

Student Assessment and Academic Misconduct

Policy and Procedures

Quality Assurance Benchmarking

This policy and procedure maps to the following external quality assurance frameworks: QAA Quality Code Chapter B6: Assessment of students, with references to Indicators 2,3,5,6 and 9.

Document History

Originated by: Quality Manager	Date: 04/09/17	Circulation: Academic Quality Committee, Principal, Programme Tutors, Academic Registry, Student Forum
Updated by: Academic Registrar	Date: 10/06/21	
First Approved by: Academic Quality Committee, September 2015	Date of next review: 07/22	
File Location: v:\education\registry\policies\updated 2021\student assessment and academic misconduct policies 2021.docx		

Document Overview	3
1. Student Assessment Policy.....	3
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Rationale	3
1.3 The scheme.....	4
1.4 Assessment Board responsibilities.....	6
1.5 Programme Advisers.....	7
1.6 External Examiners	7
1.7 Assessment criteria.....	8
1.8 Assessment procedures.....	9
1.9 The Grading process.....	10
1.10 Classification of an award	12
1.11 Fail and Referral	13
1.12 Failure to Retrieve	14
1.13 Reasonable Adjustments and Alternative Forms of Assessment	14
1.14 Mitigating circumstances	15
1.15 Late submission.....	15
1.16 Appeals (assessments).....	16
1.17 Termination of study.....	17
2. Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures.....	18
2.1 Principles	18
2.2 Collusion	18
2.3 Personation	18
2.4 Plagiarism.....	18
2.5 Unseen examinations	19
2.6 Allegations of misconduct.....	19
2.7 Major or Minor cases of misconduct.....	19
2.8 Procedure for Minor cases of suspected misconduct	20
2.9 Procedure of Major cases of suspected misconduct	20
2.10 Penalties	21
3. Overview Responsibilities	23
Appendix 1 – Generic Learning Outcomes.....	25
Foundation Degree	25
Graduate Diploma	27
Postgraduate (MA and MFA)	29
Appendix 2 – Assessment Boards	31

Document Overview

This document covers two inter-related areas of the College's academic provision. Firstly, the **Student Assessment Policy** and secondly the **Academic Misconduct Policy**. The policies should be read in conjunction with the **Student Complaints and Academic Appeals Policy** and the **Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedure**.

I. Student Assessment Policy

I.1 Introduction

I.1.1 Assessment strategies for each programme, and for individual units of study within each programme, are included in each definitive programme document. Details of the grading scheme which is adhered to by all programmes are set out below in I.9. The consistent implementation of this aims to ensure that the academic and professional standards for each award are set and maintained at the appropriate level and that student performance is judged accordingly.

I.1.2 The assessment process is designed to allow students and staff to compare programme aims with learning outcomes. It provides appropriate and timely feedback on assessed work in a way that promotes learning and facilitates improvement but does not increase the burden of assessment.

I.1.3 Benefits to the students include:

- Identification of achievement
- Involvement in an experience that is itself part of the learning process
- Feedback that identifies strengths and allows weaknesses to be addressed
- Effective and appropriate measurement of performance in terms of learning outcomes

I.1.4 Benefits to the staff include:

- A means of offering students guidance in evaluating their own progress
- A means of monitoring and evaluating the programme
- A basis for progression from one block of study to the next
- A basis for awarding a graduate or postgraduate diploma or an FdA/MA/MFA degree

I.2 Rationale

I.2.1 The scheme reflects careful consideration of national and international expectations and also reflects the particular ethos of West Dean and our aim to develop reflective professional

practitioners in the creative arts and conservation. The scheme is based on the following principles:

- That assessment should be a process that promotes effective learning
- That assessment should foster the development of critical self-awareness and independent practice
- That published and implemented principles and procedures for, and processes of, all assessment are explicit, valid and reliable
- That assessment is conducted with rigour, probity and fairness and with due regard for security
- That it should ensure an equitable distribution of the student workload across the year
- That if learning outcomes are fulfilled, students should be awarded credit toward the successful completion of units of study at each level (4, 5, 6 and 7)

1.3 The scheme

1.3.1 The attribution of credits and Framework for Higher Qualifications in England levels for different qualifications is as follows¹:

Qualification	Credits	FHEQ Level (s)
Foundation Degree	240	4 & 5
Graduate Diploma	120	6
Postgraduate Diploma (Exit Award)	120	7
Master of Arts	180	7

1.3.2 Students taking the MFA degree complete a total of 240 credits at Level 7. In keeping with national HE frameworks 120 credits at either level represents one academic year of full-time study and under the provision at West Dean, the 180 credits required for the completion of an MA degree in Conservation Studies can be achieved through one calendar year of full-time study.

1.3.3 The 180 credits for the MA in Creative Writing and Publishing and MA Collections Care & Conservation Management can be achieved through two academic years of part time study.

1.3.4 The scheme operates within an academic teaching year of 36 weeks. The teaching year is divided into two semesters. For students registered for an MA degree in Conservation

¹ <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Framework-Higher-Education-Qualifications-08.pdf>

Studies, the academic teaching year is extended by a further 10 weeks of full-time study into a 46 week calendar year.

