

Changes to Guide to Assessment, Standards, Feedback and Marking 2018/19

Dr. Steve King, Chair of SCA (outgoing)

August 6th, 2018

Substantive additions and amendments

1. Feedback Turnaround Time (20 days) plus Week 5 Summer exemption

15.1.3 *Principles underlying the meaningful provision of feedback*

Twenty Day Feedback Rule: Students should receive feedback* within **twenty working days**. Working days exclude University closure days (i.e. 'customary leave' days between Christmas and New Year and public holidays/statutory holidays.)

Exemption for examinations in Week 5 of Summer term: The maximum time limit for feedback from examinations conducted in Week 5 of Summer term is **twenty-five working days**.

2. Removal of combined Programme Governance

As a result of the discontinuation of Combined Boards of studies, the *Guide* has been updated, replacing references to Combined Boards with references to **Boards of Studies of the Department in which the Programme Leader is based**. In the case of Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessments, there will no longer be Combined ECA Committees as Combined programmes will be covered by the Board of Studies of the Department in which the Programme Leader is based (23.4).

16.1.4 Combined programmes have a named Programme Leader and an Associate Programme Leader in the Partner Department. The primary responsibility for combined programmes rests with the Department in which the Programme Leader is based. Interdisciplinary units are governed by an interdisciplinary BoS.

3. Staggered penalties for late work

SCA has approved the staggering of penalties for late work. This applies to all assessments, not just electronic assessments.

4.7.1 **Deadlines for assessed work and lateness penalties**

Deadlines for assessed work must be published in a format that is accessible to students. All work submitted late, without valid exceptional circumstances, will have

marks deducted. **The deadline for work is on the hour, i.e. if the deadline is 16:00:00, work submitted at 16:00:01 is late.**

Work which is up to one hour late will have five percent of marks deducted. After one hour, ten percent of the available marks will be deducted for each day (or part of each day) that the work is late, up to a total of five days, including weekends and bank holidays e.g. if work is awarded a mark of 30 out of 50, and the work is up to one day late, the final mark is 25. After five days, the work is marked at zero. Note, however, that the penalty cannot result in a mark less than zero.

4. Refinement and clarification of extra-time allowance implementation

4.3.2 Extra Time Allowance

Students with a contemporary formal diagnosis of relevant disabilities, who request extra time in examinations and who have the support of the appropriate Board of Studies, will normally be permitted up to 25% extra time on the standard time allowed on any closed University examination of up to three hours' duration and for open assessments of up to 72 hours duration. **In the case of open assessments of up to 72 hours, the extension is applied in terms of an 8-hour working day, rather than the total time of the exam (e.g. 25% of a 72-hour assessment = 6 hours). This extra time is added on immediately to the end of the standard hand-in time. It is recommended that the release and hand in times of open assessments be standardised across all relevant departments to 11:00 on any day. This gives the majority of students who have been recommended extra time the opportunity to hand in their assessments during the same working day as their non-disabled peers. Where this extra time would mean the student working beyond 17:00 that day, the clock stops and restarts again at 09:00 the next working day until extra time allowance is used (e.g. a standard 72-hour paper with 50% extra time recommended would result in an extra 12 hours. The first 6 hours will be applied to the original hand-in deadline day with the clock stopping at 17:00. The clock then re-starts again at 09:00 the following working day with an additional 6 hours applied. The new hand-in deadline would then be 15:00 on the fourth day). It is advised that departments release open examinations at the start of a week to facilitate this process and where a deadline (including extra time) falls over a weekend, it is recommended that alternative forms of assessment are considered.**

Significant additions and amendments

5. Incorporation of reference to the principles of the York Pedagogy

1.2 Linking principles to policies

Working within these principles, departments are responsible for developing their own policies and procedures to meet the aims and objectives of the department. **In addition, in keeping with the aims of the York Pedagogy, assessment must be linked explicitly to the teaching and learning aims and outcomes of the academic programme concerned.** They must be designed to ensure that students are treated equitably and that they have the opportunity to demonstrate that they have achieved the learning outcomes of a programme of study. They must provide a clear framework within which examiners can make judgements on the comparative performance of students.

6. Clarification of minimum credit-weighted mean for Repeat Study

4.17 Repeat Study

Undergraduate students whose stage 1 results, after compensation and reassessment, do not meet the requirement for progression into stage 2 are now normally permitted to repeat the whole of stage 1, **provided they have a minimum credit weighted mean of 10 marks.** Tuition fees are charged for the repeat year. Assessment marks from the repeat year only are then used to judge whether the student can progress into stage 2 - marks from the first attempt at stage 1 are disregarded, though all marks are recorded on the transcript. **A student has only one opportunity for repeat study.**

7. Guidance on Graduate Teaching Assistants Marking -

SCA has considered whether any restrictions should be placed on what GTAs can mark and agreed no restrictions should be placed. However, SCA recommended that further guidance and support for departments should be offered.

14.2.1 Departmental responsibility

If GTAs are involved in marking and providing feedback, it is especially important that they understand fully level-criteria and how to guide students toward improvement. **Departments should exercise caution in using GTAs to mark and give feedback on summative work, particularly at second year undergraduate level and**

above (where marks contribute to the calculation of the final degree result), and on work that requires considerable academic judgment (e.g. essays and reports where markers cannot be provided with a detailed mark scheme and model answers - Appendix E). For further details, including in relation to training and support for GTAs involved in marking and providing feedback please see the [University's Policy on GTAs](#).

