



HIGHER EDUCATION

Chichester College Group Assessment Policy for Open University validated programmes

2018-2019



Author	Sue Banger
Reviewer	Helen Loftus
Date agreed	
Date for review	01/09/19

Quality Code Part B Assuring and Enhancing Academic Quality, ESG Standards (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9), Office for the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) good practice framework as at June 2017.

 HE@CHICHESTER.AC.UK

 CHICHESTER.AC.UK

Chichester
college

Higher Education Assessment Policy for Open University

Validated courses

1. Introduction
2. Scope of this policy
3. Monitoring arrangements
4. Communication
5. Design and implementation of assessment strategy
6. Coursework submission
7. Assessment and moderation of coursework
8. Feedback of coursework assignments
9. Academic Misconduct
10. Provision of exit awards
11. Posthumous and Aegrotat awards
12. Status of this policy

Appendix A - Extenuating Circumstances Form (ECF)

Appendix B - The AMBeR Tariff

Appendix C - Higher Education Assessment Policy - Summary for Staff

Appendix D - Higher Education Assessment Policy - Summary for Students

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The aim of this policy is to set clear and consistent standards for the creation and submission, assessment and feedback of academic coursework. The policy also sets clear guidelines for the operation of academic appeals. All aspects of this policy are operated in compliance with awarding body regulations and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Quality Code Chapters B6: Assessment of Students (2013) and B9: Academic Appeals (2013) as well as the Office for the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) good practice framework (Dec 2016) with due reference to ESG.

2 Scope of this policy

- 2.1 Objective 1: Assessment schemes and tasks are designed to enable students to robustly demonstrate the achievement of all learning outcomes for their programme of study
- 2.2 Objective 2: There are clear arrangements to ensure that all coursework is completed and assessed fairly
- 2.3 Objective 3: There is a clear procedure for submission of work by students
- 2.4 Objective 4: There is a clear procedure for students to request extended deadlines after demonstrating genuine extenuating circumstances
- 2.5 Objective 5: There is clear guidance on the assessment and moderation of assessed work
- 2.6 Objective 6: Students can expect a consistent, useful and timely standard of feedback
- 2.7 Objective 7: Students have clear guidance on standards of conduct expected in the preparation of coursework and the consequences of academic malpractice
- 2.8 Objective 8: Students have clear guidance to a simple and transparent system for appeals against academic decisions
- 2.9 The expected impact is that all students have clear, consistent and fair standards governing the creation, submission and assessment of academic coursework.

3 Monitoring arrangements

- 3.1 The operation of the policy, including academic appeals will be monitored through the Ethics Group, the Higher Education Committee and evaluated by the Higher Education Board.
- 3.2 Where amendments to the policy are required a paper will be submitted to the Higher Education Board for consideration before the beginning of the following academic year.

4 Communication (Quality Code B6 2013 Indicator 2)

- 4.1 The policy will be circulated to all study programme leaders for inclusion in their student handbooks and on the course Chi On-line pages.
- 4.2 The student version of this policy will also be available on the HE Policy page, on the college intranets.
- 4.3 All students will be informed that the policy exists and will discuss it with their study programme leaders during induction.
- 4.4 Assessment criteria will be made available through subject and unit handbooks.

5 Design and implementation of assessment strategy (Quality Code Chapter B6 2013 Indicators 1,2,3,5,6 & 7)

- 5.1 All assessments will be designed to promote active learning, using clear language and tasks which are accessible to all students. Assessment feedback should make use of feedback to help students improve their performance in subsequent assessments.
- 5.2 Course teams are required to devise an assessment strategy which ensures that all learning outcomes from the programme are met using methodologies that ensure all students are able to successfully demonstrate their learning. Assessment may be revised to meet the needs of students with specific needs. All such revisions must be reviewed through the internal verification procedure and a record of the decision placed in the course files. Any revisions to be discussed at the following Board of Examiners.
- 5.3 The Study Programme Leader has responsibility to ensure that all assessors are competent to assess the work
- 5.4 Course teams will devise and implement an internal verification strategy.. Internal verification must be planned to ensure that all students have an assessment grade verified by another member of staff at least once across each academic year. A minimum of 20% (or 5 people) of submissions for each assessment must be internally verified using second markers. Blind marking is recommended.
 - 5.4.1 Where there is a discrepancy in blind marking the marked work will be reviewed by an third marker and recommendations made to the Quality Manger for grade to be awarded before the provisional grades are released to the group.
- 5.5 Assessments are to be reviewed at the end of each academic year by teaching teams and students and the results used to revise the assessment strategy for the following academic year.
- 5.6 Students will be given an outline scheme of assessment in their course handbook or on

