Assessment and Feedback Policy

Version Number 3.12

Effective from 1 September 2026

Author: Quality Standards Manager

Quality Management Office

Table of Contents

Purpose 3
Scope 3
Definitions 3
Assessment and Feedback Principles 4
To support assessment literacy we should: 4
To promote holistic assessment design we should: 5
Assessment and Feedback Policy 6
Security of Assessment Materials 7
Verification 7
Assessment Submission 7
Late Submission 9
Network/System Failure 10
Marking and Feedback 10
Word Count/Length 13
Moderation 13
Double Marking 13
Reassessment 13
Exam Papers 14
Academic Misconduct 14
Exceptional Circumstances 14
Assessment of Study Abroad 14
Reasonable Adjustment Plans/Carer Support Plans 15
In-Year Retrieval Scheme 15
Appendix A - Guide for Internal and External Verification of Assessment Tasks 16
Appendix B - Stepped Marking Scheme 18
Appendix C - Assessment Length 20
Appendix D - Assessment Standardisation and Calibration 22
Appendix E - Moderation Process 26
Appendix F - In-Year Retrieval Scheme 29

Purpose

1. The purpose of this policy is to set out the principles which relate to assessment and feedback at the University of Salford.

Scope

2. This policy applies to all students undertaking taught programmes at levels 3 – 7 at the University of Salford and its partner institutions.

Definitions

3. **Assessment** as used in this policy refers to all forms of assessed activity, for example, coursework, presentation, test, portfolio and examination.

4. **Assessment task** is used to refer to the specific task which a student is asked to complete, and it is documented with an Assessment Guidance document.

5. **Formative assessment** has a developmental purpose and is designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving students feedback on how their work can be improved and/or maintained. It refers to any activities that support students in developing their work, and can comprise many different forms such as:
    - Written and/or oral feedback provided to students to help inform their learning. This feedback can be provided by a tutor, peer, and or generative artificial intelligence including online and reference sources.
    - Teaching activities built into module and programme design to provide guidance to students on what they are doing well on and what they need to improve (quizzes, games, tests, simulations etc.).
    - Peer learning activities involving students giving and receiving feedback to each other through a range of learning and teaching activities.
    - Self- assessment activities including students marking and moderating work.
    - Co-development activities between students and tutors (e.g., co-construction of a rubric).

6. **Summative assessment** is used to indicate the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria and is used to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme. Summative assessment can also have a formative function in providing students with feedback that they can use in supporting their learning in future modules.

7. **Rubrics** (also referred to as a grid, matrix, scheme or criteria) should be used formatively to support learning, and also summatively to assess student learning outcomes.

    Rubrics can be used as a formative tool and co-constructed with students to help them to understand the requirements of assessment. They should be used as a summative tool to assess student performance.

8. **Feedback** as used in this policy refers to all information provided to students about their performance in an assessment task that enables them to learn. Feedback is a necessary component of learning and therefore should be a feature of all assessment tasks and assessment for learning

9. Feedback opportunities should be clearly signposted to students in modules and the importance of these learning opportunities explained.

Assessment and Feedback Principles

10. Assessment is used for a variety of different purposes:
    - Assessment of learning: used for certification: identifying levels of achievement; awarding credit and qualification; assurance of academic standards.
    - Assessment for learning: promoting student learning through timely, actionable feedback; motivating, guiding their approach to learning; giving the tutor useful information regarding effectiveness of teaching strategies.
    - Assessment as learning: where students develop an awareness of how they learn and use that awareness to adjust and advance their learning, taking an increased responsibility for their learning.[1]

11. The University's goal is to ensure that all students have equal access to assessment and equal opportunities to do well. The Equity, Agency, and Transparency (EAT) assessment and feedback principles should inform our approach to assessment:

To support assessment literacy we should:

- Clarify what the assessment is and how it is organised. Explain the principles underpinning the design of assessment so that students can understand the relevance and value of it.
- Provide explicit guidance to students on the requirements of each assessment (e.g. clarification of assessment criteria; learning outcomes; good academic practice).
- Clarify with students the different forms, sources, and timings of feedback available including e-learning opportunities.
- Clarify the role of the student in the feedback process as an active participant (seeking, using, and giving feedback to self and peers; developing networks of support), and not just as a receiver of feedback.
- Provide opportunities for students to work with assessment criteria and to work with examples of work at different grade levels in order to understand 'what constitutes good.'

To support assessment feedback we should:

- Ensure that the curriculum design enables sufficient time for students to apply the lessons learnt from formative feedback in their summative assessments.
- Give clear and focused feedback on how students can improve their work including signposting the most important areas to address (what was good; what could be improved; and most importantly, how to improve).

[1] Principles of Good Assessment and Feedback (JISC, 2022) Bloxham & Boyd (2007) Developing Effective Assessment in Higher Education

- Ensure that formative feedback precedes summative assessment; that the links between formative feedback and the requirements of summative assessment are clear.
- Ensure that there are opportunities and support for students to develop self-assessment/self- monitoring skills, and training in peer feedback to support self-understanding of assessment and feedback.
- Ensure training opportunities on assessment feedback for all those engaged in curriculum delivery to enhance shared understanding of assessment requirements.

To promote holistic assessment design we should:

- Ensure that opportunities for formative assessment are integral to curriculum design at module and programme levels.
- Ensure that all core resources are available to students electronically through the virtual learning environment (e.g. Blackboard) and other relevant sources from the start of the trimester to enable students to take responsibility for organising their own learning.
- Provide an appropriate range and choice of assessment opportunities throughout a programme of study.
- Ensure that there are opportunities for students to feedback on learning and teaching, both individually, and via Salford SU's Academic Course Representatives, during a taught module as well as at the end of it, to enable reasonable amendments to be made during the teaching of the module subject to the discretion of the module leader.

11. Assessment at the University of Salford will also:

Skills development

- Promote student self-regulatory skills through their active engagement in the assessment process.
- Promote the development of assessment literacy amongst students and staff.
- Encourage, motivate and engage students, promoting learning and facilitating improvement through well-designed formative assessment opportunities.
- Help students to develop through the provision of, and engagement with, timely and constructive feedback to include self-assessment.
- Support the critical, ethical, and judicious use of generative artificial intelligence.

Relevance

- Be authentic and relate to real world practice;
- Support future employment and encourage students to embark on professional pathways;
- Involve appropriate stakeholders, including industry partners;

Reliability and Validity

- Provide a valid, reliable, and transparent measure of student achievement and proficiency relative to the specific learning outcomes;
- Be conducted equitably and securely in line with University regulations and processes;
- Promote academic and professional ethical practice;

- Provide stakeholders with confidence in the quality and standards of University of Salford awards.

