



MEng Integrated Engineering - Assessment Handbook 2020-21

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| 1. | Introduction | 2 |
| 1.1 | Using this Handbook | 2 |
| 1.2 | Assessment Strategy | 3 |
| 1.2.1 | How you will be assessed | 3 |
| 1.2.2 | Assessments in 2 and 3 week Toolbox Modules | 3 |
| 1.2.3 | Assessments in 3.5-week Engineering Sprint Modules | 4 |
| 1.2.4 | Assessments in the Master's Engineering Project Module | 4 |
| 1.3 | Data Protection | 4 |
| 1.4 | Marks | 4 |
| 1.5 | Extenuating Circumstances | 5 |
| 1.6 | Reasonable Adjustments | 5 |
| 1.7 | Language, Time Zone, and Cultural / Religious Holidays | 5 |
| 1.8 | Assessment and Module Completion | 5 |
| 1.9 | Academic Integrity | 6 |
| 1.10 | Academic Misconduct | 6 |
| 1.10.1 | Reuse of Material/Self-Plagiarism | 6 |
| 1.10.2 | Process and Penalties for Misconduct | 6 |
| 1.10.3 | Appeals | 6 |
| 2. | Assessments | 6 |
| 2.1 | Assessment Styles | 6 |
| 2.1.1 | Written Assessments | 6 |
| 2.1.2 | Verbal Assessments | 7 |
| 2.1.3 | Tutorial Questions | 7 |
| 2.1.4 | Artefacts | 7 |
| 2.1.5 | Teamwork | 7 |
| 2.2 | Individual Assessments | 7 |
| 2.3 | Team Assessments | 7 |
| 2.4 | Ephemeral Assessments | 8 |
| 2.5 | Preparing Assessments | 8 |
| 2.5.1 | Discussing Assessments with Other Students | 8 |
| | AcReg_V3.0_AY20_21 | 1 |



| | | | |
|-------|--|---|----|
| 2.5.2 | Word Counts | 8 | |
| 2.5.3 | Rules for Referencing | 9 | |
| 2.5.4 | Assessment Confidentiality | 9 | |
| 2.5.5 | Keeping Assessments | | 9 |
| 2.6 | Late Submission of Assessments | | 9 |
| 2.7 | Marking of Assessments | | 10 |
| 2.8 | Feedback and Feedforward | | 10 |
| 2.8.1 | Feedback | | 11 |
| 2.8.2 | Feedforward | | 11 |
| 2.9 | Resitting Assessments | | 11 |
| 2.12 | Options for the Retake of Study | | 12 |
| 2.13 | Deferral / Postponement | | 12 |
| 2.14 | Degree Classifications | | 12 |
| 3. | Assurance of Standards | | 12 |
| 3.1 | Assessment Boards | | 12 |
| 3.2 | External Examiners | | 13 |
| 3.3 | Assessment Security | | 13 |
| 3.4 | Retention of Assessed Work | | 14 |
| | Appendix 1 – Marking Criteria Example | | 15 |
| | Appendix 2 – Student Submission and Declaration Proforma | | 17 |
| | Appendix 3 – Assessment Brief Proforma | | 18 |
| | Appendix 4 – Module Completion Student Feedback Proforma | | 21 |

1. Introduction

1.1 Using this Handbook

This Assessment Handbook applies to the assessment of all modules contained within the MEng Integrated Engineering Programme. This Handbook is for you to use during your programme of study. It outlines the policies relating to the different assessments you may have to complete for each module, details how your marks are calculated, and explains the degree classification you will receive. This Handbook tells you the general rules and regulations for completing and submitting your assessed work.

Additionally, during each module, you will be directed to other documents which provide specific information relating to assessment. Module- or programme-specific information can be found in your [MEng Integrated Engineering Programme Handbook](#) or in individual module specifications available on Canvas, NMITE's Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). The information in this handbook may



occasionally change over the course of your studies. You will be notified directly of any major changes.

