

Regent European University

Assessment Procedures

Contents

1. Introduction and Purpose	3
1.1 Regulatory and Policy Framework	4
2. Definitions.....	4
3. Extenuating Circumstances Procedures	4
3.1 Definition and Scope.....	4
3.2 Qualifying Circumstances	5
3.3 Application Process	5
3.4 Evidence Requirements	5
3.5 Processing Timeline	5
3.6 Outcomes and Impact	6
4. Mitigating Circumstances Procedures	6
4.1 Definition and Scope.....	6
4.2 Processing and Decision Making.....	6
4.3 Outcomes and Impact	7
5. Marking and Feedback Procedures.....	7
5.1 Marking Guidelines – Markers	8
5.2 Marking Guidelines - Registry Officers	9
6. Moderation Procedures	9
6.1 Internal Verification of Assessment Tasks	9
6.2 Internal Moderation of Marking	10
6.2.1 Sample Size.....	10
6.3 External Examination	10
6.4 Moderation Documentation.....	11
7. Assessment Board Procedures	11
7.1 Board Schedule	11
7.2 Board Meetings Format	11
7.6 Board Decisions	12

8. Record Keeping.....	12
8.1 Assessment Records	12
8.2 Extension and Mitigating Circumstances Records	13
8.3 Assessment Board Records	13

1. Introduction and Purpose

This document sets out the operational procedures for implementing the University's Assessment Regulations. It provides detailed guidance on processes, timelines, and responsibilities related to assessment activities across all programmes.

These procedures apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. They should be read in conjunction with the Assessment Regulations and do not replace or supersede policy requirements.

1.1 Regulatory and Policy Framework

These procedures are underpinned by the principles of robustness, reliability, and continuous improvement as defined in the University's Quality Enhancement Policy, ensuring that assessment processes remain transparent and aligned with European Higher Education Area (EHEA) standards.

The Assessment Regulations establish the principles and requirements for assessment. These procedures explain how those requirements are implemented in practice. Where procedures and regulations appear to conflict, the Assessment Regulations take precedence.

2. Definitions

For the purposes of these procedures, the following definitions apply:

Working Day: Monday to Friday, excluding UK bank holidays and University closure periods (Christmas break, Easter break).

Assessment Deadline: The date and time by which assessment must be submitted, as stated on the Assignment Brief.

Extension: Permission to submit assessment after the original deadline but within 14 days, granted for extenuating circumstances.

Mitigating Circumstances: Serious circumstances of a more prolonged nature requiring extensions beyond 14 days, deferral to a later assessment period, or retrospective consideration for completed assessment.

For retrospective claims, circumstances must have significantly affected performance during the assessment period but could not reasonably be disclosed at the time. Examples include bereavement occurring immediately before an exam where the student sat the assessment despite being in shock, or undiagnosed medical conditions only identified after submission.

Late Submission: Assessment submitted after the deadline without approved extension or mitigating circumstances.

Non-Submission: Failure to submit assessment by the deadline or extended deadline, or submission more than 10 working days after the original deadline.

Resubmission: A second attempt at assessment following initial failure or non-submission.

3. Extenuating Circumstances Procedures

3.1 Definition and Scope

Extenuating circumstances are short-term, unforeseen circumstances that temporarily prevent a student from meeting an assessment deadline. Extensions of up to 14 days may be granted for extenuating circumstances.

3.2 Qualifying Circumstances

Examples of circumstances that warrant extension include:

- Acute illness (lasting 2-7 days)
- Medical/dental emergency requiring treatment
- Sudden bereavement
- Unexpected emergency affecting immediate dependents
- Traumatic event (accident, crime)
- Religious observance for time-specific events
- Significant technological failure beyond student control

The following do not constitute extenuating circumstances:

- Poor time management
- Multiple assessment deadlines
- Work or family commitments known in advance
- Minor illness (cold, headache)
- Computer problems that could have been anticipated
- Holidays or travel
- Misreading the deadline

3.3 Application Process

Students must complete the Extension Request Form, attach appropriate evidence, and submit via Student Support Services to the Programme Leader for consideration within 3 working days from the deadline.

