**QUALITY ASSURANCE STANDING GROUP**

**UNCONFIRMED minutes of the meeting held on 14th January 2015**

**Present:** C Symonds (Chair), R Chater, J De Vekey, B Dyer, E Mayo-Ward, H Mitchell, R Rogers (Clerk), P Ryland, N Silvennoinen (Secretary)

**In attendance:** M Frampton (observing)

**Apologies:** J Freeman, A Main, C Merrett, K Phalp, G Roushan, R Stafford

**1 Minutes of the meeting held on 11th JULy 2014**

1.1 The previous minutes were confirmed as an accurate record of the meeting.

**2 Matters arising**

2.1 **Minute 5.2 (17.10.13) – Management of a Late Submission -** Schools to consider the management of the process whereby Assessment Board discretion may allow a late submission, which would have been a pass had the student submitted on time. **Completed** - (Update 14.01.15) This was considered at QASG January 2015 as part of the Assessment Regulations review.

2.2 **Minute 2.7 (14.03.14) - Aligning the new Student Records System with the standard assessment regulations** - A number of changes to the assessment regulations would not come into effect until September 2015, but would need to be approved earlier by Senate to allow ease of implementation of the new Student Records System (SRS). Senate was scheduled to meet again in February 2015 prior to the SRS implementation which would better align with the annual review of standard assessment regulations undertaken by QASG in January. **Completed** - (Update 14.01.15) This was considered at QASG January 2015 as part of the Assessment Regulations review.

2.3 **Minute 4.4.5 (14.03.14) – Developing a more streamlined approach for managing UK Credit transfer as part of the SRS implementation plan** - Policy and Procedural changes relating to this were still going through the deliberative committee structure for approval. EDQ and Student Administration would meet following committee approval. **Completed -** (Update 11.07.14) A meeting had been held to discuss this and it would be incorporated if possible.

2.4 **Minute 6.1.3 (06.05.14) - 6J - Mitigating Circumstances including extensions: Policy and Procedure** - EDQ to obtain feedback on the short-term sickness notification process from Schools/Faculties prior to republication of *ARPP* 6J. **Completed** - (Update 14.01.15) Schools/Faculties were contacted after the summer assessment boards and no issues were raised.

2.5 **Minute 6.1.4 (06.05.14) - 6J - Mitigating Circumstances including extensions: Policy and Procedure** - EDQ to update *ARPP 6J* to advise the designated person receiving the call (for short-term sickness notification) does not approve (or otherwise) the request for mitigating circumstances. **Completed -** (Update 14.01.15) This was added to *ARPP 6J* V3.0.

2.6 **Minute 6.1.5 (06.05.14) - 6J - Mitigating Circumstances including extensions: Policy and Procedure** - EDQ and the Programme Administrator Representative to consider the structure of existing information within Appendix 3 of *ARPP* *6J*. **Completed -** (Update 14.01.15) A meeting was held between the PA QASG rep and EDQ to discuss this.

2.7 **Minute 4.2 (11.07.14) - Academic Administration Manager representative** - The Academic Administration Team to confirm the Academic Administration Manager (AAM) representative on QASG. **Completed** - (Update 14.01.15) Heather Mitchell was the new AAM representative.

2.8 **Minute 4.3 (11.07.14) – Faculty of Science and Technology representatives** - The Faculty of Science and Technology to confirm their academic representatives on QASG. **Completed** - (Update 14.01.15) Keith Phalp and Rick Stafford were the academic representatives for the Faculty.

2.9 **Minute 5.5 (11.07.14) - Management of mid-Level assessment outcomes for incoming mobility students** - Following the changes proposed by QASG relating to the management of mid-Level assessment outcomes for incoming mobility students, this would be considered by AAT for feedback prior to implementation. **Ongoing** – (Update 14.01.15) This was raised at AAT. A final template letter with provisional marks was circulated to AAMs from Academic Partnerships.