Chichester On-line indicating the assignments to be submitted for each module. They will receive a detailed plan giving precise details of course work assignments, submission and return arrangements and the role of exam boards at the beginning of each module. Any alterations to the scheme of assessment must be ratified by the Director of Higher Education or Higher Education Quality Manager prior to delivery.

5.7 Where coursework is submitted late and there are no accepted extenuating circumstances it will be penalised in line with the following tariff:

- Submission within 6 working days: a 10% reduction deducted from the overall marked score for each working day late, down to the 40% pass mark (for UG) and 50% pass Mark (PG awards) and no further.
- Submission that is late by 7 or more working days: submission refused, mark of 0.

A working day is any calendar day (including weekends), with the exception of Bank Holidays and College closure days, and submission after the deadline will be assumed to be the next working day. Students who fail to submit work for assessments or attend examinations shall be deemed to have failed the assessment components concerned and will be marked as 0.

6 Coursework submission (Quality Code Chapter B6 2013 indicators 5, 8 & 11)

- 6.1 Students are required to submit course work which covers all of the assessment specifications by the specified deadline on the assignment brief. Course work is deemed to have been submitted once it is lodged in the designated office or submitted through Chi Online.
- 6.2 Students will be required to submit some or all assessments through plagiarism detection software. The software will detect plagiarism. If evidence of plagiarism is detected then the study programme leader will initiate the process described in section 10.
- 6.3 Meeting deadlines is a critical part of workplace preparedness. Any student who has failed to meet a submission deadline will be required to attend a progress meeting with the study programme leader.
- 6.4 Any student may request an extension to a course work deadline which will be considered by the course management team (if an extension of up to 48 hours is requested) or the Director of Higher Education (if an extension of over 48 hours is requested). If a student wishes to request an extension, they must complete an Extenuating Circumstances Form (appendix A) available from their departmental office or from Chi On-line. The purpose of offering Extenuating Circumstances is to ensure that students who have been hit by unexpected and severe problems can be assessed fairly. The form requires the student to

explain the grounds for seeking an extension and supply evidence deemed necessary such as medical certification, for more information see appendix A. The completed form must be submitted to the departmental administrator or online to the study programme leader allowing seven calendar days for a decision. If an extension is allowed, a revised date for the submission of the piece of course work will be confirmed. Extensions will not normally be granted beyond the date of the next examination board for the programme.

- 6.5 If the student disputes the decision made, they must state their case in writing to the Higher Education Quality Manager who will consult the course team and discuss the outcome with the student. The Higher Education Quality Manager's decision will be final.
- 6.6 Students may apply for leave in order to attend to an urgent personal or work related issue. Students wishing to take leave must complete an Extenuating Circumstances Form available from their departmental administrator or from Chi Online. The completed form must be submitted to the departmental administrator. Students must allow 5 working days for a response. If the leave is approved the study programme leader will agree dates for submission of coursework which may be after the main assessment boards. In the latter case the decision will be confirmed by the Exam Board. Should the student dispute the decision, they must state their case in writing to the Higher Education Quality Manager, whose decision will be final.
- 6.7 Resubmissions. Students who have successfully completed all pass assessment criteria will not normally be allowed to re-submit work in order to improve their grade. In order to resubmit the student will need to demonstrate an extenuating circumstance using the process described in Appendix A of this document. Students who have not met all the pass criteria will be allowed to re-submit once per module within an agreed deadline of 2 weeks, where the awarding body regulations permit.
- 6.8 Where students fails a module the following will apply:

Options for the retake of study

If, having exhausted all permitted compensation, resit, and retake opportunities, and a student is still unable to pass, the Board of Examiners may, at its discretion, permit one of the following repeat options:

(a) Partial retake as fully registered student:

- (i) The student is not permitted to progress to the next stage of the programme but must retake the failed modules and/or components in full during the following academic year,
- (ii) The student has full access to all facilities and support for the modules and/or components being retaken,