3.4 Evidence Requirements

Acceptable evidence includes medical certificates, hospital/clinic letters, death certificate, police report, or official documentation.

Self-certification is accepted only for illness lasting up to 3 days, and will give place to an extension of the same length.

3.5 Processing Timeline

Applications for extenuating circumstances are processed according to the following maximum timescales to ensure timely support for the student:

Student Support Services: acknowledge receipt and notifies Programme Leader within 1 working day; verify the application's completeness; forward complete applications to the Programme Leader or returns incomplete applications to the student for correction.

Programme Leader: reviews the application and records a formal decision within 3 working days of receiving the full application and evidence.

Notification: the Student Support office notify the student of the final outcome via their official university email, immediately following the decision.

3.6 Outcomes and Impact

Work submitted within approved extension period is marked normally without penalty and receives full marks available.

4. Mitigating Circumstances Procedures

4.1 Definition and Scope

Mitigating circumstances are serious, longer-term circumstances that significantly disrupt a student's ability to complete an assessment. Unlike short-term extensions, these may result in the deferral of

To qualify for mitigating circumstances, the student must provide evidence of severe disruption, such as:

- Serious illness or injury requiring hospitalization or extended recovery
- Major surgery
- Pregnancy and childbirth
- Serious mental health crisis
- Death of immediate family member
- Victim of serious crime
- Major traumatic event with lasting impact

Claims submitted retrospectively, after an assessment deadline or exam can only be considered if the circumstances significantly affected performance during the assessment period but could not reasonably be disclosed at the time. This includes situations where a student sat an assessment despite severe shock (e.g., immediate bereavement) or where a medical condition was only diagnosed after submission.

4.2 Processing and Decision Making

The processing of claims follows a structured workflow to ensure timely outcomes:

Student Support Services: Student Support acknowledges receipt within 1 working day, and inform the Programme Leader; verify completeness and send to the Programme Leader for review.

The Programme Leader reviews the claim and records a decision within 10 working days of receiving the full application.

If the case is exceptionally complex or involves retrospective consideration of a graded assessment, the Programme Leader refers the request to the Academic Council for a decision at its next meeting.

The Student Support Office notify the student of the final outcome via university email immediately following the decision.

4.3 Outcomes and Impact

Students must submit a formal claim using the Mitigating Circumstances Form, with supporting evidence as soon as the circumstances arise.

For retrospective claims: submit within 10 working days of assessment deadline or grade notification.

Once a claim is evaluated, it will result in one of the possible outcomes:

- Extended deadline: Specified new deadline beyond 14 days
- Deferral: Assessment postponed to next scheduled period (typically next academic block)
- Retrospective mitigation: Circumstances considered by Assessment Board in determining progression/award
- Not accepted: Rationale provided.

Approved deferrals count as the first attempt, and will be graded according to merit. Retrospective mitigation may result in Assessment Board exercising discretion on borderline cases.

5. Marking and Feedback Procedures

In accordance with the Quality Enhancement Policy, feedback is recognized as a primary tool for academic enhancement; it must be constructive, timely, and designed to support the student's ongoing learning journey and achievement of module learning outcomes.

If submissions are marked by more than one markers, the Module Leader is responsible for organizing a Standardization Meeting for all markers before the marking process begins.

The team shall review a small sample of scripts from current or past submission, to ensure a shared understanding of the grading criteria.

Feedback must be provided within 20 working days of the submission deadline or final extended deadline. Marking begins only after the final deadline has passed.

If feedback will be delayed beyond 20 working days, students must be informed immediately with explanation and revised feedback date. Delays must be reported to Assessment Board.

All feedback must include:

- Major strengths of the work
- Areas for improvement
- How marks could have been enhanced
- Grades achieved and any penalties applied (late submission, word count, etc.)