Assessment and Feedback Policy

12. All assessment is conducted in line with the University's Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes.

13. Examinations are conducted in line with the University's Examination Rules and Regulations. If a student is unable to attend an examination at a particular time due to religious observance, guidance is available on the Timetabling and Exams Hub.

14. All modules must be assessed in line with the approved module specification using the validated assessment strategy. The assessment strategy should be designed to encourage student engagement with each assessment task.

15. Assessment tasks must be aligned with module and programme learning outcomes, and marks should only be awarded against marking criteria which relate directly to those learning outcomes and which appear in the marking rubric. If marks for contribution/engagement are used these must be explicitly identified in the assessment guidance document and marking rubric/criteria. Mark penalties must not be applied for non-attendance.

16. Each module must contain at least one component of assessment. The Academic Regulations for Taught Programmes provide further information about the maximum permitted number of components of assessment. Marks are awarded for whole components of assessment and sub-components should not be used. Where a single component of assessment comprises a number of parts, but has one submission date, as in a portfolio or project, a single mark should be awarded for the whole assessment and only this mark will be recorded.

17. To help support the transition of students into higher education there should be **no formal written examination**s in Trimester 1 for students at levels 3 and 4 within any mode of module delivery (either modules of one trimester in length (short fat), or modules of two trimesters in length (long thin)), this does not preclude the use of other types of assessment carried out under time-limited conditions. Formal written examinations are permitted where this is a requirement of a PSRB, or subject to additional accreditation awarded by external bodies. A note to this effect should be included in relevant programme approval documentation.

18. All assessment tasks (with the exception of examinations) must be provided to students electronically using the University's assessment guidance template. All sections of the assessment guidance document must be completed. This is the set of instructions outlining the type of assessment and the specific criteria for the assessment task. Assessment guidance must include a rubric which outlines the assessment criteria for a specific assessment task and the different levels of achievement possible within it.

19. Examination papers must be prepared in accordance with guidance provided by Student Administration. Marking rubrics/schemes are also required and should be included in the assessment guidance and form part of the verification process.

20. All assessment tasks shall normally take place within modules during the approved duration of each programme. The final submission date for assessment tasks must not

exceed the end point of a programme as set out in the Programme Specification. This is to ensure compliance with Home Office requirements in relation to programme end dates which are specified in Confirmation of Acceptance for Studies (CAS).

Security of Assessment Materials

21. All individuals involved in the assessment process, including academic staff, Independent Assessors, External Examiners and professional service staff, are expected to take care with how they handle assessment materials to maintain the integrity, security and confidentiality of assessments. Assessment materials, both digital and hard copies, must be stored securely until required. Any concerns that the integrity, security or confidentially of assessment materials has been compromised should be urgently reported to the School Office and notified to QMO@salford.ac.uk.

Verification

22. Verification of assessment guidance and rubrics/marking schemes is used to ensure that the assessment of students is appropriate and promotes effective learning.

23. The purpose of verification is to consider:

    a. the appropriateness of the module assessment strategy in relation to the module's intended learning outcomes;
    b. the clarity of instructions within the assessment guidance to support completion of the assessment task(s) and consideration of marking schemes/model answers;
    c. the appropriateness of the rubric/marking scheme.

24. The verification process is described in Appendix A.

Assessment Submission

25. Programme teams shall produce an assessment schedule one week prior to the student induction period at the start of each academic year to document all assessment and assessment deadlines. This is to ensure that module assessment activity is scheduled in an appropriate manner, this should ensure that all students receive timely feedback on performance through early assessment, that assessments are spaced in a manner that avoids bunching and promotes progressive learning through the staggering of submission dates throughout the academic year. The assessment schedule shall be published on Blackboard for students to access.

26. Assessment guidance for students, including submission dates, shall be published at the start of each module via module information on the module site within Blackboard.

27. Submission dates must not be scheduled on dates when the University is officially closed and when setting due dates, consideration should be given to the impact of the late submission period (see section 37). In the event of circumstances resulting in all students being unable to meet a published submission deadline, modifications may be made, with the agreement of the relevant Associate Dean (Academic). Any changes must be documented in the Module Leader Report and entered into the Banner system.

28. Programme teams should strive to accommodate major religious festivals of all faiths in its planning, though this is not always possible. Programme teams should consider

significant dates when setting submission dates. Significant dates can be found in the SHAP calendar.

29. The University's assessment processes are conducted primarily through electronic means. This includes the electronic submission of assessments, as well as the electronic marking and provision of feedback. All written assessment tasks must be submitted via Blackboard, unless a formal exception has been granted by the Head of Academic Quality. Wherever practicable, other types of assessment tasks or artefacts should also be submitted through Blackboard. However, where Blackboard is not used for such submissions, formal exemption is not required.

30. Module leaders must make ensure that all submission areas are set up in accordance with University guidelines.

31. Exceptions to electronic submission are considered as part of the module approval and amendment process through the Programme Validation and Review Procedure. Alternative arrangements for submission may be considered for students studying at collaborative partner institutions. Alternative arrangements must be agreed and logged with the Quality Management Office.

32. When submitted online, assessments will be receipted electronically, or confirmation of receipt provided on screen. When an assessment is legitimately submitted offline, students must use the assessment submission form. Schools must ensure that there is a robust system for the timed receipting of student work, again using the assessment submission form.

33. Whether online or offline, the deadline for submission of assessments is 16:00 UK time on the specified submission date, which should normally be a weekday, except where the relevant module is normally delivered on a weekend. Any submission after 16:00 UK time, even if by only a few seconds, will be considered as late.

34. When work is submitted through Blackboard, only one submission for each assessment is possible. If an incorrect version has been submitted, students may contact Digital IT to request the submission is removed. Where a submission is removed, and the subsequent submission is within the late submission period, late submission rules apply. It is not possible to request removal of an incorrect version after the late submission period has ended.

35. It is a student's responsibility to ensure that assessments are submitted successfully and that the correct version has been submitted for marking. In the case of online submission, students must ensure that assessment tasks are submitted to the correct folder or equivalent.

36. Students are required to upload their assessment task files directly to the designated submission area and must not submit links to online files. This is to ensure tutors can access the work for marking and verify submission through Turnitin. Submissions made via links will be considered non-submissions unless prior approval has been granted by the tutor due to exceptional circumstances, such as large file sizes. Any such arrangements must be formally agreed upon with the Module or Programme Leader in advance of the assessment deadline and, where applicable, outlined in the Assessment Guidance document.