- (iii) The marks that can be achieved for the modules and/or components being retaken will be capped at the module and/or component pass marks,
 - (iv) The student retains the marks for the modules and/or components already passed,
 - (v) No further resit opportunities are permitted.
- (b) Partial retake for assessment only:
- (i) As in paragraph 17.5.1(a) of the OU regulations except that access to facilities and support will be limited to certain learning resources for the module(s) and/or component(s) being retaken. Participation will only be allowed for relevant revision sessions and assessments.
- (c) Full retake:
- (i) This is only permitted where the student has extenuating circumstances;
 - (ii) The student does not progress to the next stage of the programme but instead repeats all the modules in the current stage during the following academic year,
 - (iii) The student has full access to all facilities and support,
 - (iv) The marks that can be achieved are not capped, and the student is normally entitled to the resit opportunities available. However, a student is not able to carry forward any credit from previous attempts at the stage.

Where compensation, resit, and retake opportunities have been exhausted, a Board of Examiners may recommend a student for an exit award as defined in Section 10 below.

With the approval of the Board of Examiners students may be eligible to progress to a higher stage of a programme without having completed the requisite 120 points of the lower stage. They may exceptionally be allowed to do so if any of the following conditions are met:

- (a) A minimum of 80 credit points at the lower level have been successfully completed including passes in all designated core modules;
- (b) All requirements for academic prerequisites for the higher-level modules are met;
- (c) The Examination board have approved progression following a successful application for extenuating circumstances, and results are still pending in the student's profile.

Institutions that offer a rolling entry system for qualifications with a high study intensity

may find that the timings of examination boards do not coincide with those institutions that offer programmes within the traditional academic year. Under such circumstances, students are provisionally allowed to progress on the programmes, with the recommendation deferred until the next Board of Examiners which must be held within twelve calendar weeks. At which point the student's full profile will be considered and a formal recommendation for progression will be made (if applicable).

7 Assessment and moderation of coursework (Quality Code Chapter B6 2013 indicator 13)

7.1 The process of assessing and moderating assignments must be explained clearly to learners so that they understand the procedure and the timescale.

7.2 Assessors must show how they have reached their decisions using the published assessment criteria and recording the results in a format for use by Boards of Examiners and to communicate individual results to learners.

When a learner has completed an assignment, the assessment team will give a grade for each unit. This given according to the highest level for which the learner is judged to have met all of the criteria. Therefore:

To achieve a **Pass**, the learner must have satisfied all the pass criteria for the learning aims, showing coverage of unit content and attainment of the appropriate level on the national framework;

To achieve a **Merit**, the learner must have satisfied all of the pass criteria and all of the merit criteria through high performance in each learning outcome;

To achieve a **Distinction**, a student must have satisfied all of the pass and merit criteria as well as all of the distinction criteria through outstanding performance.

7.3 The assessment team:

The **Study Programme Leader** has overall responsibility for the programme, its assessment and internal verification to meet awarding body requirements, record keeping and liaison with the External Examiner. The Study Programme Leader will have full knowledge of the assessment and verification requirements and processes.

Internal Verifiers (IVs) oversee all assessment activity, liaising with the Lead IV (where required). They check all that assignments and assessment decisions are valid. The activities of IVs will be standardised through working with the curriculum team. Normally IVs are assessors, but they do not verify their own assessments (see 5.4 marking internal verification requirements)

Assessors set or use assignments to assess students to national standards. Before taking assessment decisions, assessors participate in standardisation activities led by the Study

Programme Leader.

The **External Examiner** will sample student work across assessors. The External Examiner will also review evidence of internal verification and assess decisions.

7.4 Process:

7.4.1 Any assignment briefs must be verified internally and externally approved by external examiners before being issued. The assignment must be assessed, internally verified (according to the plan) and approved by external examiners before being returned to the learner.

7.4.2 Feedback must follow the Colleges assessment criteria as laid out in the subject handbook. Grading must show how the grading decision has been reached, may show why attainment against criteria has not been demonstrated, may give guidance on how to improve in the future but must not provide feedback on how to improve the evidence provided.

7.4.3 Where a learner has not met the pass criteria the College's current policy on re-assessment opportunities may be followed.