2.10 **Minute 6.5 (11.07.14) FdSc Computing – Yeovil College** - To confirm with the Faculty of Science and Technology how the QASG decision relating to the FdSc Computing proposal would be communicated back to Yeovil College. **Completed** - (Update 14.01.15) Yeovil College was communicated to by the Chair of QASG.

**3.0 UPDATES ON RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY QASG TO ASC AND SENATE**

3.1 There were no updates to report.

**4 CONFIRMATION OF TERMS OF REFERENCE / QASG MEMBERSHIP UPDATE FOR 2014-15**

4.1 QASG noted its Terms of Reference and its remit to discuss and advise ASC on policy, regulations and procedures associated with the quality assurance and enhancement framework.

4.2 Heather Mitchell was welcomed to QASG as the Academic Administration Manager Representative. The Academic Partnerships representative would no longer attended QASG. QASG would like to thank Katy Fisher for her involvement with the committee.

4.3 A number of apologies from academic colleagues had been received for this meeting of QASG. With the strategic shift from Schools to Faculties, QASG membership was discussed. In order to determine strong academic representation on this committee, it was agreed that QASG academic attendees would propose three Faculty academic representatives with a strong knowledge of quality assurance processes to attend QASG, with the assumption that two of them would normally attend. These may be members of the Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group.

**ACTION**: QASG academic representatives to propose three Faculty academic representatives (to the Chair of QASG) with the assumption that normally 2 of them would attend QASG.

**ACTION**: EDQ to update the Terms of Reference to reflect these changes for ASC approval.

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

To approve the changes to QASG membership within its Terms of Reference due to Faculty restructuring and to strengthen academic representation on QASG.

**5 RATIFICATION OF REVISED *9B – QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT GROUP: PROCEDURE***

5.1 There had been an established practice in place whereby Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG) members were expected to be independent of their own School/Faculty to which the QAEG activity related to. In light of the University’s strategic aim to reduce the number of Schools, QASG considered the role of QAEG members and how their independence may be affected by this. Working on the basis that the University considered the appointment of an external examiner from the same department of the same institution to a different framework in a different subject area, EDQ initially proposed a similar approach to this for the use of QAEG members, whereby: QAEG members may now be used from within the same Faculty/Partner providing they were from a different academic group/department and were independent of the provision the activity related to.

5.2 During November 2014, this proposal was communicated to QASG for their feedback. There were no concerns raised by QASG members and an updated version of *9B – Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG): Procedure* was provided for ratification. QASG requested that QAEG ‘independence’ was clarified as having no direct involvement in the teaching, management and delivery of the provision. Other relevant *ARPP* documents would be updated to reflect the change in QAEG independence. Faculties and relevant departments would be informed of these changes by EDQ.

**ACTION**: EDQ to republish *9B – Quality Assurance and Enhancement Group (QAEG): Procedure* to the *ARPP* subject to the amendment as per 5.2 and to update other *ARPP* documents to reflect the changes in QAEG independence and to inform Faculties and relevant departments of the change.

**6 REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS AND ASSOCIATED PROCEDURAL CHANGE**

6.1 ASC had asked QASG to review the implementation of regulatory and procedural changes for reassessment as part of the annual review of assessment regulations. To inform the current review, feedback was invited from chairs, secretaries and independent members of Assessment Boards. Matters brought directly to the attention of EDQ were also included in the review. School and Faculty Quality Reports were scrutinised for issues and external examiners’ feedback. QASG was asked to consider the following proposed changes for consideration by ASC.

6.2 **Late submission (Procedure 6L) -** Carrying a capped mark forward as the reassessment outcome

6.2.1 When students submitted a piece of assessment late (but within 3 weeks of the deadline) and had it been a pass if it had been submitted on time, Assessment Boards may use their discretion and allow this piece of work to be carried forward to the next Board as the reassessment, capped at the pass mark. However, feedback indicated that this process was confusing for staff and students and could be seen as disadvantaging students who submitted on time and marginally failed against those who submitted up to three weeks later. Issues with hand in deadlines close to Assessment Board dates were also raised, as was the management of late work submitted to Reassessment Boards.

