

**Summary of Consultation Feedback: Policy on Submission of Work for Summative Assessment on Taught Programmes (December 2017/January 2018)**

**Further work carried out on reviewing/updating the Policy during 2018/19 by the TLG Policy and Guidance subgroup; updated Policy approved by Senate in February 2019, for implementation from September 2019**

Faculty / School	Feedback	Comments/ Action Taken
<b>Humanities</b>		
<b>Alliance Manchester Business School</b>	<p>The summary of changes indicates that one revision to the policy is clarification that the 10 mark per day late penalty applies <i>only to large assignments</i> (i.e. weighting of 100% on 30-credit units), and that for smaller assignments, Schools should decide what penalties to impose. Given that smaller assignments can include substantial pieces of work, I think it would be helpful to have some guidelines on appropriate penalties or even a specified penalty. This would help ensure broad consistency in penalties across Schools and Faculties, which is not only consistent with the proposed policy's principle that penalties should be 'equitable' (section 4.9) but also has practical implications e.g. in the case of cross-School and cross-Faculty programmes.</p> <p>In the case of the proposal that Schools should have measures in place for dealing with work exceeding word limits, again it would be useful to have some guidelines on appropriate penalties.</p>	<p>Actioned: In the revised policy, the principle is now of a standard sliding scale of penalties, <i>which must be used for large pieces of work</i> (e.g. dissertations or projects of 30 credits or more), and <i>will be the default arrangement for smaller pieces of work, unless alternative arrangements are agreed with the relevant Faculty.</i></p>
<b>SALC</b>	<p>Our core concern is that the policy document provide no pedagogical rationale for making a distinction between 'large pieces of work' and 'smaller pieces of work' when applying late penalties. The absence of rationale is more than a little ironic, given that the stated purpose of the policy is 'to ensure that the arrangements and procedures for the submission of work for summative assessment are equitable and transparent'. We feel it is incumbent on the proposers of these changes to explain the pedagogical logic behind them. Without such a rationale, how can we transparent in explaining these changes to staff and students?</p> <p>Following on from this, we'd like to know if any thought been given to the implications of introducing such policy changes within and across Schools in the Faculty? In SALC, at both UG and PGT level, having two different late submission policies, based on the size/credit weighting of summative assignments, is bound to confuse students, especially given that we have non-native English speakers on our PGT degree programmes.</p> <p>Furthermore, having different late submission penalties for assessments of different lengths will</p>	<p>Actioned: As above, the principle is now of a standard sliding scale of penalties, <i>which must be used for large pieces of work</i> (e.g. dissertations or projects of 30 credits or more), and <i>will be the default arrangement for smaller pieces of work, unless alternative arrangements are agreed with the relevant Faculty.</i></p>

	<p>pose difficulties for students taking units in other Schools, which is common in SALC. Given that the policy document states that 'There should be School/Faculty norms for late submission penalties, with exceptions being possible if there are sound pedagogic reasons', it seems incongruous that differential penalties are being proposed - and without any pedagogic reasons, sound or otherwise, being offered by way of justification.</p> <p>We look forward to seeing how this feedback will be acted upon prior to the document being submitted for final approval.</p>	
<b>Law</b>	<p>The comments are mainly from PSS, but the majority of academic colleagues involved in the Law Teaching and Learning Committee were very concerned about the inconsistencies that can arise from the proposed changes. We are particularly concerned as our students take modules in other schools, and we have non-law students on our modules, so if different schools take different approaches to penalising late submission this could result in extremely inconsistent treatment of students across cohorts.</p>	<p>Actioned: As the principles for late submission now apply to all sizes of assessed work, (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty), there should be more consistency between different Schools.</p>
<b>BMH</b>		
<b>Division of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Clarification that the section on penalties for late submission only applies to 'large pieces of work', e.g. dissertations/projects which carry a credit weighting of 30 credits or more, and also only relates to first attempts rather than referrals; <b>How does this provide equity for students if you have 1 policy for 30 credits or more and another for less than 30 credits?</b></i></li> <li>• <i>a slight update to the recommended sliding scale for penalties for late submission, in that "the mark awarded will reduce for 10 marks per calendar day", rather than the original wording of "the mark awarded will reduce for 10 marks per day <b>for 5 day...after which a mark of zero will be awarded;</b>" <b>This would potentially extend marking periods for staff and lead into teaching time.</b></i></li> <li>• <i>Clarification that, for smaller pieces of work, Schools must have their own mechanism in place to penalise late submission, and must publicise it to students at the start of each semester; <b>This would open up inequity across the University especially for programmes which offer course units from across different Schools.</b></i></li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: The principles for late submission now apply to all sizes of assessed work, (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty).</p> <p>Noted: This was acknowledged, but was felt to be the best way forward.</p> <p>Actioned: This issue has now been removed, as the penalties for late submission apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty).</p>
	<p>Re the "Guidance on late submission"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Guidance on late submission for large pieces of work", with a definition of work carrying</i></li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: the Policy and Guidance now have the same penalties for</p>