1.2 Assessment Strategy

NMITE's assessment strategy is derived from the need to meet assessment standards expected by students and external bodies (The Open University as NMITE's validation partner, The Engineering Council, the UK Quality Code for Higher Education, the IET, the CMI), and from NMITE's Assessment Strategy Statement, which aims to ensure that the assessment process at NMITE reflects how engineers are assessed in practice. For more information, see the [MEng Assessment Policy](#).

1.2.1 How you will be assessed

Each module will be summative assessed using multiple assessments. Assessments may be individual or team submissions. They will be of a type from the following: Academic Report, Artefact - physical or digital, Business Plan, Debate, Essay, Industrial Report, Journal Paper, Media Output, Presentation, Project Plan, Q&A, Specification, Study, Test Report, Tutorial Questions (worksheets, online quizzes, or equivalent), or White Paper.

All information regarding specific module assessments (including deadlines and methods) will be provided to you at the start of each module. You are encouraged to engage in dialogue with your module educators and your Personal Tutor to promote a shared understanding of the assessments and the basis on which academic judgements are made. Assessments are designed to provide all students with an equal opportunity to demonstrate learning (with, where appropriate, reasonable individual adjustments). Learning environments and activities are therefore designed to enable all students to achieve the desired learning outcomes, measured through clearly aligned assessment activities which are both objective and repeatable over time.

1.2.2 Assessments in 2 and 3 week Toolbox Modules

- Regular quizzes: you will regularly be asked to complete short quizzes on Canvas. These quizzes are not credit-bearing and therefore will not contribute to your end of module assessment, but they will allow you and your module educator to gauge your progress in learning key concepts.
- Formative assessment: each module will contain the opportunity for you to discuss your progress with an educator. This is not a formal review and will not contribute towards the end of module assessment but should enable you to understand your achievements relative to the end-point expectations.
- Summative assessment: each module assessment at a given level of study (FHEQ Levels 4-7) shall differentiate by outcome in breadth and depth of learning. A pass mark of 40% (at Levels 4-6) and 50% (at Level 7) will ensure competency is sufficient for you to access later learning as appropriate, and to evidence academic attainment.

Deadlines: Assessment times will vary by module and will be distributed throughout modules wherever possible. However, for 2- and 3-week Toolbox modules the assessments will take place on the final day (Friday) at the latest.



1.2.3 Assessments in 3.5-week Engineering Sprint Modules

- Regular quizzes: you will regularly be asked to complete short quizzes on Canvas. As above, these quizzes will not contribute to your end of module assessment, but they will allow you and your module educator to gauge your progress in learning key concepts.
- Formative assessment: each module shall contain a midpoint formative review with an educator. This formative review will not contribute towards the end of module assessment but should enable you to understand your achievements relative to the end-point expectations.
- Summative assessment: each module at a given level of study (FHEQ Levels 4-7) shall differentiate by outcome in breadth and depth of learning. A pass mark of 40% (at Levels 4, 5, and 6) and 50% (at Level 7) will ensure competency is enough for you to access later learning as appropriate and to evidence academic attainment. The assessment shall wherever possible assess the capability in an applied context.

Deadlines: Assessment times will vary by module and will be distributed throughout modules wherever possible. However, they will take place, at the latest, by the final day (Wednesday) of a 3.5-week Engineering Sprint module, leaving the Thursday and Friday available for any resits.

1.2.4 Assessments in the Master's Engineering Project Module

- Formative assessment: Written feedback on draft versions of the final 10,000-word Academic Report will be provided in a variety of formats. This will include comments on a draft structure midway through the project, and a full draft version 5 weeks from the end of the project. In both cases comments will be provided within 5 working days to ensure they can be acted upon effectively.
- Summative assessment: The module will be assessed using 2 related assessed elements, a 45-minute Viva Voce Q&A and an Academic Report. Each assessment evaluates all 7 learning outcomes required for passing the module. A pass mark of 50% for each assessment ensures competency at FHEQ Level 7.