6.2.2 QASG agreed that whilst the principle should remain, there should be clearer guidance on operationalising the process. QASG heard that most students who submitted late normally did so within 24 hours. QASG recommended that there should be no Board discretion to allow consistency of approach and to only allow this process for students who submitted late up to three calendar days (72 hours) after the submission date and time. This approach would allow Programme Administrators time to process assessments and, if appropriate, contact students who had not submitted on time. The mark of zero would still show up on the Board report, but the Assessment Board and/or the Reassessment Board would then accept the Late Submission capped at that Board which would apply to assessments submitted as for the first time and/or subsequent reassessments. Section 9 of *6A -* S*tandard Assessment Regulations* would be amended to reflect this. It was noted that Section 12 would also need to be reviewed to make it explicit that any late submission accepted in this way would count towards the student’s overall reassessment allowance for the level.

NB The three week late submission period would still remain. Staff would still be advised to mark and provide feedback to students on late submissions submitted after this 3 day deadline but still within three weeks. Work submitted after 3 weeks would still be treated as a non-submission

6.2.3 QASG agreed this process would provide transparency to staff and students when managing marginally late submissions. A new Student Records System code may be required.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO ASC:**

1. To recommend to Senate that Section 9, ‘Submission of Coursework and Attendance at Examinations’ of *6A -* *Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) be amended to stipulate that a maximum mark of 40 (UG) or 50 (PG) will be awarded to coursework if submitted within 72 hours after the deadline. To recommend that Section 12, ‘Provision for Failed Candidates’ be amended to make it explicit that a late submission accepted in this way forms part of the reassessment allowance *(see proposed amendments to Sections 9.1-9.2 and 12.3 of Appendix 1)*.
2. To give in-principle approval for associated procedural updates to *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure.*

**ACTION**: (Subject to Committee approval) Student Processes and EDQ to determine how the process will be best managed for the purposes of Assessment Board reporting.

6.3 **Provision for failed candidates (Regulation 6A) -** Equal reassessment limit for all students

6.3.1 Concern was expressed as to whether Boards should have some discretion regarding the number of reassessments granted to students who had exceeded their reassessment entitlement, if it was not deemed in their interest to be reassessed in a large number of credits at one time. QASG noted that, currently, if students chose not to be reassessed in some or all reassessments then they did not have to be, although it would result in higher fees when repeating units. QASG agreed that Boards should have discretion to exceptionally allow less reassessment if it was perceived to be in the academic interest of the student. In this case, a detailed rationale should be recorded in the Board minutes and the student counseled accordingly.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO ASC:**

1. To recommend to Senate that Section 12, ‘Provision for Failed Candidates’ of *6A -* *Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) be amended to allow Boards to exceptionally determine a lower reassessment limit for students who exceed the level entitlement for reassessment if this is perceived to be in their academic interest *(see proposed amendments to Sections 12.4 and 12.7 of Appendix 1).*
2. To give in-principle approval for associated procedural updates to *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure*.

6.4 **Provision for failed candidates (Regulation 6A) -** Failing reassessment due to the new capping rule

6.4.1 Concern was expressed that where a student was required to be reassessed in more than one formal assessment element, they would fail the unit in line with the new capping rule unless they received a minimum mark of 40 (or 50) in all reassessed element(s). QASG agreed that the regulation should not be reconsidered but current guidance within *ARPP 6L* should make it explicit that students must achieve an element pass (i.e. a minimum mark of 40, or 50) in order to pass reassessment.

**ACTION**: EDQ to further clarify in *ARPP 6L* that where students are reassessed they must achieve a formal element mark of 40 (or 50) to ensure they pass the unit overall.

(Clerk note: May 2015) Following further discussion, it was clarified within *ARPP 6L* that the student must be able to achieve the overall unit pass mark

6.5 **Provision for failed candidates (Procedure 6L) -** Board discretion to determine reassessments and repetition within a Level

6.5.1 Where students exceeded the reassessment limit for a Level, Assessment Boards may be required to exercise discretion to determine reassessments/repetition. The current *ARPP 6L* included guidance to help Boards identify units for completion by reassessment/repetition, but further clarification was requested, for example, to choose partially failed units over fully failed units. QASG discussed this and agreed that this additional clarification should be added to the current guidance in *ARPP 6L*.