7.4.4 The learner must be informed that the grade awarded is provisional until it has been confirmed by the appropriate Board of Examiners and ratified by the Open Universities Module Results Approval and Classification of Qualifications Panel (MRAQCP).

8 Feedback of coursework assignments (Quality Code Chapter B6 2013 indicator 6 & 9)

8.1 Assessed work will be returned to students in accordance with the arrangements on the assignment brief. Feedback should be provided as soon as is possible after the submission date, under normal circumstances a student can expect written feedback within two working weeks for any formative assessment, and within 4 working weeks for any summative assessment, and in line with exam board requirements. In all cases students should be clear when they will receive assessed work and feedback and the assessment should communicate revised deadlines if these are unavoidable.

8.2 The written feedback will consist of judgements against overall grading criteria and a detailed assessment of the strengths as well as areas for improvement in each student's work. Each student may request to receive verbal feedback to help them improve future submissions.

8.3 Students may appeal against their grading or feedback using the college's appeals procedure (see appeals procedure).

8.4 All undergraduate assessment will be marked on a percentage scale of 0-100.

% Scale Score	Performance Standard
70+	Excellent pass
60-69	Very Good pass
50-59	Good Pass
40-49	Pass
0-39	Fail

The final grade for an individual assessment component will be determined after completion of a quality assurance process (e.g. moderation, remarking) as detailed in the partner institution's OU approved policy for moderation.

Where the result of the overall assessment calculation creates a mark of 0.5% or greater, this will be rounded up to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.5% is rounded to 70%; 59.5% to 60%; and so on). Where the calculation creates a mark below 0.5%, this will be rounded down to the next full percentage point (e.g. 69.4% is rounded to 69%; 59.4% to 59%; and so on). For the purposes of rounding up or down, only the first decimal place is used.

8.5 Determining module outcomes:

The overall module mark shall be determined as per the assessment strategy detailed in the module specification and published in the Programme Handbook.

A student who passes a module shall be awarded the credit for that module. The amount of credit for each module shall be set out in the programme specification and published in the Programme Handbook.

In order to pass a module a student must achieve the requirement of the module as set out in the module specification and published in the Programme Handbook.

Where a student is registered only for a module (rather than a qualification) the resit provisions will apply.

8.6 Provision for *viva voce* examination:

Exceptionally, *viva voce* examinations may be required by a Board of Examiners (with the approval of external examiners):

- (a) to confirm the progression/result status of a student;

- (b) to determine the result status of unusual or borderline cases;
- (c) when there is conflicting evidence from the various assessment components;
- (d) as an alternative or additional assessment in cases where poor performance in assessment is the result of exceptional circumstances verified through due processes.

9 Academic Misconduct (Quality Code Chapter B6 2013 indicator 14)

9.1 All assessable items must be the candidate's own work; where this is not so the Exam Board will deal with case as one of academic malpractice.

9.2 Academic malpractice is cheating: it is when a person (or people) trick, defraud or deceive others. It includes the following:

9.2.1 Collusion: where a student works in a fraudulent manner with another (or others) being assessed independently (either wholly or in part) in the same module.

9.2.2 Plagiarism: to 'take and use another person's thoughts, writings, inventions as one's own' (Oxford English Dictionary). All quotations must use the Harvard APA referencing system.

9.2.3 Commissioning: getting another person(s) to complete work which is subsequently claimed as the student's own work.

9.2.4 Impersonation: where somebody undertakes an examination or assessment posing as another person.

9.2.5 Syndication: the submission of substantially similar piece(s) of work by two or more students, either in the same institution or in a number of institutions, either at the same time, or at different times.

9.2.6 Falsification of data: where data has been invented, altered, copied or obtained by unfair means.

9.2.7 Aiding and abetting: where a student assists another student in any form of dishonest academic practice.

9.2.8 Professional misconduct: where, in the course of their assessed work, students on professional courses act in a manner which breaches the relevant professional Code of Conduct.