- I.3.5 There are two summative Assessment Points for full time courses during the 36-week teaching year, one at the end of each semester. At the end of Semester 1 progression is recorded for all full time courses. At the July assessment point progression to the second year of two year programmes is recorded and the final results/awards are ratified for all diplomas and two year degree programmes. For part time courses, there is one summative assessment point at the end of each year of study in July. For the 46 week MA programmes, there is a further Assessment Point at the end of September when the additional credit for the award of the MA degree may be awarded.
- I.3.7 Continuous feedback is provided throughout the year in tutorials, and students are made aware of their level of performance and what they need to do in order to progress. At the end of each unit students receive written feedback related to the learning outcomes supported by formative feedback on areas for improvement. Formative written and verbal feedback is also given during units.
- I.3.8 A unit is a self-contained credit rated provision of study. A unit carries a minimum of 5 and up to a maximum of 60 credits. The credit rating for a particular unit represents a proportion of the overall total credit for the level of the programme. The unit is weighted in order to reflect its proportion of the total student study time and workload for the teaching year.
- I.3.9 The study week is approximately 35 hours, which over the year equates to one credit being equal to 10 hours of study. Due to the practice based nature of all programmes, extended workshop opening hours (which are 7.00 am until 10.00 pm seven days a week) provide flexibility for students to manage their time in relation to the demands of their individual projects.
- I.3.10 Credit ratings are consistent with the College's Credit Accumulation and Transfer Scheme, i.e. 120 credits corresponding to 36 weeks of full-time study. Assessed work within a unit is quantified in such a way that it is proportional to the amount of credit that can be awarded.
- I.3.11 Units of study may be consecutive, concurrent or a combination of both. The sequencing of units is determined with reference to the programme specification. All units are delivered and assessed within the pattern of the teaching year.
- I.3.12 Each unit of study has a description detailing:
- The aims and learning outcomes
 - The content
 - The learning and teaching methods
 - The assessment requirements
 - The assessment criteria

- An indicative reading list
- I.3.13 Students work on a number of individual assignments, appropriate to their programme of study, and produce objects, artefacts or artwork with associated documentation. They take part in lectures, seminars, presentations and visits, and complete written work in the form of essays, scripts for presentations or dissertations.
- I.3.14 Programme documents, set out the units on offer and their sequence during the year. Access to all documents is provided through the Student VLE. The Principal, as part of quality assurance arrangements, ensures that all modifications and/or additions are incorporated on an annual basis. Modifications and/or additions may arise from specifications made from time-to-time by the QAA and identified either by the College or by the University of Sussex.
- I.3.15 Information related to the operation of the unitised scheme is issued to all students at the beginning of the academic year. Students are issued with unit descriptions and assignments at the commencement of each unit of study. This information includes submission deadlines, the timing of student assessments and reviews, and feedback on progression.
- I.3.16 If a student does not achieve a pass in a unit, a Referral may be awarded. A student awarded a Referral, following the attribution of a grade 4 for a unit, is given a period of time in which to repeat work and then have it reassessed (see *the Grading Process*, section 1.9 below).
- I.3.17 The Referral period is a maximum of six weeks from the date of the outcome of the assessment.. All units must be passed in order for an award to be made or in order that a student can progress to the next stage of the programme. A student's assessment may be deferred due to illness or other extenuating circumstances, in which case a revised schedule of assessment may be agreed by the Programme Tutor with approval by the relevant assessment board (see 1.13 *Mitigating circumstances*).

I.4 Assessment Board responsibilities

- I.4.1 The Assessment Board has formal responsibilities for:
- Confirming marks, grades and awarding credits.
 - Approval of the results lists for all units and pass lists for the Awards.
 - The drawing up of formal pass lists and passing these to the appropriate bodies for conferment.
 - The consideration of all candidates who do not pass a unit of study at a summative assessment point, including referrals and assessments that are deferred due to extenuating circumstances.
 - The formal notification of Referral or Fail to any candidates who do not pass a unit of study.
 - Considering all suspected cases of plagiarism and cheating. The Assessment Board Chair shall appoint members of the panel other than the Chair who will usually be the Principal.
 - Monitoring the quality of programme provision and making recommendations

- Receiving and responding to immediate (verbal) External Examiner reports and comments.
- The recommendations of candidates to the University of Sussex for the final awards.

I.4.2 In the event of any candidate querying the decision of the Assessment Board, arbitration is via the College's Academic Appeals Procedure (**Student Complaints and Academic Appeals Policy** section 5).

I.4.3 The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the Board carries out the responsibilities referred to above and overseeing the process through which the views of all External Examiners are ultimately reported to the Academic Quality Committee (AQC). Any general or specific issues which arise from these minutes must be included in the established programme monitoring processes.

For the composition and terms of reference of Assessment Boards see Appendix 2 below.

I.5 Programme Advisers

I.5.1 The College is committed to ensuring the professional currency of its programmes and involves industry representatives in the design of its programmes and on an ongoing basis. Most programmes have external Programme Advisers drawn from industry and relevant professions, from the public and private sector, and selected for their knowledge of Higher Education and empathy for the ethos and approach of the programmes they serve. They form an important link with industry and the professions and provide productive contacts with specialist networks.

Programme Advisers are appointed for a maximum period of five years in the first instance, which may be extended if mutually desired.

I.6 External Examiners

I.6.1 The University of Sussex appoints an External Examiner for each programme of study normally for a period of four years. An External Examiner may assume responsibility for a number of related programmes within the College provision. External Examiners appointed to their role at West Dean are responsible to the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sussex **and operate in accordance with the University's regulations.**

I.6.2 The College provides nominations for appointment as External Examiners and nominees will typically:

- Hold or have held an academic position in another HE institution.
- Have experience as an internal and/or external examiner in another institution.
- Be highly respected in their field.

- Be experienced in the assessment of students' work at the appropriate level.
- Not have been involved in the teaching of the relevant West Dean programme for the previous five years and will not be employed at the same institution as the previous incumbent.

I.6.3 External Examiners are asked to report on:

- whether the academic standards set for its awards are appropriate.
- the extent to which our assessment processes are rigorous, ensure equity of treatment for students and have been fairly conducted within institutional regulations and guidance.
- the standard of student performance in terms of the stated learning outcomes and criteria for assessment.
- the comparability of standards and student achievements with those in any other higher education institutions.
- good practice they have identified.
- any matters requiring attention and actions.

I.6.4 External Examiners use the University's reporting form and each academic year they are sent a copy of the specifications setting out their duties by the University. They are also provided with definitive programme documents including Programme Specifications and Unit Descriptors by the College, so that details of the assessment processes and grading scheme are clear. They visit the College during assessments, attend meetings of the Assessment Boards, sample and review written work, and submit a comprehensive report following the summer Assessment Board to the University of Sussex. Copies of the report are forwarded to the College where they are circulated to the Principal, Registrar, Quality Manager and relevant Heads of School and Programme Leaders. Programme Leaders respond to the External Examiners Report in the Programme Annual Monitoring Report and any actions arising are included in the Programme Action Plan.