37. If a student discovers, after the submission deadline, that an assessment task has been submitted to an incorrect Blackboard or Turnitin folder, they should contact the Module Leader to request that the submission is marked, as long as this occurs prior to the meeting of the Module Assessment Board which formally ratifies module marks.

Late Submission

38. The University's late submission period is seven consecutive days following the submission date. The seven consecutive day period includes weekends and Bank Holidays but not extended periods of official closure e.g. Christmas, Good Friday and Easter Monday. The late submission period ends at 16:00 UK time on the last day of the late submission period.

39. The late submission period applies to all assessment attempts (including resit attempts) except In-Year Retrieval Assessment attempts. Late submission arrangements do not apply to examinations or similar scheduled and timed assessment events such as presentations or performances.

40. Where assessment tasks are submitted in the late submission period, the following rules apply:

- If the work is **no more** than seven days late, then if the work would otherwise be of a pass standard, then the mark for the work shall be capped at the pass mark for the component.
- If the mark achieved is lower than the pass mark, then no penalty will be applied.*
- If the work is **no more** than seven days late and graded either Pass or Fail, then no penalty shall be applied.
- If the work **is more** than seven days late then it cannot be submitted. It will be recorded as a non-submission (NS) and no feedback will be provided.
- Late submission rules only apply to whole components and no penalties should be applied to individual elements of portfolio/project type assessments.

41. Students with an approved Reasonable Adjustment Plan or Carer Support Plan (refer to Section 82 for further details) may be granted an adjusted submission deadline for assessments. Such adjustments will allow for an extension of up to seven calendar days. Submissions made within this adjusted timeframe will not incur late submission penalties. Penalties for late submission, in line with section 40, will apply after the adjusted deadline has elapsed.

42. Where a student has valid reasons for submitting an assessment task late and has a request for Exceptional Circumstances (ECs) accepted through the Exceptional Circumstances (EC) Procedure, the penalty applicable for late submission will be removed.

43. Where students have submitted an assessment task later than the published deadline, as permitted by the late submission period or by a Reasonable Adjustment Plan/Carer Support Plan, programme teams should provide feedback within 15 working days after the date the assessment task was submitted. The 15 working day period for provision of

feedback does not include days when the University is officially closed, for example weekends, Bank Holidays or during the Christmas closure period.

Network/System Failure

44. Where there is an unexpected University network failure, and Blackboard was not accessible at the deadline for submission or in the 12 hour period before that time, the Head of Academic Quality (or nominee) will determine the course of action to be taken in discussion with Associate Deans.

45. Where a student experiences a technical issue with University systems which means that they are unable to complete their assessment task, they must report this to Digital IT immediately and obtain confirmation of their report which be required to support an exceptional circumstances (EC) or academic appeal request.

Marking and Feedback

46. All summative assessments are either awarded a numerical mark expressed as a percentage or a pass/fail grade.

47. All marks are awarded in line with the University marking scale of 0-100%. The 2026/27 academic year will serve as a transition period towards the University-wide implementation of a stepped marking scheme. The stepped marking scheme is detailed in Appendix B. Stepped marking will not be used for assessments where marks are explicitly allocated to individual responses or where there is a clearly defined correct answer, such as multiple-choice questions (MCQs).

48. All assessment tasks are marked using specific criteria detailed within a marking rubric/scheme and which are shared with students at the start of the module. Marking criteria must align with programme and module intended learning outcomes.

49. The University provides brief descriptors of level of performance and generic assessment criteria. Schools are required to develop, implement, and review annually subject-specific performance descriptors within a marking rubric/scheme that aligns with the University descriptors and generic assessment criteria. Schools should ensure that any issues arising from their annual reviews are recorded in Programme Action Logs through the Programme Monitoring and Enhancement Procedure.

50. At levels 3, 4, 5 and 6 the pass mark is 40% and the scale is:

Percentage Mark	Level of Performance
80 – 100	Exceptional
70 - 79	Very Good
60 - 69	Good
50 - 59	Sound
40 - 49	Satisfactory
0 - 39	Needs significant improvement

51. At level 7 the pass mark is 50% and the scale is:

Percentage Mark	Level of Performance
80-100	Exceptional
70 - 79	Very Good
60 - 69	Good
50 - 59	Satisfactory
40 - 49	Needs improvement
0 - 39	Needs significant improvement

52. Where assessment tasks are awarded pass or fail grades, the requirements for passing the assessment must be described in the assessment guidance document.

53. All summatively assessed work must be marked anonymously where possible and practical to do so; however, there will be some forms of assessment where this is not possible, for example observed assessments such as performances and presentations.

54. Calibration activities are required for assessment tasks offered on apprenticeships and collaborative provision programmes. Standardisation activities are required for assessment tasks offered on collaborative provision programmes and where more than one person is marking the work (i.e. where there is a marking team). Calibration and standardisation are defined in Appendix D along with a description of the processes.

55. Marks and feedback (for summatively assessed work) shall be provided to students within 15 working days of the published submission deadline except where concerns relating to academic misconduct arise. In such instances, the marker may cease marking and prepare a case for referral to an Academic Misconduct Officer. Feedback will not normally be given to the student until the case has been considered. Where students have submitted later than the published submission deadline due to a Reasonable Adjustment Plan/Carer Support Plan or use of the late submission period, section 40 outlines requirements in relation to the timing for provision of marks and feedback.

56. All marks and feedback are returned to students via Blackboard.

57. The QAA's UK Quality Code provides guidance on how effective feedback is achieved:

Effective feedback enables students to understand the strengths and limitations of their performance, and to recognise how future performance can be improved.[2]

58. Arrangements for obtaining feedback must be clearly articulated to students and clarified in the assessment guidance document. Programme teams will need to ensure that students have sufficient time to act on any feedback received.

59. The purpose of feedback is to support learning and therefore should identify strengths and areas for improvement and development. Focused feedback should be provided for

[2] QAA's UK Quality Code for Higher Education Advice and Guidance Assessment (2018)

all summative assessments with the exception of formal written examinations, must, as a minimum:

- provide an un-ratified mark or grade;
- indicate how marks were arrived at with explicit reference to the descriptors and marking criteria for the assessment task;
- present constructive, developmental comments on the assessment task, including reference to successful and less successful aspects of the task, and advice on how to improve.

60. Feedback should provide the following information:

- What the student did well in this task (briefly describing the main strengths).
- Where improvements could be made to the task and how (detailed and clearly explained points with links to examples to demonstrate how where possible).
- What the student should consider for future tasks (how feedback should be applied to improve the next/later similar elements of assessment).