8. Peer-based marking and Peer evaluation

The *Guide* includes clarification that when Group members are involved in evaluating other group members - such student marks are to be “ratified by the acknowledged academic marker” (Appendix C). There is also further guidance in regards to peer marking:

4.16 Peer marking of summative student work

Involving students in assessing each other’s formative work should be actively encouraged as such activity increases student familiarity with the standards expected of them, the criteria used to mark their assessments and the processes involved in making critical judgements. However, peers assessing summative work and contributing to the summative marks of other students is **not permitted**. Any divergence from this principle requires the approval of the University Teaching Committee. To incorporate peer assessment and marking into summative work, group members may assess and mark other group members as long as such marks are then submitted to the acknowledged academic marker who has the final say over the marks.

9. Clarification and corrections in relation to Special Cases Committee

There have been clarifications and corrections of procedural in 5.12e and 24.8.3. The Exceptional Circumstances Policy has also been updated to state that **all programme extensions must be approved by SCC**.

10. Recommended technology for Electronic Assignment Submission

13.3 e Electronic assignment submission

Students should be aware that a submission is only successfully completed when a time-stamped receipt has been issued to them. Submissions with images will take longer than plain text files. We advise that a submission should be attempted no later than 30 minutes before the official deadline and **should be done using recommended technology, in order to ensure that the work is received in time and does not incur a lateness penalty. Where students do not use the [recommended technology](#) as suggested they should allow more time for potential troubleshooting and pay extra attention when double-checking the functionality**

and readability of the file they have submitted. We strongly advise against trying to submit assignments on a mobile device, smart TV or gaming console.

11. External Examiner's appointment length

18.2(d) In line with the QAA Quality Code for Higher Education the duration of an external examiner's appointment will normally be for four years, achieving a balance between the need to bring in a fresh perspective and the need to benefit from the external's knowledge and insight gathered over a period of time. Once approved, the Academic Support Office will confirm the appointments in writing to the nominee.

Academic Misconduct Policy

12. Change of procedure for cheating cases

SCA approved a change to the procedure for dealing with cases of cheating. Due to the inconsistencies in the implementation of academic misconduct outcomes for the act of cheating identified by members of the Standing Academic Misconduct Panels (StAMPs) and the Academic Misconduct and Examinations Administrators, the following changes have been made to the policy, including the distinction between breach of assessment rules and cheating:

24.2.1 Assessment offences

(a) Breach and/or (b) Cheating – failure to comply with the rules of closed assessments e.g. unauthorised access to materials in a closed assessment.

24.4.1 Initiating the procedures in respect of breach/cheating

Where the invigilator(s) of a closed examination have reported a suspected case of cheating any unauthorised material must be removed, a full report made using the 'Unauthorised Material Form' and the Exams Office informed immediately following the exam.

Breach: First offence

In cases of cheating where a breach of assessment regulations has taken place but where no advantage is apparent: the report from the Senior Invigilator, the evidence and the details of the student will be checked by the the Exams Office. A formal warning letter will be issued by the Exams Office to the student and a record kept.

Breach: Second Offence

In cases of cheating where a breach of assessment regulations has taken place but where no advantage is apparent but students have already received a formal warning: the report from the Senior Invigilator, the evidence and the details of the student will be checked by the the Exams Office. The information will then be forwarded to a nominated departmental representative(s) of the relevant Standing Academic Misconduct Panel to initiate a StAMP investigation. The Exams Office will highlight that this is a second offence to the StAMP investigatory panel and SCA member and recommend that the mark should be in the 0-59 range rather than

convening a full investigation. The student should be informed of this decision (see 2.2.2).

Serious Breach/Cheating

The report from the Senior Invigilator, the evidence and the details of the student will be sent by the Exams Office to a nominated departmental representative(s) of the relevant Standing Academic Misconduct Panel to initiate a StAMP investigation. The Exams Office will also nominate a SCA member to assist the StAMP investigatory panel. A full investigation of the case will follow and StAMPs may choose from the penalty table in section [3.3](#).

Unauthorised Calculators

In cases where a student has used an unauthorised calculator in a formal examination where no special arrangement has been made by their department, the StAMP should judge that they have an unfair advantage, whether intended or not, and their mark should therefore be capped at a compensatable fail. If pre-programmed information potentially relevant to the exam has been found on the confiscated calculator, then a mark of zero should be applied.

Second Offences in cases of breach/cheating

In terms of second offences, breach and serious breach/cheating are considered different offences. Therefore a student may have an ongoing cheating case but still may receive a formal warning or penalty for breach of assessment rules. Subsequent breaches of assessment rules will be treated as a repeated breach and will therefore be capped at a compensatable fail.

3.3 Cheating/Breach that occurs in a module which is not probationary

There is also a new penalty table associated with the offence of Breach/Cheating.

13. Other changes

24.3.13 Second offences

A second offence means an offence discovered after procedures for the first offence have been completed. Two offences of the same type need to be committed under the policy for the penalties for second offences to apply.

24.3.15 Self-plagiarism and re-use of previously assessed work

Self-plagiarism is not deemed to be an academic offence under this policy due to different disciplines' approach to the reuse of assessed material within a degree. Departments should set assessment tasks that encourage and require new material. Students, however, should be advised that the re-use of academic work is poor practice and that if they reuse work, it should be acknowledged. If departments wish to penalise students for the re-use of work (e.g. markers ignore extensively re-used material), they should make this clear in their departmental handbook and include student guidance on referencing their own work.