Late submissions with capped grades receive minimal feedback indicating mark cap applied.

5.1 Marking Guidelines – Markers

Markers may not begin marking until after the final deadline has passed.

Where practicable, assessments are marked anonymously. Students are informed at module start whether anonymous marking applies.

All grades are provisional until internal moderation, External Examiner review (where applicable), and Assessment Board confirmation are complete.

Students must be informed that grades may change following moderation.

The following codes are used by markers when recording grades:

Situation	Grade	Notes
Late submission (within 10 days)	Capped at 50	Full feedback provided. Both capped grade and uncapped mark recorded in comments.
Late submission (beyond 10 days)	Not marked	Considered as non-submission. Where possible, VLE system settings should be set to not accept submissions after 10 days.
Academic misconduct (under investigation)	0 (provisional)	Full feedback provided with actual grade in comments. The grade will be rectified if misconduct is cleared following investigation.
Wrong file uploaded	5	Marker informs Student Support, to contact the student and invite to resubmit correct file within 48 hours.

Situation	Grade	Notes
	50	Treated as late submission
Corrupted file - unrecoverable	2	Marker contact VLE team to attempt recovery.
	Grade according to merit	Work is graded according to its merit, no penalty applies.

5.2 Marking Guidelines - Registry Officers

Situation	Code	Notes
Non-submission	NS	No work submitted by deadline/extended deadline OR submitted >10 days late. No feedback provided. Resubmission required.
Late submission (within 10 days)	LC	Full feedback provided. Both capped grade and uncapped mark recorded in comments.
Academic misconduct	AM	Recorded following Academic Integrity investigation outcome. Resubmission required.
Wrong file uploaded	WF	Submission is graded 5, and treated as Fail. Resubmission required.
Corrupted file - unrecoverable	CF	VLE team attempted recovery but failed. Work marked as NS. Mitigating Circumstances might apply; otherwise resubmission required.

6. Moderation Procedures

All assessment tasks, briefs, and marking criteria must be internally approved before being issued to students. This process verifies that the assessment aligns with module learning outcomes and academic standards.

6.1 Internal Verification of Assessment Tasks

Before the commencement of each module, the Module Leader is responsible for drafting the assessment task and the corresponding marking scheme. These materials are then formally reviewed by the designated Assessment Moderator to ensure they meet the following standards:

- **Academic Level:** Full alignment with FHEQ Level 7 requirements
- **Alignment:** Direct mapping to the learning outcomes in the module descriptors
- **Clarity:** Clear instructions and transparent requirements for students
- **Criteria:** Appropriate and robust marking rubrics

Once both the Module Leader and the Moderator have signed off on the task, the finalized assessment brief is published on the students' VLE platform.

6.2 Internal Moderation of Marking

Internal moderation serves as a critical quality assurance mechanism to ensure the integrity and consistency of marking standards across the University, reflecting the strategic commitment to a 'Quality Culture' as outlined in the Quality Enhancement Policy.

The moderator reviews the sample independently. While "blind" marking (without seeing the first marker's comments) is preferred, the primary goal is to verify that the marking criteria have been applied consistently.

The first marker and moderator compare results. If a difference of 5% or more, or a change in grade band occurs, the first marker and the moderator must discuss the application of the marking criteria and agree upon a final mark.

Where a consensus cannot be reached, the Module Leader (or Programme Leader, if the Module Leader is the first marker) will act as arbiter to determine the final mark.

Moderation must be finalized and recorded within 20 working days and prior to the release of results, ensuring feedback is provided in accordance with policy guidelines.

6.2.1 Sample Size

Internal moderation is conducted on a sample size equal to the Square Root of N (rounded up to the nearest integer), with a minimum of 5 scripts (or 100% of the cohort for groups of 5 or fewer).

The sample must provide a representative spread of the marking across the module, ensuring the moderator reviews work from every internal marker, and at least one script from every grade band achieved (e.g., Fail, 3rd, 2:2, 2:1, 1st), including those near grade boundaries.