Feedback is delivered differently for End Point Assessment (EPA) tasks on integrated apprenticeship programmes. When commenting on where improvements could be made at EPA, feedback should not risk breaching the confidentiality of the assessment questions. For example, the marker should refrain from saying 'if you had covered/written X, you would have passed'. Furthermore, EPA feedback must not include considerations for future tasks because the EPA is the final assessment of the apprenticeship programme.

61. In addition to meeting the standards set out in this Policy, programme teams must ensure that they meet any standards for feedback required by relevant Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies.

62. For written examinations feedback should, as a minimum, constitute:

- a mark or grade;
- an opportunity for students, upon request, to view their annotated examination script.

63. Although examination scripts are exempt from subject access requests under the General Data Protection Regulation, comments made by assessors and moderators are not exempt and should be provided to students if requested. Where requested, examiners' comments must be transcribed onto a separate sheet.

64. Feedback should be easily accessible and clear, ensuring that comments can be accessed confidentially by individual students and can be retained by students and the University.

65. A record of marking, which evidences the breakdown of marks for each assessment task, will be retained within the Student Information System. Only whole component marks are recorded.

Word Count/Length

66. Where a word count or length is specified in the assessment guidance document, students must adhere to this. Appendix C provides further guidance about word count/length.

67. No arbitrary penalty shall be applied for exceeding the stated length of a task however, markers will cease considering content for the purpose of marking and feedback once the stated maximum length has been exceeded. Content beyond this point will not contribute to the determination of the awarded mark and will not be commented upon in feedback.

Moderation

68. Summative assessment outcomes shall be subject to moderation and confirmed by the Assessment Board in line with the Assessment Boards for Taught Programmes Policy. The purpose of moderation is to provide assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately and to verify academic standards. Where appropriate, moderators may raise concerns regarding marking with assessors, but it is not the role of internal or external moderators to reconsider any individual mark.

69. The moderation process is described in Appendix E.

70. Students may receive un-moderated marks and feedback in advance of ratification by the Board. Students must be advised that where marks and feedback is provided prior to the meeting of the Module Assessment Board, any marks indicated are provisional and may be changed following moderation and are subject to ratification by the Module Assessment Board.

Double Marking

72 The University's standard moderation processes provide the necessary assurance of consistency and fairness across the majority of modes of assessment and there is no case to introduce second marking as a requirement where moderation can be adequately complete. Second marking should only be used when it is not possible to use sample moderation or where it is specifically prescribed by a PSRB. Further guidance on second marking is available.

Reassessment

73. Reassessment submission dates should be set at a time which is suitable for the programme and, where there is a School wide reassessment submission date, published within the University Activity Planner.

74. At the start of each module, students must be provided with details of all reassessment tasks and submission dates via module information on the module site within Blackboard. This information should be signposted in the assessment guidance document.

75. A reassessment task must be the same task as that offered at first attempt unless there is an appropriate academic justification to set an alternative task. For example,

a. where an individual has failed a group assessment task and is not able to join a group for the reassessment, it would be necessary to design a different equivalent task for reassessment;
b. for unseen written examinations, or similar, an equivalent alternative version should be produced for reassessment.

76. For End Point Assessments (EPAs) on integrated apprenticeship programmes, reassessment rules are mandated by the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education (IfATE) assessment plan. In such instances, the IfATE assessment plan is followed as an exception to the University academic regulations. Further details on reassessment at EPA can be found in the Higher and Degree Apprenticeships End Point Assessment Policy and in the specific module specifications/ EPA Handbook for specific programmes.

Exam Papers

77. Following the end of the reassessment period, all exam papers are shared with the Library for inclusion in the past exam papers site to support students in testing their knowledge and boosting confidence in advance of future exams. As past papers are shared with students, past papers should not be re-used to maintain the security of exam papers.

78. Exam papers from apprenticeship End Point Assessments (EPAs) will not be shared with the Library for inclusion in the past exam papers site. This is because exam question banks may be used for several years in line with IfATE guidance.

Academic Misconduct

79. Any improper activity or behaviour by a student which may give that student, or another student, an unfair academic advantage in a summative assessment is considered to be an act of academic misconduct. This is unacceptable in an academic community. All cases of suspected academic misconduct will be considered in line with the Academic Misconduct Procedure or the Student Misconduct Procedure.

Exceptional Circumstances

80. Where a student's ability to undertake or submit an assessment task is seriously affected by exceptional circumstances (ECs) a student may submit a request through the Exceptional Circumstances Procedure that their ECs be taken into consideration by the University in respect of:

- late submission of the assessment task;
- deferment of an assessment task to a later time.

Assessment of Study Abroad

81. Where a student undertakes a period of Study Abroad as part of a programme of study, further information about how this will be assessed is available at the International Opportunities Student Hub.

Reasonable Adjustment Plans/Carer Support Plans

82. Reasonable adjustment and carer support plans document measures in place to mitigate the effects of a student's individual needs. Reasonable adjustments are made while the student is progressing through their programme and may affect the conduct of their assessments. Reasonable Adjustments Plans are developed by the Disability Inclusion Service and Carer Support Plans are developed by the Student Diversity team.

In-Year Retrieval Scheme

83. The University has an in-year retrieval scheme (IRYS) which provides level 3 and 4 students with an opportunity to recover failure in some summative assessments before the reassessment period. Essentially this offers students the opportunity to retrieve failure in assessment tasks, or to submit tasks that were not submitted at initial attempt, at a much earlier point in the academic year, closer to the point of module content to which the task relates. The Scheme is described in Appendix F.

In Year Retrieval Scheme – FAQs for Staff

In Year Retrieval Scheme – FAQS for Students

Retention and Disposal of Summatively Assessed Work

84. The University retains assessed work for a period of five years in line with OfS requirements.

85. Advice is available to Schools on the management and confidential disposal of assessed work from the Information Governance Team.

Appendices

Appendix A – Verification Process

Appendix B – Stepped Marking Scheme

Appendix C – Assessment Length Guidance

Appendix D – Standardisation and Calibration Processes

Appendix E – Moderation Process

Appendix F – In Year Retrieval Scheme

Appendix A - Guide for Internal and External Verification of Assessment Tasks

1. Background and Purpose

1.1 The range of assessment for each programme is reviewed in detail at first validation (programme approval) and through periodic programme review. These processes should consider the mapping of assessment tasks against programme and module learning outcomes as well as the coherence of the proposed range of assessments. The coherence of assessment should be reviewed to ensure that there is an appropriately scaffolded progression of tasks within and between levels. Subsequently, verification of assessment guidance documents is conducted to ensure the appropriateness and clarity of each assessment, to ensure that each assessment is inclusive and promotes effective learning.

1.2 Verification should take account of:

- intended learning outcomes;
- level of study;
- consideration of rubrics/marking schemes/model answers,
- the characteristics of the student cohort;
- proposed student effort required for the assessment task;
- opportunities for outcomes/feedback to feed forward;
- previous assessment outcomes.