9.3 Misconduct duties:

In all cases of academic misconduct or any other form of attempting to secure unfair advantage, Chichester College Group confirms a Member of the HE Quality Team will be responsible for initial investigations of alleged academic misconduct by any student undertaking a module all cases must be investigated and dealt with on a formal bases

9.4 General Considerations:

- 9.4.1 Student may be found guilty of academic misconduct whether or not there has been any intention to deceive; that is, a judgement that negligence has occurred is sufficient to determine guilt.
- 9.4.2 Students have a duty to inform themselves of the Assessment Policy and Procedures and of the academic conventions used in the College for correctly citing and acknowledging the work of others, including the correct use of quotation marks, and the regulations governing examinations. For advice on correct referencing see programme handbooks, referencing handbook and relevant websites.
- 9.4.3 Depending on their nature and severity, alleged academic misconduct will be dealt with by the HE Team.
- 9.4.4 When academic misconduct is alleged, a student is required either to attend a meeting arranged to discuss the alleged misconduct with a member of the HE Team or if s/he does not wish to attend to submit a written response to the allegation 48 hours before the date of the meeting. If the student attends the meeting, s/he may bring a member of the Students' Union executive to help him or her in presenting his or her case. A meeting may proceed in the absence of the student (and their representative) provided that the member of the HE Quality Team concerned is satisfied that due notice has been given to the student
- 9.4.5 In some instances, such as allegations relating to collusion or group submissions, it may be necessary and appropriate for a member of the HE Quality Team to see more than one student at a time
- 9.4.6 If an allegation of an academic misconduct has been proven, the student will be invited to disclose any further cases which they wish to be taken into consideration as part of the same misconduct. Students are warned that all undisclosed misconduct which comes to light will be treated as subsequent misconduct, potentially carrying heavier penalties.
- 9.4.7 In determining the penalty for an academic misconduct, any previous confirmed academic misconduct will be taken into account as per AMBeR tariff (see appendix B.) When more than one misconduct is considered at the same time the misconduct will normally all be considered as a first misconduct if the student has not previously been found guilty of academic misconduct. A subsequent academic misconduct may occur from the point at which a student is found guilty of a first misconduct.
- 9.4.8 If a student is given an opportunity to resubmit work having been found to have committed academic misconduct; any further allegations made about the resubmitted piece of work will be treated as subsequent misconduct
- 9.4.9 Students are reminded that the penalties for academic misconduct may be very

severe, especially those for any subsequent misconduct (i.e. misconduct identified after any previous misconduct has been confirmed), including requiring a student to withdraw or determining that a degree not be awarded. Where necessary the relevant Professional Body will also be informed

9.4.10 Where a student has a penalised mark for work as a result of an academic misconduct the penalty will not be carried forward if the student repeats a year. However, the record of the misconduct is kept on the student's record and the academic misconduct database and any further misconduct will be classified as subsequent misconduct. Where necessary, the relevant Professional Bodies will be informed.

9.4.11 Where the alleged misconduct involves an alleged breach of the College's behaviour policy, the case must be referred to the Head of Student Services

9.4.12 Where academic misconduct has been alleged and a student has withdrawn, or is required to withdraw, from the College for reasons not related to the allegation; the Academic Misconduct Procedures will be completed. If the student is found to have committed an academic misconduct, a notional penalty will be allocated and a record made of the outcome. The outcome will be communicated to the student in writing.

9.5 Academic Misconduct procedure:

9.5.1 The HE Quality Manager will act on behalf College shall have the power, taking into account the circumstances of the case, to carry out a full investigation and where required hold investigatory meetings to uncover all related facts in order to:

- Determine that no misconduct has been committed
- Determine that misconduct has been committed and issue penalties in line with the AMBeR Tariff (see appendix B)

9.5.2 The HE Quality Manger will

- Inform in writing the student whose case has been referred about the nature of the alleged misconduct
- Check if any there have been any previous occurrences which will be taken into account
- Hold investigatory meetings where required in order to fully understand the circumstances and support decisions made
- Inform the student of the outcome within 10 working days and the students right to appeal against the decision within 5 days.
- Confirm in writing the decision in respect of any case and grounds for the decision (a copy must be given to the student and a copy must be held on the Course Managers File) in line with the standard closure of procedures letter.

- Inform the OU annually of the number of cases dealt with

9.5.2.1 Investigatory meetings

Investigatory meetings must be fully minuted and where students are witnesses to facts, the investigation will allow the investigated student to question witnesses to support their defence

9.5.3 Retrospective Misconduct

Misconduct identified post completion of the qualification which has led to the former student having an unfair advantage over their peers may lead to the full retrospective removal of the qualification.