1.3 Data Protection

All assessments will be carried out securely in order to ensure the integrity of the assessment process and academic standards. Canvas provides a secure portal for the transit of draft assessments between Academic members (and where appropriate with External Examiners). Canvas also provides a secure authentication login procedure, thereby confirming the ownership of each assessment submission. Finally, access to assessment marks and feedback is controlled by Canvas through a two-factor password protection system. Your data on Canvas is covered by [NMITE's Data Protection Policy](#).

1.4 Marks

Marking criteria explain what is expected in order to achieve a particular mark for a piece of work. Details of the marking criteria and learning outcomes for each module are provided on the relevant Canvas page. A sample may be found in [Appendix 1](#). All assessments are criterion-referenced and marked as a percentage out of 100.

Each module within the MEng will be graded as follows:



- FHEQ Levels 4, 5 and 6: Fail (<40%); Pass (40% or over)
- FHEQ Level 7: Fail (<50%); Pass (50% or over)

To meet with the accreditation requirements of the IET students must achieve an average mark of at least 50% at FHEQ Level 6 to be eligible to progress to Level 7 and continue to complete this MEng.

Students who have achieved the 40% Pass mark for each module at Level 6, but not the required 50%, will not be eligible to continue to Level 7 for the award of MEng and instead will be transferred to the BEng (Hons) exit route.

1.5 Extenuating Circumstances

NMITE considers an Extenuating Circumstance to be an unexpected/unforeseen significant event affecting your health or personal life which is beyond your control and is sufficiently serious enough to result in your being unable to attend, complete, or submit an assessment on time. In such cases, please see the [Extenuating Circumstances Policy](#) to find guidance about how to report a claim.

1.6 Reasonable Adjustments

Reasonable adjustment of assessments may be made in cases where your personal circumstances (such as a medical condition, different needs or conditions) prevent you from fulfilling assessments in ordinary conditions. In such cases we may be able to adapt aspects of the assessment to suit your needs. Additional arrangements will be agreed based on the evidence of need and you may not be able to have all the arrangements you ask for. Discuss these adjustments with your module educator immediately.

If you have declared a disability to NMITE, we will automatically provide you with a link to information about adjustments to assessments. More information can be found in the [Student Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy](#), in the [Student Handbook](#), or by contacting [Student Support](#). If you feel you have grounds for appeal about adjusted arrangements made for an assessment, you can find more information in the [Student Academic Appeals Policy](#).

1.7 Language, Time Zone, and Cultural / Religious Holidays

Assessments will be conducted in English in the UTC time zone. Only public or bank holidays will be considered when setting assessment submission deadlines for all modules. Further information on advice and support regarding religious observance is available through [Student Support](#).

1.8 Assessment and Module Completion

When you have registered for a module, you are expected to complete all the assessments in line with the Learning Plan provided in Canvas. However, NMITE recognises that under Extenuating circumstances, students may start a module but are then unable to complete all assessments within the scheduled timetable. Please refer to paragraph 2.6 – Late Submission of Assessments for more information.

1.9 Academic Integrity

High academic standards are fundamental to ensuring continued trust and confidence in NMITE's programme of innovative teaching and learning, as well as the individuals who work and study here. NMITE takes academic integrity very



seriously and expects you to familiarise yourself with NMITE's referencing requirements; please refer to paragraph 2.5.1 for further information. We also recommend that you make use of the research and writing support available in the Academic Skills Centre to ensure adherence to high academic standards.

1.10 Academic Misconduct

Please refer to the [Academic Misconduct Policy](#) for a complete definition of Plagiarism, False Authorship, Collusion, Misconduct in Timed Assessments, and Fabrication or Misrepresentation. Read it carefully for guidance and if necessary, seek further support and clarification from the Academic Skills Centre. NMITE uses the academic integrity software Turnitin to check your assessments against both the work of other students and against internet sources and other published material.