2. Verification Process and Timing

2.1 Verification involves both internal and external review to ensure that assessment tasks meet both institutional and sector standards and offer an appropriate level of challenge to students as well as forming an authentic and accessible way to gauge student achievement.

2.2 Verification for all components of summative assessment is required every time an assessment task changes, where the weighting of a task changes, or every three years if the task has not changed.

2.3 Internal verification is undertaken by at least one member of academic staff from outside the module team.

2.4 External verification by the External Examiner is required:

- for assessments that contribute to the classification of qualifications;
- for assessments at other levels, where required by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) or by collaborative provision agreements;
- where assessments/modules outcomes have been identified as falling outside accepted norms;
- for assessments which form part of the non-subject related English/Study Skills modules at level 3, and part of the International Foundation Year.

2.5 Verification of assessment tasks should be completed **before** the start of the module and before details are distributed to students.

2.6 First-sit assessment tasks and, where a different task is used for reassessment, should be verified at the same time.

2.7 The verification form is used to record the outcome of the verification process.

2.8 The Module Leader is responsible for ensuring that the following documents are made available to the internal verifier:

- verification form;
- assessment guidance document describing the assessment task;
- marking rubric/scheme;
- the previous year's assessment guidance documents and outcomes for comparison.

2.9 Internal verifiers should record the outcome of their verification process on the verification form, and either confirm that the assessment task and marking scheme/rubric are appropriate and record any examples of good practice or any concerns and suggested amendments. In the case of concerns, internal verifiers should discuss the comments with the Module Leader. Where appropriate an amended or new assessment guidance document and/or marking rubric/scheme is produced and the process of internal verification is repeated.

2.10 Once internal verification is complete, and where external verification is required, the Module Leader is responsible for ensuring that the following documents are made available to the External Examiner:

- verification form with details of internal verification completed;
- internally verified assessment guidance document;
- marking rubric/scheme;
- the previous year's assessment guidance document and outcomes for comparison.

2.9 External Examiners record the outcome of their verification process on the verification form, and either confirm that the assessment guidance document and marking scheme are appropriate, or record any concerns about the assessment guidance document together with amendments. Where necessary, originators produce an amended or new version, and the process of external verification is repeated until satisfactorily completed.

3. Retention of Verification Information

3.1 Schools must retain records of verification in line with the Information Retention Schedule, as these may be required if a student submits an academic appeal or complaint or for audit purposes.

Appendix B - Stepped Marking Scheme

The 2026/27 academic year will serve as a transition period towards the University-wide implementation of step marking. During this period, existing marking practices will continue. Programmes currently using a form of step marking may continue to do so, while programmes not currently using step marking will maintain their existing marking approaches. Throughout 2026/27, the University will work with Faculties to review current practice, agree a single institutional model of step marking, and develop the guidance, training, and support required to facilitate implementation. Stepped marking will be mandatory for all programmes across the University from the commencement of the 2027/28 academic year.

Marking Scheme

Stepped marking refers to a restricted grade band marking scheme, where markers may only choose marks representing the upper. middle and lower range of each band, as illustrated in the table below (for levels 3 to 6). For example, in the adequate band must choose between 42%, 45% or 48%. **Undergraduate**		**Postgraduate**	
Possible Mark Choices	**Performance descriptor**	**Possible Mark Choices**	**Performance descriptor**
100 95 92 88 85 82	Exceptional	100 95 92 88 85 82	Exceptional
78 75 72	Very Good	78 75 72	Very Good
68 65 62	Good	68 65 62	Good
58 55 52	Sound	58 55 52 50 (use as a capped mark only*)	Satisfactory
48 45 42 40 (use as a capped mark only*)	Satisfactory	45 40	Needs improvement

35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0	Needs significant improvement	35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0	Needs significant improvement

*students should be given the full mark achieved for the assessment but where the assessment in submitted for reassessment requirements, the mark will be capped at the pass mark.

Using stepped marking allows markers to indicate where the work sits within each band but removes the need to make very finely tuned judgements and avoids borderline marks. Stepped marking should make conversations between markers, students and moderators more straightforward. For holistic marking rubrics, the marker will select one mark from the list in the table, and for analytic rubrics (where multiple criteria are assessed separately) each criterion is marked separately, and the overall mark calculated based on the weighting of the different criteria.

Appendix C - Assessment Length

1.0 Principles and Scope

1.1 It is often useful for tutors to provide guidance as to the appropriate length (word count, page number, time etc) for an assessment task either to guide the student as to the expected amount of effort required or to address the specific pedagogic challenge of producing work to a given assessment task. Having an upper limit on the length of submission acceptable for a given task can help to protect students from spending a disproportionate amount of time on any one piece of work and can control the demands on staff required to assess the submitted work.

1.2 Where a guide length is provided it is important that the nature of this is stated explicitly to students including full details of what is included in this e.g., page lengths, font size, margins etc. where page lengths are used, or whether references, tables, appendices etc. are included if a word count is specified.

1.3 Regardless of how the length is specified, it is essential that the nature of this limit and margin of acceptability is detailed in the assessment guidance document. A clear distinction is required to identify the upper limit of length beyond which work will not be accepted for consideration to derived mark.

1.4 Under no circumstances should there be an arbitrary deduction of marks for excessive length. Rather, the assessor should cease consideration of content at the specified length and award marks only on the basis of work within the stated acceptable upper limit of length.

1.5 Where producing work to a specific, fixed length is an essential skill/ILO then we should when possible use the available technology to create assessment templates that do not allow submission of more than the allowable limit. – This is common practice in many online forms and prevents students exceeding the limits (limits can be set by no. characters, no. words, or no. pages as appropriate).

1.6 Where use of a constraining template is not possible or appropriate, the maximum length should be clearly articulated in the assessment guidance document (providing full details of how this will be determined) and consideration of content will cease during the marking process at the prescribed length.

1.7 Where the assessment length is for guidance and adherence is not an essential outcome or ILO, the submission rules should reflect this. The guidance length should be communicated in as much detail as possible and be sufficient to permit students to meet the assessment criteria. To help manage student effort and to manage marking workload, an upper allowable limit is still advisable. This should be set at a level that reflects the nature of the limit, typically ~10%. Where work exceeds this upper limit assessor should cease consideration of content at the specified length and award marks only on the basis of work within the stated acceptable upper limit of length.