	<p><i>a credit weighting of 30 credits or more; <b>How does this provide equity for students if you have 1 policy for 30 credits or more and another for less than 30 credits?</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Procedure for the handling of cases where a student receives a pass mark for an assignment (including dissertations) but then fails the assignment due to the deduction of marks as a penalty of late submission. If a student's original mark, before the application of a penalty, was in the compensation zone, the mark recorded should be capped at the lowest compensatable pass mark (30C for UG and 40C for PGT) and the student should not be asked to resit the assignment. <b>Does this mean the student has been referred at 1<sup>st</sup> attempt? It suggests the only penalty applied is a reduction of the mark to the lowest compensatable pass mark which is less of a penalty than that stated above.</b></li> </ul>	<p>all sizes of assessment.</p> <p>No, this relates to students whose mark would have been a compensated pass at first attempt, but the application of a penalty takes them, in theory, below the compensation zone.</p>
	<p><i>Removal of the table of examples of mark deductions, as it was felt that the reduction of 10 marks per calendar day (for work marked out of 100, and a proportional amount for work not marked out of 100) should be simpler with the removal of the cap of up to 5 days; <b>Would it not be easier to talk about % marks rather than specifics (i.e 10% of mark for a piece of work worth 40 marks overall would be 4 marks –not 10)</b></i></p>	<p>This has now been actioned, and the Policy/Guidance do refer to percentages rather than marks.</p>
<p><b>Division of Pharmacy and Optometry</b></p>	<p><i>Clarification that the section on penalties for late submission only applies to 'large pieces of work', e.g. dissertations/projects which carry a credit weighting of 30 credits or more, and also only relates to first attempts rather than referrals; <b>We do apply this policy at present however it states that penalties for late submission will now only apply to large pieces of work, and large is classed as 30 credits. All of our PGT units are 15 credits, and some of our courses are only 30 credits, never with just one piece of assessment. So it seems that this central policy will not now apply at any of our PGT units, other than projects which are 60 or 90 credits. This is a shame and it would be much better to have a more unified approach across the School, including for smaller pieces of work. This would also avoid confusion for both staff and students, particularly on programmes which are owned by different consortia or Schools.</b></i></p>	<p>Actioned: This issue has now been removed, as the penalties for late submission apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty).</p>
<p><b>Division of Psychology and Mental Health and Division of Human Communication</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Clarification that the section on penalties for late submission only applies to 'large pieces of work', e.g. dissertations/projects which carry a credit weighting of 30 credits or more, and also only relates to first attempts rather than referrals; <b>Why do the fix late penalties now only apply to large pieces of work? I don't think it is very helpful to devolve this to Schools and Divisions again as that's what happened before and everyone goes off doing their own thing and ends up a real mess when you have students taking units from</b></i></li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: This issue has now been removed, as the penalties for late submission apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty).</p>

	<p><b><i>different Schools and Faculties with differing penalties.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a slight update to the recommended sliding scale for penalties for late submission, in that “the mark awarded will reduce for 10 marks per calendar day”, rather than the original wording of “the mark awarded will reduce for 10 marks per day for 5 day...after which a mark of zero will be awarded;” I don’t think the wording is very clear, I don’t think this explicitly shows that the mark gets reduced by 10 marks if its 1 minute late, I think you can read it as it only gets reduced by 10 marks when it is a day late. I also think it needs to say per 24 hours, not calendar day, could that be interpreted as meaning the penalties increase at midnight.</i></li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: The wording has now been revised to state: “Any work submitted <i>at any time</i> within the first 24 hours following the published submission deadline will receive a penalty of 10% of the maximum amount of marks available... The Policy relates to 24 hours/<i>calendar days</i>, so includes weekends and weekdays.”</p>
<p><b>Division of Population Health, Health Services Research &amp; Primary Care</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large pieces of work, for this purpose, are defined as being single pieces of assessed work carrying a credit weighting of 30 credits or more. <b>For our MRes Translational Medicine (and other MRes), students have to submit a lit review and research proposal for ‘research project 1 (BIOL 66121). This is a 30 credit unit, with the two components weighted 50%, with the same submission deadline. Would this count?</b></li> <li>• Penalty for going over length (4.10 and 4.11) <b>I really favour a policy where the word limit is the word limit, not the +10% that we currently have. This would not apply e.g. for a conference abstract, publication etc.</b></li> <li>• Procedure for the handling of cases where a student receives a pass mark for an assignment (including dissertations) but then fails the assignment due to the deduction of marks as a penalty of late submission (appendix4, no.5). <b>Not sure what happens here if the assignment is not compensatable? I also don’t see how 5ii follows from 5i, if a student’s original mark is a pass, and they are not required to resit, then 5ii is redundant.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: The penalties for late submission now apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty).</p> <p>Schools must have appropriate procedures in place for dealing with work exceeding the required length.</p> <p>Even if an assessment is not compensatable, the application/recording of penalties would remain the same. The wording of 5i and 5ii have been updated.</p>
<p><b>Division of Psychology and Mental Health</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We feel the rewording has clarified any points which were previously uncertain.</li> <li>• We don’t have any stand-alone coursework which reaches the 30 credit threshold. The closest is our Final Year projects which carry a 28 credit weighting. The wording in the</li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: The Policy has now been revised, following feedback, so it should hopefully be clearer</p>