1.10.1 Reuse of Material/Self-Plagiarism

As well as ensuring all your essays and coursework are your own, you must also avoid self-plagiarism. This means you cannot submit the same piece of work (either with or without stylistic variation) in order to gain credit more than once. The same criteria apply to self-plagiarism as to other forms of plagiarism and will so incur a penalty. This could be a mark of zero or a reduction in the overall mark.

The onus is on you to avoid duplication. This is to ensure that the same work is not double counted for different modules. If you are unsure about revisiting a topic, contact your Personal Tutor or the Academic Skills Centre for support and guidance.

1.10.2 Process and Penalties for Misconduct

If any academic misconduct is deemed to have taken place, penalties will be applied in accordance with the AMBeR tariff. For more details refer to the [Academic Misconduct Policy](#).

1.10.3 Appeals

If you feel you have been unfairly accused of academic misconduct you can appeal for review. Refer to the [Academic Misconduct Policy](#) and the Complaints and Appeals section of the [Student Handbook](#) for more information on the grounds for a review and how to submit an appeal.

2. Assessments

2.1 Assessment Styles

2.1.1 Written Assessments

Written assessments are widely used throughout the programme to assess the successful completion of learning outcomes. These assessments gauge the development of systematic technical understanding and communication skills. Examples of written assessments include reports, business plans; specifications; test reports; project plans; White Papers; essays, studies, and journal papers.

2.1.2 Verbal Assessments

Where appropriate, learning outcomes may be assessed through various verbal assessments such as oral presentations, debates, question and answer sessions, posters, and media output. Clarity of message (for both technical and non-technical



audiences), rhetorical reasoning, and debating techniques will be considered when assessing verbal communication skills.

2.1.3 Tutorial Questions

Where appropriate, individual unseen and time-constrained assessment tasks called tutorial questions may be used to assess learning outcomes. The ability to respond to a given, unseen question or task quickly, whilst maintaining accuracy and clarity, is an important engineering skill.

2.1.4 Artefacts

In order to demonstrate and assess the practical skills and competencies required in the learning outcomes, you may be required to produce an artefact. Examples of artefacts include products, components, programs, or assemblies which satisfy a given functional purpose. Artefacts may therefore be physical or digital.

2.1.5 Teamwork

Your ability to function as a productive member of a team is critical to success in engineering. While you will work in teams in all modules as part of the learning process, you will be assessed on your team working skills in the four Community-Based Challenge Concept and Prototype modules.

2.2 Individual Assessments

Where the assessment is identified as individual, the precursory work and the final assessment is completed individually, and the marks are awarded individually. You are responsible for your own work and for meeting the assessment deadline. You must also fill out, sign, and submit the Submission and Declaration Form for each assessment, otherwise they will not be marked and will count as a failed submission. See [Appendix 2](#) for an example.

2.3 Team Assessments

Where the assessment is identified as team, the same mark will be awarded to each member of the team. In instances where any team member is not seen to be fully participating or contributing, the educator conducting the assessment retains the right to intervene and to diminish that individual's marks as a consequence. The details of all expectations and the penalties for insufficient participation in team assessments will be specified in the assessment brief. See [Appendix 3](#) for an example.

Where team members are not participating / contributing, you are asked to inform the module educator and Student Support as soon as any such instances occur so we can follow up with these students. Please do not wait until end of teamwork to inform us as nothing can be done at this late stage.

In cases where students have still failed to contribute / participate after they have been warned as per the above then please just list on the [Submission and Declaration Form](#) the name(s) of those students who have participated. It would also be extremely helpful for markers if you clearly identified those students who did not participate.