Table 1 Examples of application of guidance

Example	Proposed action	Rationale
Assessment length set for guidance of effort and to control marking load.	Set guide length as ‘n’ pages / words / minutes etc with an upper limit for acceptable length (typically +10%). Do not mark beyond stated upper limit. Where possible configure submission to only accept work up to upper limit.	Sets expectation with guide length. Does not impose an arbitrary penalty. Provides scope for students to write more if necessary but prevents really excessive length to constrain both student and marker workload.
Assessment seeks to address the development and evaluation of concise writing skills.	Use assessment template to constrain submission length e.g. by the creation of web or word forms with maximum word / character / or line numbers, upper limit on file size or media length. Students are unable to submit work beyond the accepted length. If maximum length cannot be constrained by technology, make clear the absolute limit and do not mark content beyond stated upper limit.	Prepares students in an authentic manner for completion of many forms. Does not apply an arbitrary penalty. Prevents students from exceeding the acceptable limits.

Appendix D - Assessment Standardisation and Calibration

This section explains different types of standardisation activity and how they are organised and carried out.

	Title	**Timing**	**Circumstances it takes place.**	**Aim**	**Impact on students' marks**
A	Assessment Calibration (pre-assessment)*	Prior to the assessment activity	Required for: • Apprenticeships • Collaborative provision (unless agreed otherwise) It also may be used where several people will be marking as part of a team.	To gain a shared understanding of the application of rubrics/schemes to either a specific type or level of assessment and so increase understanding of the assessment and minimise risk of discrepancies when the marking actually takes place. It may also include a reflection on similar previous marking exercises.	No direct impact on any individual student marks.
B	Standardisation (see guidance below)	As part of assessment marking (prior to internal moderation)	Required for: • Collaborative provision (unless agreed otherwise) It is also used where several people will be marking as part of a team including Apprenticeships.	To ensure consistency of the application of rubrics/schemes in marking.	Individual student marks as part of the sample used may change because of the exercise.
C	Assessment Calibration (postassessment)*	After internal moderation and/or external moderation	Routinely for Apprenticeships It also may be used in other circumstances if considered appropriate based on feedback from internal and/or external moderators have raised issues.	To review and learn lessons from assessment marking activity that can be used to inform future assessment marking. For apprenticeship it may also involve calibration against other apprenticeship providers and include employer feedback on assessment.	No change in student marks as result of the exercise.

*Depending on timing A and C make take place in the same session.

Guidance on how to run an assessment calibration event (A and C)

The main purpose of calibration is to maintain academic standards within a programme team or across related programmes. It is a process of peer review which involves dialogue, negotiation and joint decision making, comparing judgements on student work to reach a shared understanding of the academic standard at each level. In addition to being an important quality assurance mechanism for improving marking and moderation, calibration offers important collaborative learning and professional development opportunities for academics.

For further information on calibration, see the resources from the Advance HE "Degree Standards" project.

A calibration activity involves the following:

1. Examples of student work from one assessment component (e.g. written assessment, video of performance, artefact) representing high, medium and low levels of student attainment.
2. An agreed reliable mark for each piece of work (e.g. the moderated grade originally given, confirmed by the module/programme leader) along with an explanation of the reasons for the mark awarded, with reference to the contextual information and external reference points below.
3. Contextual information about the assessment component e.g. learning outcomes, assessment guidance document, marking rubric/scheme and criteria. Also, the relevant external reference points, e.g. subject benchmark statement, FHEQ and professional standards.

Examples of student work are discussed with the aim of reaching a consensus as to the standard of each piece of work, taking account the full range of arguments. The discussion focuses on making reasons for judgements explicit and considering them in detail. This enables the participants to gain an in-depth understanding of the standards, and the aim is that repeated participation in calibration activities will over time result in ‘calibrated academics’.

The approach adopted for calibration involves two main stages: a pre-activity marking task and a facilitated workshop activity (in person or online).

In advance of the workshop (e.g. one week before), the participants are each sent electronic copies of 3-5 pieces of student work representing a range of student work and are asked to place each within a 10% band according to the university descriptors, based on the marking rubric and criteria for the task; in addition, participants can also be asked to give a specific percentage mark for each piece. They then submit their bands and marks anonymously to a central coordinator (e.g. using an MS Form set up for this). Before the workshop, the facilitator collates the marks and produces graphs/tables showing the distribution of marks for each piece of work.

At the workshop, participants are shown the range of benchmark standards that have been awarded to each piece of work and the variation in terms of grades given. Small-group discussions (F2F groups or break out groups for virtual workshops) are then held to consider these results, with the aim of achieving a group consensus on the band/grade for each assessment and for the markers to reflect on what influenced their decisions.

A whole group facilitated discussion is then held with a view to achieving a consensus regarding the marking decisions, bringing the previously agreed reliable mark and rationale into the discussion. In addition, a list of common characteristics that influenced their judgements is compiled.

The outcome of calibration discussions should be recorded using the Calibration Outcome Form and stored with verification and moderation forms.

For support in facilitating these workshops and the broader calibration process, please contact the Academic Developers within LTEC.

Guidance regarding how to run an assessment standardisation event (B)

Assessment standardisation should take place where more than one assessor will be marking an assessment (i.e. where there is a marking team). The aim is to ensure consistency of the application of rubrics/schemes in marking for a specific assessment. The following guidance sets out the minimum requirements for standardisation. Marking teams or Associate Deans may identify a need for additional steps and/or more formal record keeping in relation to standardisation than is described here. It is important to note that this standardisation activity should take place before assessments are formally marked and is a distinct activity which is separate to moderation.

The assessment standardisation activity should normally be planned to take place within three working days of the assessment submission deadline. It should not take much longer than this as it may affect the ability of the marking team to meet assessment feedback deadlines. The standardisation meeting should be set up well in advance. Where marking takes place with international partners it is important to allow for differences in both time zones and days of the working week.

1. **Day one after submission deadline**. One of the marking team, normally the most experienced member of staff, scans through the submissions to choose four or five submissions that, from their initial review, seem to represent the high, middle, low and fail range of submissions. They do not include examples of very poor/clear fail submissions. The selected assessments are randomly labelled A, B, C, etc and shared with the marking team. How they are shared will depend on the nature of the assessment. Although the selection will have been chosen based on a preliminary view of the assessments being high, middle, low and fail, information about which assessment falls into each group should not be shared with others in the marking team as it may prejudice their considerations.

2. **Day two after submission deadline**. All the marking team (including the person who did the initial selection) apply the marking rubric to the sample and determine their initial mark. The marking team are not expected to include student feedback; however, they may find it helpful to make a few notes that may be useful in the Standardisation meeting.