**ACTION:** EDQ to clarify in existing guidance in *ARPP 6L* that partially failed units should be chosen over fully failed units.

6.6 **Compensation (Regulation 6A) -** Credit limit for compensation and failed Pass/Fail elements:

6.6.1 The current regulations were recently interpreted to accommodate unit compensation where a student had achieved a mark of 38 in a 40-credit unit but had also failed a formal Pass/Fail element in another unit. As a Fail does not alter the numerical mark profile for the unit, this was deemed to be within the regulations as the overall unit mark was over 40. QASG discussed this and agreed that compensation should not apply if a Pass/Fail element had been failed in addition to the failed units being considered for compensation. QASG agreed that this should be made explicit in the regulation and *ARPP 6L*.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO ASC:**

1. To recommend to Senate that Section 7 ‘Compensation’ of *6A - Standard Assessment Regulations* (all awards) be amended to make explicit that failed Pass/Fail elements must be considered in the same way as units with failed numerical elements when compensation decisions are made *(see proposed amendment to Section 7.1 of Appendix 1).*
2. To give in-principle approval for associated procedural updates to *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure*.

6.7 **Classification (Regulation 6A) -** Use of the profile regulation

6.7.1 The profile regulation was available for final awards and could not be applied to intermediate awards. Within the Faculty of Health and Social Sciences (HSS), a programme leading to professional registration had a DipHE as its highest award and it had been queried whether the profile regulation could apply in this case. QASG agreed that the profile regulation should apply where the award of DipHE had been designed as the final award for academic and/or professional body reasons. This would be in line with Foundation degrees which were seen as final rather than intermediate awards and included the profile regulation. Conversely, BA/BSc (Hons) awards were known as the final level of undergraduate awards but were becoming increasingly available as an intermediate award on integrated masters programmes. It was agreed that the profile regulation should apply to Level H of an Integrated Masters award to ensure parity with Honours degrees (see Section 7.6.1 below).

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

1. To approve the principle that the profile regulation may be applied where the award of DipHE is designed as the final award. Any such exceptions to the standard assessment regulations should be approved through the framework evaluation process.

**ACTION**: (Subject to Committee approval of recommendation) EDQ to liaise with HSS regarding the Faculty’s existing DipHE provision.

6.8 **Provision for failed candidates (Regulation 6A) -** Overall unit mark where a Pass/Fail element is failed:

6.8.1 Concern was expressed regarding units which included formal elements that were assessed on a Pass/Fail basis, often in relation to practice assessments. Where a student failed a formal Pass/Fail element, this could not be numerically ‘capped’ and therefore had no impact on the assessment outcome. In the past, the full unit mark would have been capped but currently only failed formal elements were capped so a student could still achieve a high overall unit mark and the failed element would be masked*.* QASG discussed this as it had been brought to its attention and agreed that HSS should consider the management of this during the design of their provision.

**ACTION**: EDQ to inform the Deputy Dean (Education) for the Faculty of HSS that failed formal Pass/Fail elements in relation to practice assessments should be considered during the design of the provision.

6.9 **Board reporting clarification (Procedure 6L) -** Reassessment of formal elements below the pass mark but above the mark of 36 (or 46)

6.9.1 It had been requested that Board Reports highlighted cases where a student failed a formal element and had received a mark of less than 40 (or 50) in one or more other formal assessment elements. As the failed element would be capped and compensation would not apply to reassessments, the student would fail the unit unless they were required to be reassessed in all such elements (NB also see Section 6.4.1 above regarding the subsequent reassessment pass mark). It was anticipated that this would be highlighted on the Board reports produced via SITS. An update was required from Student Administration whether this could be added to Unit-E during the current cycle. EDQ would also raise this with the Academic Administration Managers (AAMs) and include this in staff development sessions for Assessment Board members.