I.7 Assessment criteria

I.7.1 Each unit of study includes assessment criteria selected from one or more of the three domains: Practical, Theoretical and Professional. The principles of assessing learning outcomes in these domains is set out in 1.8.6 below.

I.7.2 The structure and weighting of each domain reflects the emphasis West Dean College places upon practice and technical accomplishment and helps to define our approach to advanced practice. We believe that advanced vocational study needs to be informed by technical knowledge and by critical thinking, located within a theoretical and professional context. Work required, specified in unit descriptions, is designed to provide evidence that learning outcomes

have been met. The exact specification of work required, particularly within the practical domain, is the subject of a negotiated agreement between the student and the tutor.

- I.7.3 The average student to staff ratio of 8:1 and workshop based nature of the provision enables the progress of each individual student to be closely monitored. Work required from an individual student reflects the weighting and learning outcomes of a unit of study and also takes into account the particular needs of the individual. Assessment criteria develop in depth to reflect progression within each level and from level 4 to level 7. An assessment criterion applied in a unit of study of a particular programme may appear again later in the programme, and students are required to exhibit greater fluency, deeper understanding and wider knowledge as they progress. An assessment criterion measures threshold performance of a learning outcome and work required may give evidence that more than one learning outcome has been achieved.
- I.7.4 Continuous improvement is encouraged and expected from students from the beginning of a programme. Work required at the end of a Foundation Degree final year, a Graduate Diploma year or the end of a Masters Degree year is measured against selected generic, as well as programme specific, assessment criteria to ensure that the learning outcomes of the programme have been achieved.

I.8 Assessment procedures

I.8.1 Marking

Practical work is assessed on a continuous basis by pathway specific staff and comments are fed to students informally on an on-going basis through discussion, one-to-one bench tutorials and private tutorials. At assessment and review points the process of continuous assessment is consolidated by two staff members, who share their judgements before grades are agreed and feedback written, usually by one tutor. The same process applies to the assessment of presentations. For written assignments within the pathway specific units, a pathway tutor would assess and a second tutor from a different pathway, would review and moderate 1:3 of the assignments.

For the cross-pathway units in science and contextual studies, where assignments span a larger student cohort, assignments are marked by individual assessors and a sample selection are reviewed and moderated independently by a second tutor at a ratio of 1:3.

I.8.2 Verification by External Examiners

Student numbers in Higher Education at West Dean allow virtually all internally assessed practical work and dissertations to be seen by External Examiners who operate in accordance with regulations specified by the University of Sussex. Prior to the confirmation of a grade list or pass list, the External Examiner is expected to endorse the outcomes of the assessments they have been appointed to scrutinise.

- I.8.3 In the event of an External Examiner not endorsing a grade or the grades in general, the work will be referred back to the College to repeat the first marking process with a different internal marker, and then the External Examiner will moderate the work again. If the internal assessors and External Examiner remain in disagreement about the proposed grades, the matter is then presented to the Chair of the Assessment Board. Beyond this, any unresolved matters may be referred to the Vice Chancellor of the University of Sussex.
- I.8.4 External Examiners normally meet all students and see all, or a major cross section, of marked written work as well as all practical submissions during assessment. Prior to the meeting of the Assessment Board, External Examiners liaise with Programme Advisers where applicable and are asked to convey any general or particular views they may wish to bring to the attention of the Board.
- I.8.5 All credits attained through achieving the learning outcomes as well as the grades which indicate the quality of the students' performance in doing so, remain provisional until agreed at the Assessment Board.
- I.8.6 The learning outcomes are assessed within the context of the three interconnected and interdependent domains: Practical, Theoretical and Professional. These learning outcomes constitute the knowledge, range of skills and attributes a student needs to acquire for a particular award. For a student to successfully address a learning outcome he/she must demonstrate the minimum of a grade 3 performance (see section 1.9 below). A generic set of learning outcomes, typical examples of work required and a generic set of assessment criteria for all the undergraduate and postgraduate programmes are listed in Appendix 1 below. When viewed together learning outcomes help to define graduate and postgraduate qualities in keeping with the framework for Higher Education (FHEQ)² and within the context of practice-based programmes of study. Programme specific learning outcomes are located in the individual programme documents.

1.9 The Grading process

- I.9.1 Students are informed of all deadlines and assessment requirements relating to their units of study during the induction period. Assessment requirements may be revised or modified from time to time and such revisions are published prior to the commencement of a unit of study.
- I.9.2 More than one member of the assessment team is required to consider elements of a student's work. This is achieved either through joint marking on practical units or sample moderation of written assessments and assessments on cross-pathway units. This is to ensure that the

² <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/en/Publications/Documents/Framework-Higher-Education-Qualifications-08.pdf>

aims and learning outcomes of a programme are assessed in an integrated way. Firstly the assessment process determines whether or not the learning outcomes have been achieved using the relevant criteria. Secondly, consideration is given to how well the learning outcomes have been achieved using the grading system. The assessment criteria relate to level 4 and 5 performance for the Foundation Degree, level 6 for the Graduate Diplomas and level 7 performance for the MA and MFA degrees.

1.9.3 At the assessment points the grades for all units of study are considered and confirmed. The following performance descriptions, which are generic and apply to each learning outcome for a unit of study, describe the characteristics of work in each grading band:

1.9.4 Grade 1*

The work assessed demonstrates an advanced level of skill combined with a thorough understanding of practical, theoretical, and professional issues. Research is thorough and analysis draws sound and original conclusions. The student shows exceptional personal and professional initiative and outstanding communication skills. The learning outcomes at the appropriate level (4, 5, 6 or 7) are accurately and expertly addressed.

1.9.5 Grade 2*

The work assessed illustrates a high standard of skill and understanding of practical, theoretical, and professional issues. Research is thorough and the student shows personal initiative and good communication skills. The learning outcomes at the appropriate level (4, 5, 6 or 7) are fully and accurately addressed.

1.9.6 Grade 3*

The work assessed illustrates an adequate grasp of theoretical concepts and practical skills. The student shows personal initiative and effective communication skills. There are no major omissions in the work required or any relevant research and the learning outcomes at the appropriate level (4, 5, 6 or 7) are adequately and properly addressed.

