibilities

36. Academic units are responsible for maintaining and monitoring the local implementation of this policy. All practices must incorporate the core requirements set out below. Procedures for monitoring the effectiveness and appropriateness of these policies will be established in the final core requirement.

Core Requirements

37. Academic units should devise procedures to release provisional marks awarded on any summative assessment to students as soon as they are available and within the stated turnaround deadline of 20 working days (i.e. normally four weeks). It is good practice to disclose provisional marks at the same time as feedback (e.g. on feedback sheets) to encourage students to value both and to use feedback effectively.

38. If a case of plagiarism is currently being investigated (but has not yet been decided), the unit should not enter a mark for that student but should return marks as usual to the rest of the cohort. At this time, the student under investigation should be informed that the piece of work is under investigation for a possible assessment irregularity and that he/she will be advised when initial investigations have been concluded: either that there is no case to answer or that formal proceedings are to be instigated.

39. If, after provisional marks have already been returned, an internal or external examiner draws attention to the possibility of plagiarism, an investigation may be initiated at that time. In this instance, the original mark should be deleted (i.e. from NESS or other University systems) until the outcome of the assessment irregularity case is known.
40. Academic units must maintain student confidentiality in the disclosure of marks, regardless of whether marks are distributed electronically (e.g. Blackboard, NESS, email) or physically (e.g. on scripts or mark sheets, posted in a central location according to student numbers).

41. Provisional marks on any summative assessment should be disclosed to students, whenever practicable, as an integer on the appropriate University common mark scale. If raw marks do not map onto a common marking scale (e.g. if marks are constructed by totalling a number of different marks for distinct elements of an assessment), markers should calibrate provisional marks before releasing them to students.

42. Students must be informed that provisional marks on summative assessments are subject to review and potential moderation prior to the Boards of Examiners. Information on the disclosure of provisional marks must be published in degree programme handbooks and reiterated when feedback and provisional marks are returned to students.

43. Academic units must retain any summative examination scripts and coursework submissions that contribute 30% or more of a final module mark for a period of one year after the award of the degree or qualification, for quality assurance purposes and in case of any appeals. In the case of coursework, units may choose to retain electronic submissions and/or copies of physical submissions. Copies of feedback and mark sheets should also be retained for internal and external review.

44. Academic units may use discretion in deciding whether or not to return copies of examination scripts to students. Under the Data Protection Act, units are not obliged to provide students with access either to original exam scripts or to copies of those scripts, although they may do so if they wish. Regardless of whether or not they view exam scripts, students have a legal right to request access to the breakdown of marks and to markers’ comments (including separate comments made by each of multiple markers). Academic units are encouraged to be transparent and accountable to students in their handling of examination scripts so as to inspire student confidence in a consistent and equitable practice. See Appendix 1 of the Policy on Feedback on Assessed Work for additional guidance on examinations.

45. Schools/Institutes should retain representative samples of formative coursework from each cohort (e.g. from each year of a three/four year programme) for one year for external quality assessment and audit purposes. Such samples need not be originals, and it is good practice to photocopy or scan not only the assessment itself but also any feedback provided.

46. Internal and external review processes will ensure that academic units have developed and are maintaining policies and practices that incorporate all applicable core requirements. Annual Monitoring and Review (AMR) processes will examine the evidence of disclosure of marks and return of assessed work listed above, and Learning and Teaching Reviews (LTRs) will include random module checks to ensure implementation of the core requirements at the level of individual modules.
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