	<p>policy gives the impression that this is the type of 'large' work that should be covered by the policy – could someone clarify whether that is the case?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For our other assessed coursework we're assuming that, in the absence of a School policies about penalizing late submission and work which exceeds stated lengths, we're free to determine policies for our own Programme (so long as they are clearly communicated to students) – is that right?</li> </ul>	<p>now. The penalties for late submission now apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty). Schools must have their own appropriate procedures in place for dealing with work exceeding the required length.</p>
<b>Division of Medical Education</b>	<p>For the MBChB, we do not see a problem being compliant with the late submission policy. We operate a 5 day '0' mark policy on some pieces of work, rather than 10 days based on the professional programme requirements.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<b>Division of Pharmacy and Optometry</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy has to apply to more than just the very large pieces of work that has been proposed – it seems this would be applicable to very few programmes. Maybe it would be better to refer to the size of the piece of work as a % of the total marks for that unit. Maybe 10%? If the Faculty policy only applies to few pieces of work, individual programmes will devise their own regulations for the rest, and then the Faculty policy will be pretty redundant.</li> <li>We have lots of Pass/Fail pieces of work and they are often the cause of difficulty/inconsistency in handling.</li> <li>If we choose to adopt this policy for all assessments, a minority of students will see this as an automatic 10 day extension. This minority of students already miss deadlines and this policy effectively allows them to hand work in up to 10 days late and still be allowed to pass / progress. The deterrent of capped marks will not work with these students.</li> </ul>	<p>Actioned: The penalties for late submission now apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty).</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
<b>School of Biological Sciences</b>	<p>Clarification that the section on penalties for late submission only applies to 'large pieces of work', e.g. dissertations/projects which carry a credit weighting of 30 credits or more, and also only relates to first attempts rather than referrals; <b>A 10 credit piece of work is also what I would</b></p>	<p>Actioned: The penalties for late submission now apply to all sizes of work (unless approved</p>

	consider to be a large piece of work. Certainly in SBS we would apply the penalty stated to late submission of a dissertation or literature which are both 10 credits. Maybe this section should/could be amended accordingly to include course work worth 10-30 credits?	otherwise by the Faculty).
School of Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I would be interested to know how this policy will be implemented across the Faculty, how much freedom will the School have to implement their guidelines or will they be influenced by the other Schools?</li> <li>• I would be supportive of maintaining the current deduction scale for all summative coursework, regardless of credit weighting.</li> <li>• a slight update to the recommended sliding scale for penalties for late submission, in that “the mark awarded will reduce for 10 marks per calendar day”, rather than the original wording of “the mark awarded will reduce for 10 marks per day for 5 day...after which a mark of zero will be awarded;” <b>I would be supportive of this change.</b></li> <li>• <b>As the policy has changed to focus on large pieces of work carrying a credit weighting of 30 credits or more, this doesn’t apply to any of our UGT work.</b></li> </ul>	The penalties for late submission now apply to all sizes of work (unless approved otherwise by the Faculty); so there should be more consistency between Schools in terms of penalties for late submission.
<u>FSE</u>	<i>The policy needs to make it clear that the sliding scale that is mandatory for large pieces of work may also be used as a default for other pieces of work. For example, that a Faculty could agree that the default policy is that the same penalty is applied across the board but that Schools may get Faculty permission to do something different where there is good reason to do so. It should be done in such a way that other documents can refer to ‘the default late penalty’ in an elegant way (at the moment the late penalty is only described in a sentence that says it’s for large pieces of work, so it feels odd then saying ‘and also for other things’).</i>	Actioned: in the revised policy, the principle is now of a standard sliding scale of penalties, which must be used for large pieces of work (e.g. dissertations or projects of 30 credits or more), and will be the default arrangement for smaller pieces of work, unless alternative arrangements are agreed with the relevant Faculty.