1.9.7 Grade 4*

There are significant omissions in the theoretical or practical elements of the work. There is insufficient evidence of research and personal initiative. A basic level of professionalism may be missing. There is inadequate evidence of overall competence and the learning outcomes at the appropriate level (4, 5, 6 or 7) may be partially, but are not completely addressed. An overall grade 4 in any unit results in a referral (see below).

1.9.8 Grade F*

There are serious deficits in the theoretical or practical elements of the work and very little evidence of research and personal initiative. The learning outcomes at the appropriate level (4, 5, 6 or 7) may be either minimally addressed or not addressed. The failure is such that any offer of retrieval is deemed inappropriate.

* The grades correspond to the percentages in the grade table below.

1.9.9 Calculation of unit grades

For many units the assessment requirement comprises a single component or portfolio of work which is assessed holistically in accordance with the grading scheme above. Where a unit of study consists of a number of assessed components. Each component is assessed and awarded a mark on a percentage scale related to the grading scheme, which enables the calculation of the final unit grade to accurately reflect the relative weighting of each component.

The weighting given to different components is outlined in the unit descriptor.

Where a unit of study contains components that are weighted differently, the overall unit grade is derived using the awarded percentage multiplied by the weighting. An example is provided below:

FdA Historic Craft Practice - Unit HC-HI History of Craft

Assessment method	Weighting	Example Tutor grade	Multiplier	Example conflated grade
Written coursework	70%	60/100	0.7	42
Oral presentation	30%	40/100	0.3	12
	100%			54%

In this example, a conflated grade of 54% would therefore equate to a grade 3 for the example unit when applying the West Dean grade scheme below.

Grade	Percentage scale
1	80% and up
2	60 - 80%
3	50 - 60%
4	40 -50%
F	0-40%

1.9.10 The final classification of the award will be awarded on the basis of the grade scores for all the units of the student's programme of study following confirmation at the relevant Assessment Board.

1.10 Classification of an award

- I.10.1 The College's grading system leads to a final classification scheme of Fail, Pass and Pass with Distinction. A Pass classification is awarded to a student who has achieved Pass grades in all the units of study required for the award.
- I.10.2 A Pass with Distinction classification is awarded to a student who has demonstrated a high standard of work throughout the course and in the case of degrees a high standard of work in their final major project unit, meeting the calculation criteria as set out in the table below.
- I.10.3 A Fail classification is awarded to a student who has any units graded at Grade 4 or Fail at the time of the Assessment Board. For students with units graded at 4 a retrieval opportunity is normally offered in accordance with Section I.10.2 below.

I.10.4 *Calculation of distinctions:*

Graduate	75% of the grades in semester one and two have to be at grade I (90 out of 120 credits).
One Year FT MA Two Year PT MA	90 credits out of the total 180 credits have to be at Grade I including those for final Major Project Unit (45 credits).
Two-year degrees (FdA/ MFA)	120 credits out of the total 240 credits have to be at grade I. including those for final the MFA Studio Work IV Unit (45 credits) and the FdA Professional Portfolio Unit (60 credits)

- I.10.5 Only a fully constituted Assessment Board (with membership approved by the Academic Board) can confirm grades and recommend awards. Students are informed that all grades remain subject to confirmation by the Assessment Board.

I.11 Fail and Referral

- I.11.1 If at the summer assessment point, all units are passed and therefore all credits are awarded to an individual they will be awarded the relevant Diploma or Degree, or in the case of a two-year programme, allowed to progress to the next year of study. There is no compensation.
- I.11.2 If a student fails to achieve the full credits at the summer assessment point he/she is deemed to have failed to fulfil the requirements for the award or. Failure to achieve a substantial amount of the credit such that successful retrieval within the six week retrieval period is unlikely may mean the student is given the opportunity to re-take the Programme with full-

time attendance or that the student is excluded from a programme for failing to progress satisfactorily. Such a decision is at the discretion and academic judgement of the Assessment Board with advice from the Unit Board.

- I.11.3 If Grade 4 - Referral has been awarded for either a single unit or number of low credit weighted units, a retrieval opportunity is usually granted.
- I.11.4 Referred work must be completed satisfactorily within a timescale agreed at the Assessment Board, which is usually six weeks. A student who retrieves a grade 4 is awarded the maximum of a grade 3. For Foundation Degree and Graduate Diplomas, this applies at the mid-year assessment and at the end of the second semester. For MA students completing towards the end of September, their final project may be referred by the award of a grade 4 and the opportunity given for retrieval prior to the mid-year assessment board in February.

I.12 Failure to Retrieve

- I.12.1 No student can be referred more than once for a unit. If the resubmission of the unit assignment is not retrieved to a satisfactory standard at the agreed resubmission date the unit is recorded as Fail and there is no further opportunity to retrieve the unit. It is the formal responsibility of the Chair of the Assessment Board to notify a student of the outcome of the assessment of referred work. Confirmation of a Fail grade on behalf of the Assessment Board means that a student is not permitted to continue with their programme of study (see below).

I.13 Reasonable Adjustments and Alternative Forms of Assessment

Where a student has declared a disability or health condition (mental or physical), supported by a statement prepared by an educational expert, which may impact on the standard and quality of work produced for assessment, the college will consider making reasonable adjustments or applying alternative forms of assessment to enable fair assessment to take place.

Reasonable adjustments refer to a “measure or action taken to assist a student with disability to participate in education and training on the same basis as other students”. They are designed to place students with disability on a more equal footing, and not to give them any kind of advantage.

Reasonable adjustments made for a student with disability will maintain the academic integrity of the qualification and not cause a health or safety risk for another student(s) or negatively impact upon the learning experience of another student(s).

In considering alternative forms of assessment, equal opportunity, not a guaranteed outcome, will be the objective. The assessor will not be expected to lower standards to

accommodate students with a disability, but rather are required to give them a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate what they have learned.