3. **Day three after submission deadline: The standardisation meeting**. The marking team meet (in person or online) and share their view of the initial marks for the sample

assessments. The discussion should then focus on the assessments where there are substantial differences in the marks between the members of the marking team. Where there is little or no difference between the marks, the marking team should still review how the overall mark was derived from the rubric/scheme to identify if there are differences in the application of the rubric/scheme. As a result of the meeting, all those doing the marking should feel confident that they will apply the rubric/scheme consistently as team.

4. **After the standardisation meeting**. All the assessments, including the sample assessments, are then formally marked and student feedback prepared. Once all marking is completed, internal moderation takes place (see separate guidance).

Appendix E - Moderation Process

1.0 Background and Purpose

1.1 The purpose of moderation is to provide assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately.

1.2 Moderation involves both internal and external review.

1.3 Internal moderation is required for all assessment tasks which are summatively assessed. The internal moderator must not have participated in marking the assessment but should be familiar with marking at the appropriate academic level and subject area. Wherever possible the moderator should not be a member of the module team. For programmes delivered by collaborative partners, internal moderation should involve staff from the University of Salford. Where the University has a formal arrangement with another UK University with degree awarding powers in relation to programme delivery, moderation may be conducted by academic staff at the partner University.

1.4 External moderation is required:

- where assessments contribute to classification of a final award;
- where required by PSRBs;
- for assessments which form part of the non-subject related English/Study Skills modules at level 3, and part of the International Foundation Year.

1.5 Moderation of assessment tasks submitted for reassessment is required where the reassessment task is different, or if the marking team has changed.

1.6 In the case of assessments which do not include a written submission (e.g. music performance, clinical activity or an oral presentation) the assessment record (i.e. feedback sheet) must be made available for moderation purposes as a minimum. Wherever possible, video or audio recordings of the student work should be provided.

1.7 Where a marking team consists of multiple individuals, a standardisation exercise should take place to ensure consistency between markers. For example, before marking starts, the module leader should choose a small sample of student work to be assessed independently by all the markers using the assessment criteria. The marking team then meets up to discuss their grades and to agree on the academic standards for the task (see Appendix D regarding the standardisation process).

2.0 Moderation Process

2.1 The module leader provides the internal moderator with:

- standardisation and moderation form
- assessment guidance document;
- marking rubric/scheme model answers;
- marked student work and feedback.

2.2 The internal moderator reviews a representative sample of student work but should have access to all assessments if requested. The sample should:

- consist of a minimum of 10 assessments or 5% of the assessments (whichever is

greater) or all assessments if there are fewer than 10 students in the cohort;

- reflect the full range of mark bands;
- include samples of work marked by all assessors;
- include examples of work from all programmes on which the module is delivered.
- where Partners are involved, each Partner is treated as a separate cohort for the purposes of calculating sample sizes, once the sample is selected, moderation should take place across all partners and UoS students.

A greater sample than the minimum may be needed in order to incorporate these requirements.

2.3 The outcome of the internal moderation process is recorded on the standardisation and moderation form. The internal moderator either:

- confirms that the assessment process has been carried out appropriately; or
- records any concerns about the process on the standardisation and moderation form.

In the case of concerns, the internal moderator discusses the assessment process with the assessor(s). Depending on the discussion, no further action may be necessary, or the assessor(s) reconsider the marks given to the entire cohort of students or relevant subset (for example if the application of criteria within one grading band require review); and, as a consequence, make changes to all marks, for example by scaling up or down the whole cohort.

2.4 The outcome of any discussions between the internal moderator and the assessor(s), together with a note of any action taken, is recorded on the standardisation and moderation template.

2.5 The module leader provides the External Examiner with the following:

- standardisation and moderation form (detailing internal moderation process/outcome)
- assessment guidance document;
- marking rubric/ scheme/model answers;
- internally moderated sample of student work and feedback,

The external moderator either confirms that the assessment process has been carried out appropriately or records any concerns about the process on the standardisation and moderation template. In the case of concerns, the external moderator discusses the assessment process with the assessor(s). Depending on the outcome of the discussion:

- no further action may be necessary OR
- the assessor(s) reconsider(s) the marks awarded for the entire cohort of students if concerns apply to all students OR
- the assessor(s) reconsider(s) the marks for sub-sections of the cohort where concerns about the application of the marking standardisation and calibration process have arisen.

2.6 The outcome of any discussions between the external moderator and the assessor(s), together with a note of any action taken, is recorded on the standardisation and moderation form.

2.7 Internal moderation, and (where required) external moderation must be completed in advance of Assessment Boards and in line with deadlines for receipt of moderated marks set by Schools. All marks are provisional until ratified by the Assessment Board.

3.0 Retention of Moderation Information

3.1 Records of moderation must be kept in line with the Records Retention Schedule and may be required for the purpose of considering an academic appeal or complaint or for audit purposes.

Appendix F - In-Year Retrieval Scheme

1.0 Principles

1.1 The University's in-year retrieval scheme (IYRS) enables eligible students to recover failure in some summative assessment tasks at a much earlier stage in the academic year, and closer to the point of delivery of the module content to which the task relates. In-year retrieval is based on the premise that students will be able to re-work the same task (where possible) and act upon constructive feedback in order to improve the standard of their work. In-year retrieval does not affect a student's right to reassessment and re-take attempts.

1.2 This scheme applies only to level 3 and 4 students who are at the start of their higher education journey and who may need to familiarise themselves with the conventions of assessment in HE. Completion of level 3 provides students wishing to progress to a relevant degree programme with the relevant entry criteria. The Framework for Higher Education Qualifications requires that students completing level 4 will have a sound knowledge of the basic concepts of their subject and will have learned how to take different approaches to solving problems.

1.3 This scheme applies to students who have submitted and failed one or more assessment tasks and to students who did not submit.

1.4 This scheme does not apply to students studying on accelerated degree programmes as these students have a different assessment pattern.

1.5 This scheme does not apply where students have passed an assessment task.

1.6 In-year retrieval is optional for students. Eligible students may choose whether they wish to engage with the in-year retrieval scheme. It is recognised that undertaking in-year retrieval will increase the workload on students; however, this is off-set by the benefits associated with passing the module and avoiding the need for reassessment.

1.7 All in-year retrieval assessments must be submitted, and all assessment procedures concluded, before the meeting of the relevant Module Assessment Board so this scheme only applies to summative assessments which can be accommodated in this timeframe.

2.0 Procedure

2.1 At the end of the 15 working day feedback period, students who have achieved a mark which is below 40% or who did not submit, will be contacted by the School's Student Progression Administrator or nominated member of staff. Communication with the student will include information about the scheme, assessment help and support, details of the assessment task, the retrieval submission date and submission process. There is an expectation that students will receive academic and pastoral support.