6.3 External Examination

Where External Examiner appointed:

- Receives the sample of marked work, and internal moderation records
- Reviews marking standards and consistency
- Provides report to Assessment Board
- Attends Assessment Board (virtually or in person)

6.4 Moderation Documentation

The Programme Leader maintains record of:

- Pre-assessment approval of Assignment Briefs
- Standardization meetings
- Internal moderation sample and outcomes
- External examiner comments
- Any mark changes resulting from moderation

7. Assessment Board Procedures

7.1 Board Schedule

Programme Assessment Boards are convened at the conclusion of each teaching term to confirm module grades, and at the end of the academic year to confirm progression and final award recommendations.

Board dates are confirmed and communicated to the Academic Registry at the start of each academic year to ensure appropriate support and institutional oversight.

Before a Board can be formally convened, the Module Leader must ensure all marking and internal moderation are finalized, and External Examiner reviews have been completed where applicable.

The Academic Registrar is responsible for preparing the official Board documentation, which includes:

- The attendance list and formal apologies.
- The Programme Leader's report, providing essential academic input and recommendations for borderline cases to ensure fair and consistent outcomes.
- A summary of module/s results, and a report on extenuating/mitigating circumstances.

7.2 Board Meetings Format

All boards are held virtually unless specific circumstances require in-person meeting.

To ensure the Board remains focused on its deliberative and confirmatory duties, required membership is limited to:

- The Chair - a senior academic official who remains independent of the direct delivery of the modules being confirmed (e.g., Head of Programmes, Dean of School, or a Director).
- The Programme Leader - academic lead responsible for presenting the cohort results and providing essential academic input for borderline cases;
- The External Examiner - an independent expert who verifies that marking standards are fair, consistent, and aligned with national benchmarks (where appointed);
- An Academic Registry representative - an officer responsible for ensuring that all decisions comply with the University's Assessment Regulations and are recorded accurately.

7.6 Board Decisions

The Assessment Board is the final authority for the confirmation of academic standards.

In accordance with its deliberative mandate, the Board confirms:

- **Academic Attainment:** Final module grades and the corresponding credit awarded;
- **Student Progression:** Formal decisions on a student's ability to progress to the next stage of study or their eligibility for a final award;
- **Reassessment Framework:** Specific requirements for resubmission or referral for students who have not yet met the learning outcomes.

To ensure students can plan their next academic steps, the Student Support Office notifies students of the Board's findings via university email within 5 working days of the meeting. This notification include:

- Finalized module grades;
- Progression status;
- Detailed requirements and deadlines for any required resubmissions.

8. Record Keeping

8.1 Assessment Records

Programme Leaders are responsible for ensuring the following are submitted to Academic Registry within 10 working days of the Assessment Board:

- All submitted student work [maintained digitally within the VLE]
- Assessment briefs and marking criteria
- Moderation records

- Academic Misconduct Records, including evidence (e.g., Turnitin reports), student statements, and formal outcome records.

Academic Registry maintains these records for minimum 6 years after completion of programme or student withdrawal.

8.2 Extension and Mitigating Circumstances Records

Student Support Services collects, and Academic Registry maintains:

- All extension/mitigating circumstances forms
- Supporting evidence
- Decisions and rationale
- Communication with students

Records are retained for minimum 6 years post-graduation.

8.3 Assessment Board Records

Academic Registry maintains:

- Board minutes
- Attendance records
- Grade sheets
- Progression/award decisions

Records are retained for minimum 6 years post-graduation.

9. Policy Information

Document Owner: Academic Registry

Approved by: Academic Council

Effective Date: 08.01.2026

Review Date: 08.01.2027

Version: 1.0

Related Documents:

- Assessment Regulations
- Quality Enhancement Policy
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Complaints and Appeals Policy
- Extension Request Form
- Mitigating Circumstances Form