I.14 Mitigating circumstances

- I.14.1 Students must provide documentary evidence that confirms sudden, unforeseen and temporary conditions or events before the Unit Board meeting. The evidence needs to be submitted to the Unit Board with a completed claim form which can be downloaded from the Student VLE. Students must inform the Programme Tutor of any cause which may affect their performance or attendance at assessment. Minor illness and everyday problems, normally experienced in the course of daily life, will not be accepted nor will long term conditions or health issues for which anticipatory forms of support exist. Only under these conditions are mitigating circumstances considered.
- I.14.2 All students are given a fair and equal opportunity to demonstrate academic achievement. A student with accepted mitigating evidence impacting on a unit assessment shall be offered the opportunity to re-submit their work as for the first time. The original mark shall be expunged from the student record. Where a lower mark is obtained at this new submission this mark shall be recorded. This principle applies in order to ensure equality of opportunity for all students.

I.15 Late submission

- I.15.1 All work required for assessment must be submitted by the published assessment date stated for each assignment. Non-submission of work will be recorded as a Referral. Any request for an extension and hence deferral of assessment must be submitted in writing to the Programme Tutor at least 7 days before the published deadline, in accordance with the mitigating circumstances procedure as set out above. If an extension is granted a revised submission date will be agreed. Deferred work will be marked using the full range of marks.
- I.15.2 A penalty deduction of 5 percentage points (not 5% of the actual mark) shall be applied to work submitted up to 24 hours late although the application of such penalties shall not reduce the overall conflated mark below the minimum pass mark. This means that such penalties cannot, in themselves, prevent progression or require the student to retrieve assessments that have been academically passed.
- I.15.3 A penalty deduction of 10 percentage points (not 10% of the actual mark) shall be applied to work submitted after 24 hours and up to 7 days late, although the application of such penalties shall not reduce the overall conflated mark below the minimum pass mark. This means that such penalties cannot, in themselves, prevent progression or require the student to refer assessments that have been academically passed.

I.15.4 Work will not be accepted more than 7 days after the original deadline. A mark of 0 and a non-submission will be recorded.

I.15.5 Work that has been submitted on time will be marked once the deadline has passed and therefore a revised version cannot be resubmitted after the deadline for a penalty.

I.16 Appeals (assessments)

I.16.1 Students studying at all levels have the opportunity to raise matters of proper concern to them without fear of disadvantage and in the knowledge that privacy and confidentiality will be respected. Students have the right of appeal against a decision of the Assessment Board. An appeal can be made by submitting a completed Appeals form along with any evidence to the Registrar within 21 calendar days after the publication of results. It is the appellant's responsibility to provide full information and supporting evidence to substantiate the grounds for appeal

I.16.2 Receipt of an appeal will normally be acknowledged within 5 working days. An Appeals Panel is convened and comprises:

- The Principal (Chair)
- Two academic members of staff who will not have been involved in teaching or assessing the appellant.
- A student; usually the President of the Student Association.

I.16.3 Relevant information will then be gathered, which may include the appellant's marks record, any mitigating evidence records and Assessment Board minutes. The advice of members of staff with relevant expertise, or holding a relevant position of formal authority, may also be sought. Once the relevant information has been gathered together and advice sought, a decision will be made by the Chair of the Appeals Panel on whether there is sufficient evidence for an appeal to be upheld, or alternatively, if it is judged that the appellant has not established a sufficient basis for the appeal to be considered further.

I.16.4 Where it is judged that there is insufficient evidence for a decision to be made, the Chair of the Appeals Panel may either request additional information from the appellant or other relevant parties, recommend the establishment of an Appeals Panel hearing, or propose an alternative means of resolution where this is deemed to be in the best interest of the student. In the vast majority of cases, a decision is made by the Chair of the Appeals Panel on the basis of the evidence available.

I.16.5 The appellant will be notified in writing if the appeal is upheld by the Chair of the Appeals Panel, or if the appellant will be invited to a hearing of an Appeals Panel. The appellant will

likewise be notified where it is decided that the appeal is rejected and, where this is the case, will be given an explanation in writing outlining the reasons for rejection. Students can download the Appeals Procedure and Appeals form from the Student VLE.

I.17 Termination of study

I.17.1 An Assessment Board (or a representative group of at least 3 members of an Assessment Board) may terminate a student's study at the College for any of the following reasons:

- Academic failure
- Non-attendance *
- Academic misconduct (see Section 2 below)
- Breaching of the student code of conduct (See **Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Process**)
- Failure to pay fees or debts

I.17.2 Students are expected to attend at least 75% of all timetabled lectures, seminars, workshops, tutorials or any other teaching activity associated with their programme of study as per the College's Student Attendance Policy and Procedures, which can be found on the Student VLE.

I.17.3 Students are notified by the College immediately following a decision to terminate their studies. The reason for the termination is included.

I.17.4 Appeals against termination for academic reasons must be made following procedures in the **College's Student Complaints and Academic Appeals Policy**.

I.17.5 Appeals against termination for non-academic reasons must be made following procedures in the **Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Process Policy**.

I.17.6 Students whose studies are terminated are given 48 hours to collect their personal belongings, vacate their room and leave the College. Under these conditions, a student may seek and be offered counselling advice from the College.

2. Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures

The following sets out the College's Academic Misconduct Policy and related procedures. The process for handling breaches (alleged or otherwise) of the Student Code of Conduct that are of a non-academic nature are covered by the College's **Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedure Policy**.

2.1 Principles

- 2.1.1 Academic misconduct is defined in relation to assessment procedures and may include attempting to commit, or committing, collusion, plagiarism or any other misconduct in an examination or in the preparation of work which is submitted for assessment.
- 2.1.2 The Student Code of Conduct states 'Students are expected to undertake their academic work with integrity and honesty and not seek to gain advantage over other students by unfair or improper means.'³

2.2 Collusion

- 2.2.1 Academic misconduct involving collusion is the preparation or production of work for assessment with another person or persons and subsequently presenting the work for assessment as entirely the candidate's own work. In cases such as this, failure on the part of the candidate to declare any part of the work presented as having been undertaken by another person is an act of misconduct in the assessment exercise. An act of collusion of this kind encompasses those who actively assist others as well as those who derive benefit from others.