2.2 Retrieval assessment deadlines are at the discretion of the Module Leader, in consultation with relevant staff. Normally, students will have a period of two weeks to complete a retrieval assessment.

2.3 As in-year retrieval will be conducted within a short space of time after the original submission, late submission does not apply to retrieval deadlines nor does the Personal Mitigating Circumstances Procedure.

2.4 Where students have extra time for submission documented through a Reasonable Adjustment Plan or a Carer Support Plan, the extra time will apply to the in-year retrieval deadline.

2.5 At retrieval students are required to re-work and submit the original piece of work or, wherever possible, engage in the same assessment (e.g., a practical or performance). Where it is not possible to recreate the same assessment (e.g., group work, etc.), an alternative verified assessment should be provided which tests the same learning outcomes. In-year retrieval assessments will be submitted using the same mechanisms as the original assessment. Where assessments are submitted through Blackboard (unless an exception is in place) it will be via an additional retrieval folder

2.6 Where a student achieves a lower mark at retrieval, the original higher mark will be used for the purpose of module mark calculation. All in-year retrieval assessments will normally be capped at the pass mark of 40%, except where there are accepted ECs for the original assessment.

2.7 Where a student is making use of the IYRS to meet a higher grade threshold (above the minimum pass mark) required for progression on certain programmes, the IYRS mark will be capped at 40% or the original mark achieved awarded, whichever is higher.

2.8 Where the module does not require the student to pass each component of assessment (Method A) and the module is failed if, following retrieval, the capping of the component mark prevents the student from passing the module, the module mark will be capped rather than the component mark.

2.9 Where a module requires the student to pass one or more components of assessment (Method B) and a student has failed a must-pass component, the maximum mark for any re-assessed component will be the pass mark. This mark will contribute to the overall module mark.

2.10 Where a student achieves a pass mark at retrieval, further feedback will not normally be provided.

2.11 Where a student fails a retrieval attempt, markers are required to provide feedback. Feedback on retrieval assessments must be provided within 15 working days of the retrieval assessment submission date.

Further Information:

- In Year Retrieval Scheme – FAQs for Staff
- In Year Retrieval Scheme – FAQs for Students

Document Control Information			
Revision History incl. Authorisation: (most recent first)			
Author	**Summary of changes**	**Version**	**Authorised & Date**
Carol Evans/ Annette Cooke	• The Assessment Brief is now called Assessment Guidance • University Generic Assessment Guidance (Levels 3-7) provide a guidance to support development of rubrics for assessments tasks. • Nomenclature: Assignment task changed to assessment task throughout • Minor revisions to definitions of formative and summative assessment. • Assessment and Feedback principles updated from abstract to concrete tasks. • Identification that rubrics have a role as part of formative assessment as a learning tool in addition to using rubrics summatively to assess students' work. • Collapse of the lowest three descriptors of level of performance into one category 0-39 at UG and Masters levels and revision of names of descriptors. • Modification to timing of feedback for those with extra time to ensure markers return work within 15 working days after the date the assessment task was submitted. • An update to the requirement for retention of assessment work in line with OfS requirements. • Reference to a calibration outcome form to record the outcomes of calibration exercises.	3.12	Quality and Standards Committee 13 May 2026

Annette Cooke	Inclusion of a definition of assessment rubric and consistent use of the term rubric throughout to refer to a tool used during marking. Inclusion of step marking as a requirement. Inclusion of the requirement to produce an alternative exam paper for reassessment purposes instead of reusing the same paper. Inclusion of clarification on moderation arrangements where programmes are delivered in partnership with another UK University and where marks are released prior to conclusion of moderation. Requirement that students must not submit links to assessments, unless previously agreed. Inclusion of clarification regarding the end point of the late submission period being 16:00 on the 7th day after the submission date. Change of terminology from PMCs to ECs	V3.11	Changes approved by Quality and Standards Committee on 19 March 2025 and by Chair's Action on behalf of QSC on 1 July 2025
Annette Cooke	Inclusion of inclusive assessment and feedback principles	V3.10	Chair's Action on behalf of Quality and Standards Committee 17/11/2024
Emily Armstrong	Inclusion of appropriate references to End Point Assessments and Independent Assessors and steps to step if a submission date needs to change for good reason.	V3.9	Chair's Action on behalf of Quality and Standards Committee 19/09/2024
Annette Cooke	Update to grade band descriptors showing what a student needs to do to succeed, inclusion of the requirement to provide exam papers to the Library and that exam papers should not be re-used to maintain security of papers.	V3.8	Chair's Action on behalf of Quality and Standards Committee 3 July 2024
Annette Cooke	Simplification of moderation process, changes to frequency of verification, amendment to step marking scheme	V3.8	Quality and Standards Committee 14 February 2024

Annette Cooke	Amendment to the wording of extended time available to students with RAPs in relation to submission. Updated links. Inclusion of information about religious observance for exam purposes.	V3.7	Approved by Chair's action 30 June 2023
Annette Cooke	Inclusion of information about second marking, confirmation that late submission applies at resit, amended wording about assessment schedules and publication of resit dates.	V3.6	Editorial amendments 12 August 2022
Neil Fowler/Annette Cooke	Changes to terminology and additional guidance on late submission, no formal exams in T1 for L3/4 students, inclusion of new sections covering assessment calibration, stepped marking and extension of anonymous marking to all relevant assessments	V3.5	ASQAC 5 May 2021
Annette Cooke	General update including changes required due to the introduction of a new version of Blackboard	V3.4	Editorial amendments 21 August 2020
Annette Cooke	Addition of word count and length guidance. Changes to late submission rules. RAP extensions now applicable at reassessment. Changes to range of assessment permissible when exceptional regulations are invoked.	V3.3	ASQAC 8 May 2019
Annette Cooke	Update for 2018/19	V3.2	Editorial amendments 22 August 2018
Annette Cooke	Substantive policy review – inclusion of assessment principles, changes to moderation and verification requirements, removal of late submission in resit period.	V3.1	ASQAC 7 June 2017

Policy Management and Responsibilities:	
Owner:	This Policy is issued by the Head of Academic Quality who has the authority to issue and communicate policy on assessment and has

Others with responsibilities (please specify):	delegated day to day management and communication of the policy to the Quality Standards Manager. All subjects of the Policy will be responsible for engaging with and adhering to this policy including: Academic Staff Associate Deans (Academic) External Examiners Students
Author to complete formal assessment with the following advisory teams:	
Equality Analysis	
Legal implications (LPG)	
Information Governance (LPG)	
UKVI Compliance (Student Admin)	
Staff Trades Unions via HR Students via USSU Relevant external bodies (specify)	
Review:	
Review due:	2026/27