9.5.4 Appeal Procedure

The student has the right of appeal to the next level of review at each stage in the procedure. In the event of an appeal s/he may choose to be accompanied by a friend, a responsible peer or student advocate (see also 9.5.2.1). An appeal should be submitted within 5 working days of the outcome being notified to the student and should be heard within 5 working days after the appeal is received. The appeal must state the grounds upon which there is disagreement with the college's decision. An appeal against the outcome of an offence considered as serious malpractice will be heard by the Vice Principal.

The appeal stage may involve a review of the formal stage, or a complete rehearing of the case. It is good practice to set out the grounds on which a student may appeal.

9.5.4.1 Grounds for appeal:

- That the procedures were not followed properly
- That the decision maker(s) reached an unreasonable decision
- That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process
- That there is bias or reasonable perception of bias during the procedure
- That the penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the procedures.

9.5.5 Outcomes of appeal

- If the student successfully appeals the outcome of an academic misconduct process, the student's case may need to be reconsidered by a board of examiners. The student will be issued with a written outcome that explains what action has been taken as a result of the appeal. A Completion of Procedures letter will also

be issued.

- If the appeal is not upheld, or is not permitted to proceed under the grounds of appeal, a Completion of Procedures Letter should be sent to the student within 28 days. This should include, or be accompanied by, an explanation of the decision reached and the reasons for it, in straightforward language. This will help the student decide whether to pursue the matter further. And should set out; their right to submit a complaint to the OIA for review; the time limit for doing so; where and how to access advice and support.

10 Provision of exit awards

- 10.1 Programmes must make provision for exit awards at intermediate stages, for which clear learning outcomes must be stated and laid out in programme specifications
- 10.2 Where a student leaves with an exit award they may reapply at a later date to upgrade to a higher award on the same programme, if it is still offered.
- 10.3 A student who has withdrawn from a programme or has exhausted all assessment attempts will automatically be considered for an exit award where sufficient credit has been accrued.

11 Posthumous and Aegrotat awards

- 11.1 Should a student be prevented by illness, or other circumstances, from completing the final assessed component of the programme, the board of examiners, having considered the relevant evidence (including medical certification) may make a recommendation that an Aegrotat award be made. Such exceptions are limited to students who are permanently unable to continue their studies and are registered for the final module that would complete a qualification, and have been assessed on at least part of the module. The board must be satisfied that the student's prior performance shows beyond reasonable doubt that they would have passed but for the illness, or other circumstances.
- 11.2 Posthumous awards are permitted for all programmes. The classification for such awards is based on past performance and aligned to the closest exit award (which may include a classification). Recommended to Board of Examiners for approval.

12 Status of this policy

- 12.1 The policy was approved by the Higher Education Board and supersedes all previous documentation.
- 12.2 The operation of this policy will be kept under review by the Quality Manager Higher Education
- 12.3 It may be reviewed and varied from time to time by the Higher Education Board.
- 12.4 This policy has been impact assessed to ensure that it does not adversely affect staff on the grounds of their disability, gender or race.

Appendix A - CONFIDENTIAL EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES FORM (ECF) (TO REQUEST AN EXTENDED DEADLINE FOR AN ASSESSMENT FOR AN OPEN UNIVERSITY VALIDATED COURSE.)

Write in **BLOCK CAPITALS** your name and the address to which you wish the outcome to be sent

Student registration number	
Family Name	
Forename(s)	
Course	
Contact email address	
Contact Telephone Number	
Study Programme Leader	

Circumstance - for guidance on extenuating circumstances please read page 2 of this form

Criteria	Date From	Date To

Evidence

List here all the documents attached

Description	Evidence	Date

Please note your case cannot be considered unless all of the columns above are completed.

Submit this document to THE he Quality Manager.

Unit affected	Assignment	Due date	Request upheld/ denied	Reason(s)	New submission date

Please allow five working days for a decision.

Do I have extenuating circumstances?

The circumstances you are seeking to mitigate must be unforeseeable or unpreventable and you must be able to demonstrate how these circumstances could have a significant impact upon your ability to meet the assessment deadline see also OU regulations regarding Extenuating Circumstances.