2.3 Personation

Personation is where someone other than the student prepares work submitted for assessment. This includes purchasing essays, commissioning someone else to write an essay or asking someone else to sit an exam.

2.4 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of presenting the ideas, or discoveries of another person as the candidate's own in written work submitted for assessment. To copy sentences or phrases without acknowledgement of the source, either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate direct quotations, is plagiarism. To paraphrase

³ Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedure, paragraph 3.5.

another person's spoken or written work without acknowledgement is also plagiarism, whether the source is from printed material, the internet, broadcast media or lectures. Where such direct quoting or paraphrasing has occurred, each instance must be referred specifically to its source.

2.5 Unseen examinations

Misconduct in relation to unseen examinations includes having access, or attempting to gain access, during an examination to any books, notes, documents or any other material, except that which may have been supplied by the invigilator or authorised by the examiners. It also includes aiding or attempting to aid another candidate or obtaining or attempting to obtain aid from another candidate.

2.6 Allegations of misconduct

Members of academic staff who suspect that a candidate has committed misconduct in the preparation and/or presentation of work, should take appropriate steps to identify any instances of misconduct and report these formally in writing to the Academic Misconduct Panel. This Panel consists of the Principal (acting as Chair) and at least two academic staff members of the relevant Assessment Board who have not been involved in either the teaching or the direct assessment of the candidate who is alleged to have committed misconduct. ⁴

2.7 Major or Minor cases of misconduct

2.7.1 It is the responsibility of the Academic Misconduct Panel to determine whether an instance of alleged misconduct is Major or Minor. All instances of plagiarism, collusion or misconduct in an unseen exam are serious failures to respect the integrity and fairness of the examination process. The determination of whether a case is Major or Minor is done with the intention of finding the appropriate response, remedy and/or penalty for the alleged misconduct.

2.7.2 The Academic Misconduct Panel will, in defining a breach as Major or Minor, bear in mind the following:

- i. The extent of the misconduct will be a key factor, i.e. a piece of work which has been downloaded verbatim from the internet and presented as the candidate's own work will inevitably be regarded as a Major breach, whereas a situation in which the proper citation of one or two articles is missing or incorrectly presented might be seen as a Minor breach.
- ii. The degree of deliberation on the part of the candidate will be an important consideration. Where the evidence suggests the student has been sophisticated in the use of non-attributed material, e.g. deliberate minor editing of plagiarised text to give the impression that it is the candidate's own work may be deemed Major. Conversely, a significant but single and unedited example of non-attribution within an essay which is otherwise properly referenced might be deemed as Minor.

⁴ Other senior members of academic staff may be appointed if necessary to avoid conflicts of interest.

2.7.3 Reports of misconduct case histories (excluding names of individuals) will be circulated to all Programme Tutors and members of the AQC as they arise.

2.8 Procedure for Minor cases of suspected misconduct

2.8.1 Following agreement by the Academic Misconduct Panel that an alleged breach is Minor, the Chair, may, on behalf of the Panel, take one of the following actions:

- dismiss the case as unfounded
- determine that, while there is a technical case to answer, it is unintentional and/or trivial to the degree that no further action need to be taken other than cautioning the candidate
- determine that the case is sufficient to require the candidate to make corrections (e.g. to citations) and have the work reconsidered by the examiners
- determine that there is a clear case to answer and that a sanction is appropriate, in which case that sanction is limited to the reduction of the grade(s) to an extent that is short of causing overall failure of the programme

2.9 Procedure of Major cases of suspected misconduct

2.9.1 The application of penalties which would result in the overall failure of a programme are reserved for Major breaches of conduct. The Academic Misconduct Panel may, in cases such as these, direct the candidate to undertake some form of remedial academic coaching. Where the case is not proved, the Principal may dismiss the allegation.

2.9.2 In Major cases of suspected misconduct which cannot be dismissed, the Chair of the Assessment Board will organise a misconduct hearing which will include members of the Academic Misconduct Panel. The member of academic staff who initially identified the alleged misconduct will normally present the case at the hearing.

2.9.3 The candidate shall be informed in writing of the date and purpose of the Misconduct Hearing which will be at least 5 days from the date of the letter. The candidate will have the right to be accompanied at the hearing by a member of academic staff, the Student Liaison Officer or other member of staff, or a fellow student. A copy of these regulations and procedures will be attached to the letter. The evidence file relating to the alleged case of Major misconduct will be made available to the candidate prior to the hearing. The candidate has the right either to attend the hearing or remain absent from it.

2.9.4 The Assessment Boards, having recorded a provisional mark, will not confirm grades or process final results in relation to the candidate until the investigations of the Academic Misconduct Panel and the outcome of the Misconduct Hearing have been completed.

- 2.9.5 At the Misconduct Hearing, Panel members will examine candidates suspected of misconduct, establish facts and come to a view as to whether or not misconduct has taken place. The Chairperson of the Misconduct Hearing will read out the accusation, including the relevant definitions of misconduct and will then ask the candidate whether she or he admits or denies the accusation.
- 2.9.6 If the candidate denies the accusation, the Hearing will first be concerned to establish whether misconduct has taken place. The candidate will defend the case with the help of a representative.
- 2.9.7 Once all the evidence has been heard the candidate and the candidate's representative and the presenter will be asked to withdraw while the Panel members consider their finding. This will be decided on a simple majority vote in the absence of unanimity and in the event of a split vote, the Principal will make the final decision. The candidate, the candidate's representative and the presenter will then return to hear the finding on guilt or innocence which Panel members have reached.
- 2.9.8 If the candidate is found guilty, the Panel members will then hear any evidence in mitigation.
- 2.9.9 If the candidate is found not guilty the work as presented is assessed in the normal way.
- 2.9.10 If the candidate admits the accusation, the Hearing will be concerned with assessing the gravity of the offence and considering evidence in mitigation. The presenter will be invited to assess the extent of the misconduct and the candidate invited to respond with the help of the candidate's representative.
- 2.9.11 If the candidate is found guilty, the Panel will consider the appropriate penalty after all the evidence in mitigation has been heard and the candidate, the candidate's representative and the presenter have left the hearing.
- 2.9.12 If the recommendation is a finding of guilty of misconduct, the Panel will then move to agree a penalty which will be advised to the relevant Assessment Board. The penalty will be selected from those listed below.