**ACTION**: Student Processes to update QASG if Unit-E could highlight all formal elements requiring reassessment during 2014-15.

**ACTION**: EDQ to liaise with AAMs and to include reference to formal elements requiring reassessment within relevant staff development sessions.

6.10 **Provision for failed candidates (Procedure ARPP 6L) -** Foundation degree students progressing ‘at risk’ to Level P of a standard degree programme

QASG was asked to consider the ‘unofficial placement’ process in relation to Foundation degree students who progressed ‘at risk’ to Level P of a standard degree programme whilst they still had outstanding reassessments/extensions due to mitigation. Concern was expressed on the impact on both the student and the employer where the student subsequently fell short of a progression hurdle for Level H/6 study. QASG discussed this and agreed that the student should meet the entry requirements of the receiving programme before progressing. EDQ would advise this to the relevant School/Faculty.

**ACTION**: EDQ to advise the relevant School/Faculty that Foundation degree students should meet the entry requirements to the receiving programme before progressing.

6.11 QASG noted the proposed classification bands in the new Student Records Systems which would be submitted to Senate and had previously been supported by QASG and endorsed by ASC.

**7 INTEGRATED MASTERS ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS**

7.1 To align with the strategic aim to introduce Integrated Masters awards across its taught provision, EDQ developed a set of standard assessment regulations for this purpose based on the principles within *6A -* *Standard Assessment Regulations* for undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes. Regulations and processes from 17 other HEIs were considered which demonstrated much variance across the sector. The current non-standard assessment regulations for the Master of Engineering (Hons) (MEng (Hons)) Integrated Masters award at BU also helped inform these regulations. A number of issues required further discussion by QASG resulting in recommendations being made to ASC and Senate for their approval.

7.2 **Periods of Registration (Section 5 of the Regulations)**

7.2.1 Where other HEIs documented that they offered a part-time route, the period of registration varied (where this information was made available), although several HEIs stipulated 10 years. QASG considered a registration period for PT routes of 10 years, which reflected an incremental increase from UG provision in line with the additional 120 credits at Level M/7, and agreed it to be appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

To recommend to Senate that the Period of Registration be set at 10 years for part-time Integrated Masters awards.

7.3 **Progression (Section 8 of the Regulations)**

7.3.1 Progression hurdles may be stipulated to ensure students were able to both study at a higher Level and were not being set up for failure. For entry to PG provision, a number of PG taught programmes across BU stipulated 2:1 or 2:2 UG degree classifications as part of their entry requirements. Whilst the sector research greatly varied in regards to progression hurdles, some required hurdles between Levels I/5 and H/6, between Levels H/6 and M/7 or between all of those listed. Where hurdles were stipulated, the Level aggregates varied, although 50% or 55% were the preference. QASG agreed there should be a progression hurdle placed between Levels H/6 and M/7 with an aggregate pass mark of 50%, as per the current MEng (Hons) award.

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

To recommend to Senate that a progression hurdle should be set between Levels H/6 and M/7 with an aggregate pass mark of 50%.

7.4 **Classification – Aggregate weightings (Section 11 of the Regulations)**

7.4.1 The sector research greatly varied when determining classification weighting of the Integrated Masters award. However, it tended to favour incorporating Levels I/5, H/6 and M/7 with a preference towards incremental increases in weighting as per the approach used within the MEng (Hons) regulations, although some HEIs did weight Levels H/6 and M7 equally e.g. 40% and 40% where Level I/5 was (for example) weighted at 20%. QASG agreed that a standard classification based on 15% Level I/5 units, 35% Level H/6 units and 50% Level M/7 units (as per the MEng (Hons) award) was appropriate.

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

To recommend to Senate that a standard classification be set based on 15% Level I/5 units, 35% Level H/6 units and 50% Level M/7 units.

7.4.2 If students were permitted to enter an Integrated Masters award via Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) / UK Credit Transfer, the aggregate weightings would need to be altered for those entering at Level H/6. Where students entered the current MEng (Hons) award at Level H/6 the classification was based on an aggregate weighting of 50% and 50%.