Each team need submit only one copy of the assessment. In most cases, you will do this via the group assignment on Canvas. Only one Submission and Declaration Form is needed per team; however, all team members must sign the form in order



for the assessment to be marked. If the Submission and Declaration Form is incomplete, or unsigned by one or more group members, the assessment will not be marked and will count as a failed submission.

2.4 Ephemeral Assessments

Ephemeral assessments are those for which no permanent record of student performance is likely to be practicably kept, such as Presentations, Debates, Q&A, and some Media Outputs and Artefacts. The [Submission and Declaration Form](#) must also be signed and submitted to Canvas for Ephemeral Assessments. If the form is incomplete or unsigned, the assessment will not be marked and will count as a failed submission.

2.5 Preparing Assessments

Your assessments serve two main purposes. They help you to learn and put into practise what you have learned, and they enable NMITE to judge the standard you have achieved. The preparatory work you do for an assessment and the process of developing it should help you to concentrate on particular aspects of the module and to consolidate what you have learned so far.

The nature of assessments will vary from module to module. Within each module you will be given support, guidance, and / or examples of assessments so that you understand what is expected of you. You are encouraged to consult with your module educator, Personal Tutor, and the Academic Skills Centre for help and advice as you complete your assessments.

2.5.1 Discussing Assessments with Other Students

Although you may be most comfortable working on your own, you can learn a great deal from discussing aspects of your module with others. The studio and team environment of NMITE is designed to facilitate an atmosphere where you can discuss your assessments and your questions about them before and during your work. There is nothing wrong with discussing assessments with others, as opinions and insights formed while discussing a question with other people are equally as valuable as those you form while reading or listening on your own. However, when completing individual assessments, you are expected to work alone and not to use the work of others (in its entirety or in part) as if it is your own.

2.5.2 Word Counts

Assessment briefs provided on Canvas within each module will include clear instructions about word counts, the inclusion of footnotes, diagrams, images, tables, figures, and reference lists. You are expected to adhere to the requirements for each assessment. If you exceed these parameters, you may receive a reduction in marks. Please note there is no automatic penalty for under-length work providing there is sufficient suitable content.

2.5.3 Rules for Referencing

You are expected to demonstrate proper referencing practices in all your assessed work. Acquiring good referencing skills develops confidence in academic writing and helps prevent unintentional plagiarism. NMITE recognises the challenges which you face in this respect and is committed to making the necessary resources and support available in order for you to engage honestly and actively in the assessment process.



NMITE's preferred referencing style is Harvard. For support and guidance further support and guidance please contact the Academic Skills Centre.

2.5.4 Assessment Confidentiality

All information you give in assessments and other assessment tasks is regarded as confidential to you and will only be divulged to markers and moderators. Some modules have additional confidentiality guidelines [such as when working with children] and data protection rules which you will be told about in the module-specific information.

Assessments for some modules includes work done using collaborative online tools or software. These are accessible to anyone with the relevant permissions to the website on which they are hosted. As such, NMITE cannot guarantee that the work done in these media will remain confidential.

In your assessments and elsewhere in your module you may be working with an external partner. You may be required to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement (NDA) in some cases. For further information about Intellectual Property rights please contact the Academic Registrar – Registrar@nmite.ac.uk

2.5.5 Keeping Assessments

Always check carefully that you are submitting the correct assessment and always keep a copy of each assessment you submit (where possible). When you submit an assessment via Canvas you must ensure you get an on-screen notification that it has been successfully submitted. You may want to take a screenshot as proof of your successful submission.

You should always retain a copy of the electronic file your assessment was prepared on. For artefacts, take and retain a photo in case the artefact is lost or damaged. For ephemeral assessments such as presentations and Q&A, keep any preparatory notes or slides.

We strongly advise you to keep your marked assessments, along with proof of submission, until you complete the degree programme. We are not able to provide you with copies of your assessments.

2.6 Late Submission of Assessments

Planning, time-management, and the meeting of deadlines are all part of the personal and professional skills expected of NMITE graduates. For this reason, NMITE expects students to submit all assessments by the published deadline date and time.