2.10 Penalties

- 2.10.1 Category of case – **Minor** – dealt with by the Principal
- i. For cases which are technically proven but believed to be unintentional or trivial, no further action should be taken other than a caution and/or reprimand.
 - ii. For cases in which the work should be resubmitted, the student should be instructed to correct work by including references, etc. and the examiner(s) asked to reassess the work.
 - iii. A grade awarded may be reduced to an extent that is short of causing overall failure of the programme.

- 2.10.2 Category of case – Major – dealt with by the Academic Misconduct Panel including the Principal.
- i. Deduction of marks such as to cause disqualification from the award of a distinction.
 - ii Deduction of marks such as to cause failure of the programme but with allowance to re-sit/resubmit for a pass without distinction.
 - iii Disqualification from candidature for the award of a diploma or degree.
- 2.10.3 All reports written in connection with a misconduct hearing should be written with the expectation that the candidate involved will see them.
- 2.10.4 The Student will be informed of the outcome of the hearing within 5 days of the Panel having made a decision.
- 2.10.5 If dissatisfied, a candidate may appeal in accordance with the **Student Complaints and Academic Appeals Policy** (Section 5) against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel. The period within which the appeal must be lodged will commence from the date of a formal letter notifying the candidate of the Academic Misconduct Panel's decision. The person or persons hearing an appeal against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel should not include anyone who has been involved in the Misconduct Hearing Panel itself. If the Principal is the convenor of the programme on which a candidate is suspected of misconduct, then he or she should not be involved in the misconduct hearing in that case and another senior member of staff appointed in their place.
- 2.10.6 Students should submit a completed Academic Appeals Form to the Academic Registrar accompanied by any evidence within 21 calendar days after the taking of a formal decision by the Assessment Board, Academic Misconduct Panel or Principal.

3. Overview Responsibilities

Review and update	Responsible	Timescale/Notes
Policy review and update	Quality Manager (QM)	
Student Assessment Policy	Students and College Staff	All students and staff to be aware of and understand the Policy to ensure that it is followed.
Mitigating Circumstances	Students	Students to provide documentary evidence for causes affecting performance or attendance before the Unit Board meeting.
Late Submission	Students	Students to request any extension at least 7 days before the published deadline.
Academic Misconduct Policy When suspecting misconduct in preparation and presentation of work, Staff will report instances to the Misconduct Panel in writing.	College Staff/ Assessment Board / Principal (as Chair)	Panel consists of Principal (DoE) and at least two academic staff members of the Assessment Board . Student to be informed of Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing with a least 5 days' notice Student to be informed of outcome of the hearing within 5

Termination of Study	Assessment Board	<p>days of the Panel making a decision.</p> <p>An Assessment Board is required to terminate a student's programme of study at the College.</p>
Appeal against Principal (minor penalty)	Student	<p>Students should submit a completed Academic Appeals Form to the Academic Registrar accompanied by any evidence within 21 calendar days after the publication of results or the taking of a formal decision by the DoE.</p>
Appeal against Academic Misconduct Panel (major penalty)	Student	<p>Students should submit a completed Academic Appeals Form to the Academic Registrar accompanied by any evidence within 21 calendar days after the publication of results or the taking of a formal decision by the Academic Misconduct Panel</p>

Appendix I – Generic Learning Outcomes

The generic learning outcomes listed below and those which are specific to our individual programmes of study (see subject-specific programme documents) are prescribed and assessed within the context of the above three interconnected and interdependent domains. A generic set of learning outcomes, typical examples of work required and a generic set of assessment criteria for all foundation (level 4 & 5), graduate (level 6) and postgraduate (level 7) programmes are listed below. When viewed together, learning outcomes help to define foundation, graduate and postgraduate qualities in keeping with the QAA Quality Code for HE. At West Dean these are set within the context of practice-based programmes of study.

Foundation Degree

The Foundation Degree learning outcomes reflect the **level 4 and 5** qualification descriptors outlined in the QAA Quality Code.

Practical domain - Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of the Foundation Degree, students will have:

- Developed a thorough knowledge of historic craft processes and materials in relation to their discipline
- Developed competence and skill in the execution of these techniques
- Applied these skills to a range of new/historic objects to create innovative work

Demonstrated through

- Completed and/or partly completed practical assignments, including supporting work (visual, or prototyping)
- Written coursework, including day books incorporating critical reflection, research and portfolio
- Oral presentation

Assessment criteria

- Demonstrated knowledge of a range of techniques and materials, their properties and made appropriate choices
- Demonstrated competence in a range of techniques and processes
- Selected materials and processes in order to create new solutions and ideas

Theoretical domain - Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of the Foundation Degree, students will have

- Gained relevant working knowledge of the cultural, historical and technological contexts of their craft practice
- Understood the relationship between craft practice, context and meaning

- Demonstrated the ability to access information and data, analyse and evaluate it in order to inform practice

Demonstrated through

- Written coursework incl. essay, report, dissertation
- Oral presentation

Assessment criteria

- Demonstrated awareness of cultural, historical and technological contexts
- Understood the relationship between craft practice, context and meaning
- Demonstrated the ability to access appropriate information, analyse and evaluate it

Professional domain - Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of the Foundation Degree, students will

- Be able to effectively communicate information to a range of professional and non-specialist audiences
- Have developed the ability to take personal responsibility and make informed decisions in a work context
- Have the ability to develop existing skills, and acquire new competences that will enable them to continue to develop

Demonstrated through

- Portfolio including development, project work and report
- Oral presentation

Assessment criteria

- Verbal, written and visual skills are competent and effective in communicating to a range of audiences
- Demonstrated the ability to make informed decisions and to take personal responsibility
- Demonstrated the ability to develop and advance skills

Graduate Diploma

Graduate Diploma learning outcomes reflect the **level 6** qualification descriptors outlined in the QAA Quality Code.