7.4.3 QASG considered aggregate weightings for students entering at Level H/6, and agreed it should be on a ratio of 40% and 60% to allow students the opportunity to embed into their studies.

7.4.4 QASG considered this and agreed that students should be allowed to enter an Integrated Masters award at Levels I/5 or the start of Level H/6 which would align with *3P – Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) and UK Credit Transfer: Policy and Procedure*. However, whilst the full RPL / UK Credit Transfer limits for certificated learning (up to 2/3s of the award) would permit students to enter the Integrated Masters award with only 40 credits to complete at Level H/6, QASG did not think this would align with the nature of the Integrated Masters award, but could be exceptionally considered for Professional Body purposes. QASG discussed the appropriateness of entry to the final year and noted that it would not align with *ARPP 3P* and may impact upon recruitment to the University’s postgraduate provision.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO ASC:**

1. To recommend to Senate that a standard classification be based on 40% Level H/6 units and 60% Level M/7 units for students entering at Level H/6.
2. To recommend to Senate that students should not enter an Integrated Masters award after the commencement of Level H/6 (unless Professional requirements specifically permit this).
3. To give in-principle approval for any associated procedural updates to *3P – Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) and UK Credit Transfer: Policy and Procedure.*

7.5 **Classification – Aggregate mark (Section 11 of the Regulations)**

7.5.1 The MEng (Hons) award was classified as per the UG classification. The sector research greatly supported this approach providing Level H/6 was included in the weighting of the award, even where award titles did and did not include (Hons). Only a small number of HEIs used aggregate marks of Pass, Merit and Distinction and this seemed to be when Level M/7 consisted of 180 credits or classification was based only on Level M/7 units. QASG considered this and recommended that the aggregate mark classification should be based on the UG classification.

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

To recommend to Senate that the University adopts the UG Classification as the standard approach to classify Integrated Masters Awards.

7.6 **Classification – Board Discretion for the award of Bachelors degree (Section 11 of the Regulations)**

7.6.1 Students who performed at a higher classification than their aggregate mark in at least 2/3rds of their final Level credits would be awarded the higher classification if the aggregate mark was no more than 3.0% below the classification boundary. Equally, where the aggregate mark fell more than 0.5% below the classification boundary but remained within 1.0% of it, the Assessment Board may use its discretion and award the student the higher classification as long as this was justified by the student’s overall performance. This would apply as standard to the Integrated Masters award. QASG noted that the intermediate Bachelors award was ordinarily a final award in its own right and agreed that the profile regulation and the 1% Board discretion should apply to this intermediate award.

**RECOMMENDATIONS TO ASC:**

1. To recommend to Senate that the Profile Regulation be applied to the Intermediate Bachelors degree award.
2. To give in-principle approval for any associated procedural updates to *6L – Assessment Board Decision-Making, including the Implementation of Assessment Regulations: Procedure*, including reference to the 1% Board discretion applying to the intermediate Bachelors degree.

7.7 **2A – Awards of the University: Policy**

7.7.1 QASG was presented with amended wording in *2A – Awards of the University: Policy* for consideration. With the ongoing development of Integrated Masters awards across BU, one generic statement for all Integrated Masters awards was proposed using a definition from the *Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ)* (October 2014) to replace the current practice of defining each individual award. The new Integrated Masters award titles were also included. The amended wording to section 7.5.1.3 was also noted.

7.7.2 QASG recommended the wording be forwarded to Senate for approval. It was noted that within the Faculty of Management a Master of Management (with Honours) (MMan (Hons)) was currently being developed and should be added to *ARPP 2A* for Senate approval (subject to pending subsequent ASC approval for the proposal).

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

To recommend to Senate that the amended wording in *2A – Awards of the University: Policy* be approved and published to the *Academic Regulations Policies and Procedures*.

7.8 Any changes made to the *Standard Assessment Regulations* through the annual assessment regulations review (as per section 6 of these minutes) would also need to be reflected in the Integrated Masters regulations.

