

PARTNERS Academic Summer School

Formative Assessment Procedure

This procedure applies to all academic subject areas who include a formative assessment for PARTNERS students submitted during and after the PARTNERS Academic Summer School 2026.

Introduction

All subject strands on the 2026 PARTNERS Academic Summer School must include an appropriate formative assessment in their curriculum for students to complete either during or after the PARTNERS Academic Summer School. The completion of all elements of formative assessment set by the academic lead is an essential part of successful completion of the PARTNERS Academic Summer School and the lower PARTNERS offer.

The other requirements are adherence to the code of conduct throughout the summer school, completion of the PASS Evaluation Form and attendance at all compulsory sessions.

Assessment Criteria

The type of formative assessment is at the discretion of the subject strand leader. There can be many variations of this assessment depending on the requirements of the subject area.

It must provide the students with quality written or verbal feedback, giving them the opportunity for reflective learning, highlighting gaps in knowledge and/or skills that can be passed to the individual students as areas for their personal development throughout Stage One of their undergraduate degree.

This has been identified by both staff, students, and the External Advisors as one of the most useful elements of PARTNERS in supporting transition and progression post-entry and the Office for Students are actively encouraging providers to support students in this way.

Procedure for Submission of Assessment

Students should submit their formative assessment by the deadline as directed by their strand leader. Following the assessment deadline, subject strand leaders must:

- Inform the PARTNERS Team of any student who has not submitted the assessment (or any sections of the assessment) by no later than 24 hours after the submission deadline.
- Inform the PARTNERS Team of any student whose assessment falls significantly below the academic requirements of the subject strand.

Late submissions

The normal expectation is that students will hand their work in on time. Any assessment submitted after the published deadline will be marked as late (unless a PEC has been granted).

- Following the deadline, strand leaders/the PARTNERS Team will contact students by phone and email, to make them aware that their assessment (or part of their assessment) has not been received.
- The student will be given the opportunity to submit the assignment up to seven days after the published deadline.
 - Such assignments will be marked as 'Late Submission' and noted on the relevant Board of Assessors documentation.

- Students will be reminded of the importance of submitting assessments on time when the PARTNERS Team communicate their official result and be advised of the penalties set out in the University's Submission of Work policy.
- Students who also have unauthorised absences during the Summer School will not be offered a seven-day extension and will be referred to the Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC) procedure for the PARTNERS Academic Summer School.
- Any formative assessment submitted seven days after the published deadline **will not be accepted**, and students should be directed to the Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC) procedure for the PARTNERS Academic Summer School if relevant.
- For assessments where students are expected to complete their work in a live scenario (e.g. exam, presentation, practical), such instances will be deemed as absence, and the student should be directed to the Personal Extenuating Circumstances (PEC) procedure so provision of alternative assessment can be considered.

Assessments falling significantly below academic requirements

Although the formative work is not formally assessed, students are expected to produce and submit their assessment to a reasonable standard to the best of their ability. For students who have submitted an assessment which is significantly below the academic requirements of the subject strand, the PARTNERS Team will:

- Liaise with the subject strand leader to collect appropriate and detailed feedback for the student on their first assessment and agree a timescale for secondary submission of work. Contact all students to whom this applies by phone and email to pass on this feedback and give the deadline for them to submit their work again.

If any students fail to meet this secondary deadline, they will be contacted one further time by the PARTNERS Team. If there is no response, the PARTNERS Team will liaise with the subject strand leader to ensure that they are comfortable recommending the student fails the Summer School.

Code of Conduct

All attendees sign the PARTNERS Code of Conduct prior to attending the Academic Summer School, this is accessible via ncl.ac.uk/pass.

Academic colleagues are encouraged to document any student breaches of the code of conduct, for example, if a student is consistently absent from live sessions, disengaged or disruptive in sessions, or they have concerns about any aspect of their behaviour. The PARTNERS Team can address this immediately with the student during the summer school and make them aware that if this behaviour continues this will affect their ability to successfully complete the summer school. This remains a compulsory element of the lower conditional offer for PARTNERS students, and without this, their PARTNERS offer will become void. The PARTNERS Team can also work with academic colleagues to develop their own code of conduct for students if they deem it necessary for their subject strand.

Academic Misconduct Procedure

As part of our Code of Conduct, attendees agree to abide by our expectations for the creation and submission of academic work. These academic values are essential to the integrity of an academic community, and attendees are expected to:

- Maintain high standards of academic conduct and honesty
- Familiarise themselves with and apply the guidance provided on good academic practice, including the avoidance of plagiarism and other academic misconduct (for example, the purchasing or inclusion of unacknowledged content)

- Ensure that their submitted work is their own and acknowledge appropriately any use made of the work from other sources (as recommended on the [Academic Skills Kit webpage](#))
- Abide by the [Exam Rules and Guidance](#).