Practical domain – Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of the graduate diploma, students will have:

- A systematic, extensive and comparative knowledge of the applied aspects of a subject such that appropriate choices can be made
- A comprehensive and detailed knowledge of and ability in specific specialist techniques skills and materials and an understanding of their limitations
- A systematic understanding of current and established methods and techniques such that advanced and emerging techniques, at least some of which are at or informed by the forefront of defined aspects of the discipline, can be identified

Demonstrated through

- Completed and/or partly completed practical assignments
- Condition and treatment reports and/or research reports and sketchbooks
- Exhibited workshop/studio products

Assessment criteria

- Materials, media and techniques are used effectively and fluently in practice
- Ideas and intentions are developed through appropriate choice of materials to solve problems
- Established methods and techniques are applied to consolidate, extend and apply knowledge and understanding in new situations

Theoretical domain – Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of a graduate diploma, students will have:

- A systematic, extensive and comparative knowledge of the contextual aspects of the subject
- A conceptual understanding of the relationship between theory and practice
- The ability to identify and utilise (or apply) information, needs, systematic gathering, analysis and interpretation of ideas /data etc

Demonstrated through

- Essays
- Sketchbooks and/or learning journals
- Individual and/or group presentations to tutors and peer groups

Assessment criteria:

- Practice is related to cultural and historical frameworks
- Relevant information is used to evaluate assumptions and make judgements
- Theory is used to test and interrogate practice and vice versa

Professional domain – Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of a graduate diploma students are able to:

- Communicate the results of research accurately and comprehensively using appropriate language, conventions etc
- Apply informed professional attitudes and demonstrate transferrable skills for employment, such as initiative and personal responsibility
- Demonstrate sound decision making in complex and unknown situations

Demonstrated through

- Career or business development plans
- Group presentations and leading of seminars
- Exhibition presentation and preparation

Assessment criteria:

- Verbal, written and visual communication skills are fluent and effective
- Professional attitudes are informed and ethical
- Planning and delivery of projects is effective

Postgraduate (MA and MFA)

Postgraduate Diploma (exit award), MA and MFA learning outcomes reflect the **level 7** qualification descriptors outlined in the QAA Quality Code.

Practical domain – Learning Outcomes:

On successful completion of a postgraduate diploma, MA or MFA students are able to:

- Effectively and fluently use appropriate and contemporary materials and techniques to address problems and generate new knowledge much of which will be at, or informed by, the forefront of the specialist discipline
- Undertake applied research through practice using high level, specialist skills and techniques demonstrating sophistication in understanding and execution
- Develop ideas that test and inform the creative limitations and boundaries of the subject and demonstrate originality in the application of knowledge

Demonstrated through

- Completed practical assignments
- Condition and treatment reports and/or research reports and sketchbooks and/or written journals
- Exhibited workshop/studio products or original writing

Assessment criteria

- Choice of materials and techniques is appropriate to enable critical awareness and new insights
- High level of skills demonstrates sophistication and understanding supporting practice based research
- The development and application of techniques demonstrates originality and the extension of subject boundaries

Theoretical domain – Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of a postgraduate diploma, MA or MFA students are able to:

- Demonstrate the ability to use primary research to test and critically evaluate current thinking
- Make informed judgements and propose new hypotheses
- Demonstrate a practical understanding of how established techniques of enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge

Demonstrated through

- Essays
- Sketchbooks and/or learning diaries and notebooks
- Presentations to tutors and peer groups
- Preparation and presentation of work for exhibition or publication

Assessment criteria

- Cultural/historical frameworks are evaluated through reference to primary research
- New hypotheses are proposed that test and inform the boundaries of the discipline
- Self-direction and originality is demonstrated in identifying, tackling and solving problems

Professional domain – Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of a postgraduate diploma, MA or MFA students are able to:

- Communicate using professional conventions to specialist and non-specialist audiences
- Demonstrate informed professional attitudes including the ability to be reflexive and self-sustaining in the development of new skills and knowledge
- Make appropriate decisions in complex and unpredictable situations

Demonstrated through

- Self and peer evaluation
- Career or business development plan
- Period of work placement
- Group presentation
- Preparation and presentation of work for exhibition or publication

Assessment criteria

- Verbal, written and visual skills are of a professional standard and effective in communicating complex ideas
- A professional and personal code of conduct is demonstrated
- Planning and implementing complex projects demonstrates autonomy, independence and appropriate understanding of risk

Appendix 2 – Assessment Boards

Assessment Boards are responsible for considering all aspects of the award of academic credit to students and for recommending to the University the award of diplomas and degrees for those candidates who have satisfied the assessment requirements of the validated programmes. The Assessment Boards:

- Consider the recommendations from Programme Tutors and External Examiners.
- Make judgements in relation to mitigating evidence submitted to the Board in determining progression and the final award outcomes for individual candidates.
- Confirm the assessment outcomes and recommend to the University the award of the diploma or degree at pass, merit or distinction level for those candidates who have satisfied the assessment requirements for the award.
- Confirm, in the event of referral of assessed work, the resubmission requirements for individual candidates, in accordance with published procedures.
- Determine action to be taken in the case of assessment about which there is dispute or complaint, or where there is evidence of misconduct (including plagiarism).
Please see policy statement – Academic Misconduct – appended to this Volume.
- Consider and make recommendations on any changes to the assessment of the programmes.
- Confirm and ensure the maintenance of standards across cohorts within each level of the diploma programmes and the MA/MFA degree.
- To authorise the Principal to produce an Annual Examinations Report for submission to the University of Sussex.

There are two Assessment Boards, one for Conservation Studies and one for Arts programmes. They comprise:

- a) The Principal (Chair).
- b) All Programme Leaders and/or Programme Tutors and, where appropriate, Associate Tutors.
- c) The External Examiners.
- d) One Academic Manager who will act as Secretary.
- e) A representative of the University of Sussex will be invited to attend either as Chair or as an observer.

Assessment Boards meet twice in each academic year, at the mid-term assessment point in February and at the end of the academic year in July. There may also be an Assessment Board convened early in the Autumn Term to ratify the final awards relating to the MA degrees.