**8 REVIEW OF THE INDEPENDENT MARKING PROCEDURE (IMP)**

8.1 In March 2014, QASG considered BU assessment practices against the *UK Quality Code Chapter B6: Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning*. QASG subsequently recommended to ASC (May 2014) that the current IMP be amended to incorporate internal moderation as an alternative to second and double marking. ASC supported the proposal in principle but asked that QASG produce a fully revised IMP for University approval. Senate (June 2014) subsequently received a paper on the related policy changes but asked that these be put on hold until a fully revised procedure became available for ASC and Senate scrutiny. QASG was tasked with considering the revisions, to note clarifications and section restructuring and to finalise the proposal for ASC scrutiny.

8.2 Sector research was undertaken and a revised version of *6D - Marking, Independent Marking and Moderation: Policy and Procedure* was presented to QASG which included Internal Moderation whereby an internal assessor confirmed the proper application of the assessment processes by the first marker(s), and would be undertaken as an alternative to Second and Double Marking. It also included a revised definition of Second Marking whichrequired the second marker to mark with prior knowledge of the first marker’s comments and mark. It was anticipated that both Second and Double Marking may include an element of Internal Moderation. QASG discussed the three definitions for Independent Marking (internal moderation, second and double marking) and considered them to be appropriate. The process of Internal Moderation was welcomed and QASG noted the inclusion of examples when it would not be appropriate.

8.3 QASG was also tasked with discussing whether the practice of changing individual students’ marks within a sample without reviewing all marks in the set continued to be appropriate. QASG debated this and agreed it was no longer appropriate for inclusion. In addition, a number of other amendments were proposed and the agreed changes, some of which were for clarification purposes, can be summarised as follows:

i. Clarify in the IMP that independent marking does not involve changes to an individual student’s mark except where dissertations/final projects are subject to blind double marking to ensure that students who are in the sample are not advantaged/disadvantaged over students whose work is not included;

ii. Clarify under internal moderation that the independent marker reviews the quality of the first marker’s comments;

iii. Make explicit in the procedure that teams must ensure that their independent marking arrangements are in line with the requirements outlined in the procedure;

iv. Clarify current practice within Faculties to establish whether students receive an agreed mark and comments for double marked dissertations/final projects or each marker’s mark and/or comments in full (where second marked, only the agreed mark and comments are returned to the student);

v. Make explicit that a lead person must be identified where there are more than one first and/or second markers to ensure overview of the marking arrangements for each assessment task;

vi. Cross reference the sections more clearly where the principles of internal moderation apply to second/double marking and ensure consistent terminology within the procedure.

**RECOMMENDATION TO ASC:**

1. That the changes to *6D - Marking, Independent Marking and Moderation: Policy and Procedure*, including a revised Independent Marking Procedure are endorsed as appropriate for Senate approval with effect from academic year 2015-16 (see separate paper).

**9 ASSESSMENT PRACTICE UPDATE**

9.1 QASG has been tasked to provide updates on ‘Assessment and Feedback’ from the Schools/Faculties in relation to areas such as peer review, assessment briefs and feedback. Updates on midyear progress reviews would also be required. The necessary paperwork would be forwarded from EDQ and considered at a future meeting of QASG. With the move to Faculties, it was also seen as an opportunity to consider a more standardised approach to this across the University. Any general feedback on enhancing Assessment and Feedback should be sent to the Chair of QASG.

**ACTION**: EDQ to request updates from School/Faculties on assessment practice.

**ACTION**: QASG to send any feedback on enhancing Assessment and Feedback to the Chair of QASG.

**10 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

10.1 **Student Mobility at Level H/6**

It was noted that student exchanges at Level H/6 could have an impact upon student’s overall classification and assessments. This has been added to a future meeting of QASG for further discussion.

10.2 **Anonymous marking**

HSS advised there was a requirement for anonymous marking on some of their provision. Students were also asking about it. This has been added to a future meeting of QASG for further discussion.

**11 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of QASG would be held on Monday 23rd March 2015.