The PARTNERS Team and Academic Strand Leaders are required to investigate any allegation of Academic Misconduct made against an attendee and will take appropriate action where they decide, on the balance of probabilities, that Academic Misconduct has taken place.

There are two levels at which Academic Misconduct decisions may be considered at the PARTNERS Academic Summer School:

- **Level 1: Local Resolution:** Reports of academic misconduct are considered by Academic Strand Leaders and the PARTNERS Manager in the first instance, who will investigate the reported Academic Misconduct and decide on appropriate action.
- **Level 2: Formal Investigation:** Where a Level 1 investigation has taken place and the reported Academic Misconduct is deemed to be more significant, your case may be referred to the PARTNERS Academic Summer School Board of Assessors for a formal investigation to take place. This is likely to be the case if the reported Academic Misconduct is considered to be major, happened in an examination room, where there have been repeated incidents, or where it is felt that you have not engaged with or been honest during the Level 1 investigation.

Where it is determined that, on the balance of probabilities, Academic Misconduct has occurred, the incident will be reviewed in accordance with our Attendee Code of Conduct. Where it is determined that a more serious instance of misconduct has occurred, or where there have been repeated incidents, a Level 2 formal investigation will consider the appropriate sanction. Appendix A details examples of Academic Misconduct, and the likely sanctions to be issued.

Scott Douglass, Student Recruitment Co-ordinator
April 2026

Appendix A – Examples of Academic Misconduct and likely sanctions

Level of Procedure	Academic Misconduct Type	Indicative disciplinary actions/sanctions	Indicative academic sanctions
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor academic practice (for example, not referencing correctly) • Any <u>minor</u> breach of the University Exam Rules, such as: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not following invigilator instructions ○ Being in possession of or using unauthorised calculators/dictionaries ○ Causing disruption during an exam (for example, by leaving a mobile phone switched on) ○ Opening an exam paper or starting to write before the start of an exam ○ Continuing to write after the exam has ended. • Any <u>minor</u> Academic Misconduct reported for submitted coursework, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Allowing another student to copy any assessed coursework (even if it was not the intention that the work be copied) ○ Sharing assessed coursework online via a website or any other medium, other than for a genuine academic reason ○ The falsification of research results (including the suppression of data) 	<p>Advice and Guidance only - Academic Strand Leader writes to attendee reminding them of the importance of good academic conduct</p> <p>Academic Misconduct noted by Board of Assessors</p> <p>Warning</p>	<p>The need to resubmit the assessment (or an alternative assessment) by a specific deadline.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plagiarism or unacknowledged use of another source ○ Self-plagiarism (for example, by submitting the same or parts of the same work for multiple assessments) ○ Collusion without permission ○ Buying or attempting to buy assessed work created by another person ○ Unacknowledged inclusion of content (including text and images) generated by artificial intelligence (AI) tools or other knowledge-based systems ○ Dishonesty (including attempted Academic Misconduct detected before the submission of work) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Any <u>minor</u> breach of research ethics. 		
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Any <u>more major breaches</u> of the University Exam Rules, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Talking to or conferring with another student ○ Copying from another student ○ Being in possession of or using unauthorised materials in an exam room (this includes mobile phones, smart watches, unauthorised notes, or unauthorised exam scripts) ○ Impersonating another student or allowing another student to impersonate you (for example by sitting an exam for them, or allowing someone to sit an exam for you) 	<p>Any of the above or:</p> <p>Case referred to PASS Board of Assessors to determine appropriate sanction, up to and including a recommendation the student fails the PARTNERS Academic Summer School</p>	<p>Any of the above or:</p> <p>Case referred to PASS Board of Assessors to determine appropriate sanction, up to and including a recommendation the student fails the PARTNERS Academic Summer School</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Any <u>more major</u> Academic Misconduct reported for submitted coursework including, but not limited to –<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Allowing another student to copy any assessed coursework (even if it was not the intention that the work be copied)○ Sharing assessed coursework online, other than for a genuine academic reason. –○ The falsification of research results (including the suppression of data).○ Plagiarism or unacknowledged use of another source○ Self-plagiarism (for example, by submitting the same or parts of the same work for multiple assessments)○ Collusion without permission○ Buying or attempting to buy assessed work created by another person○ Unacknowledged inclusion of content, including text and images, generated by artificial intelligence (AI) tools or other knowledge-based systems○ Dishonesty (including attempted Academic Misconduct detected before the submission of work)○ Repeated or persistent instances of any of the above already considered under Level 1 of this procedure • Any <u>more major</u> breach of research ethics		
--	--	--	--