Common examples include:

- Significant personal illness or injury (where a Doctor certifies that you should not work or study)
- The critical illness or death of a close family member/dependent
- Unexpected significant family crises or severe financial problems leading to acute stress
- Absence for public service (e.g. Jury Service or active service if an armed forces reservist)

Circumstances not normally considered:

- Events that were planned or reasonably foreseen (e.g. booked holiday) - arrangements should be agreed in advance with the Study Programme Leader once known
- Failure, loss or theft of a computer, printer or storage medium
- Non-diagnosed illness (e.g. exam stress)
- Inadequate time management/planning
- Paid employment or volunteering commitments - arrangements should be agreed in advance with the study programme leader
- Rejection of EHCP DSA advice and guidance
- Pre-existing circumstances disclosed at interview (e.g. ongoing diagnosed illness)

Appendix B - The AMBeR Tariff

History

1st Time	100 points
2nd Time	150 points
3rd/+ Time	200 points

Amount / Extent

Below 5% AND less than two sentences	80 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	105 points
Between 5% and 20% OR more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	105 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	130 points
Between 20% and 50% OR more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs	130 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	160 points
Above 50% OR more than five paragraphs	160 points
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghostwriting service †	225 points

* Critical aspects are key ideas central to the assignment

† Some institutions may consider this to be a separate form of academic malpractice

Level / Stage

Level 1	70 points
Level 2	115 points
Level 3/Postgraduate	140 points

Value of Assignment

Standard weighting	30 points
Large project (e.g. final year dissertation)	60 points

Additional Characteristics

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences or references to avoid detection
40 points

Appendix B continued - Award Penalties Based on the Points

PENALTIES (Summative Work)

In all cases a formal warning is given and a record made contributing to the student's previous history

Points	Available Penalties (select one)
280 - 329	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action beyond formal warning Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark
330 - 379	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No further action beyond formal warning Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced
380 - 479	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit
480 - 524	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded
525 - 559	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost Award classification reduced Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours) Expelled from institution but credits retained Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn
560+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to resit, and credit lost Award classification reduced Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours) Expelled from institution but credits retained Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn

PENALTIES (Formative Work)

280 - 379	Informal warning
380+	Formal warning, with record made contributing to the student's previous history

Appendix C - Higher Education Assessment Policy - Summary for Staff

1. Students will be given a detailed plan for all assessments at the beginning of each module giving dates assessments are set, due to be submitted and returned. Students should also be made familiar with this policy and be able to access a copy of it.
2. All assessments will be carefully devised to maximise student achievement, making use of contextualised grading criteria.
3. It is the study programme leader's responsibility to ensure that assessors are appropriately qualified and experienced to assess.
4. Assessment results should not be communicated to students until the work has been internally verified.
5. Feedback to students should help them to improve their performance in subsequent coursework.
6. Students may request extra time to complete an assessment using the ECF (Extenuating Circumstances Form) form, at least 5 working days before the work is due (unless there is a genuine last minute emergency). It is the study programme leader's responsibility to assess the request and to decide whether to approve it.
7. Students who do not submit work on time and have not had a request for extra time approved will be unable to achieve grades higher than a pass.
8. Students may appeal against assessment decisions. Any appeals should be resolved between the student and assessor wherever possible. Students who wish to appeal should do so by completing the Student Appeal Form (see appeals procedure) and submitting it with evidence to HE@chichester.ac.uk. The Higher Education Quality Manager will facilitate the first two stages. Stage two overseen by the Director of Higher Education, Assessor Trainer, then internal verifier or Study Programme Leader. The third stage will be overseen by the Vice Principal. The decision of the Appeals Panel will be final. The Higher Education Board will consider all appeals against assessment decisions for each academic year and agree appropriate actions.

Appendix D - Higher Education Assessment Policy - Summary for Students

Students should:

- Be given access to and be familiar with the HE Assessment Policy
- Be given an assessment plan covering the modules or academic year. The plan will detail assessments, submission or exam dates and return of assessed work or issue of results dates.
- Students must be aware of the requirements to submit assessments that are complete, are the student's own work and are submitted on time.
- Students must submit work covering all required tasks by the date/time specified.
- Students may appeal assessment decisions using the Student Appeal form which should be completed and submitted to HE@chichester.ac.uk