If you hand in your work late, without a good reason for doing so, your mark will be reduced in line with the following:

- Submission within 6 working days: a reduction of 10 percentage points from the overall mark scored for each working day late, down to the 40% pass mark (for FHEQ Levels 4, 5 and 6) and 50% pass mark (FHEQ Level 7) and no further.
- Submission that is late by 7 or more working days: a mark of 0 is given.
- Non-submission: a mark of 0 is given.



In circumstances where the late submission results in a Fail of the assessment, the criteria for the Resitting of Assessments will apply, please refer to paragraph 2.9 in this Handbook and for further information the [NMITE Academic Regulations](#).

In circumstances where it is accepted that Extenuating Circumstances apply to the assessment submission, penalties will be waived for the affected assessment(s). Other options, such as the setting of a revised submission deadline, may also be applied if the Extenuating Circumstances Committee considers it appropriate. The revised submission deadline will be agreed upon by the Module Lead and Academic Registrar, and you will be informed of the date in writing.

2.7 Marking of Assessments

Wherever possible, assessment will be marked anonymously. Anonymous marking is defined as where an assessment is assessed without the student's name or identity being made known to the marker, moderator or external examiner. Anonymous marking avoids the risk of bias entering the assessment process and endeavors to make sure all students are treated equally. There are necessary exceptions to anonymity where assessments include debates, presentations, and some team or group assessments.

Ephemeral assessments will undergo open double marking by the module educator and another member of academic staff with experience in the subject area. Non-ephemeral assessments will undergo unseen double marking. When determining the final mark for any assessment, the outcome of the double marking process will be:

- for discrepancies of less than 10%, an average of the marks from the first and second markers;
- for discrepancies of greater than 10%, an agreement on the mark following discussions between the two markers to resolve any differences. It should be noted that where the markers cannot agree, an independent academic will act as a third marker. Third marking will normally be unseen (the third marker will have no knowledge of the first and second marker's results).

All first, second (and third, where relevant) marking will be evidenced.

2.8 Feedback and Feedforward

Feedback and feedforward are essential components of your learning process at NMITE. These will take place both informally (such as through conversation with an educator or tutor) and formally (via your assessment record and regular quizzes) during each module.

A copy of your assessment record with annotated feedback shall be provided via a pro forma on Canvas within 15 working days of the assessment date. See [Appendix 4](#) for an example. You can also access marks and feedback on the module's Grades page in Canvas. The principle of providing feedback as quickly as possible may mean that unratified coursework marks are given to students prior to confirmation by the Assessment Board.

You should be aware that until marks are ratified, they are subject to change following moderation or scrutiny by the External Examiner.



If you fail a module, you will be alerted to this situation in a timely manner so that, for the purpose of resits, optimal use (as appropriate) can be made of the Thursday and Friday following the end of all 3.5-week modules.

2.8.1 Feedback

NMITE recognises that effective feedback is an essential part of both formative and summative assessment and that effective feedback is best given as a dialogue between students and educators. All modules will therefore have extensive opportunity for you to discuss your work, and its level, with staff in a formative manner. Written feedback will also be provided on summative assessments in a form that reflects the nature of the assessment.

For both regular quizzes and formal assessments, feedback shall compare the process, activity level, timing, effort, and engagement with expected levels, and will provide you with guidance as to how your work on the assessment could have been improved. Feedback will target the process followed rather than the result gained. This shall include whether you have successfully completed the tasks in the expected way to the appropriate level.

2.8.2 Feedforward

Feedforward shall provide you with guidance as to how to resolve, complete or deliver future assessments of a similar nature. The feedforward will include detailed improvement opportunities together with advice about content, time management, effort, engagement, information sources, presentation style and effectiveness. The feedforward will also include personal development and learning/coping strategies. Opportunities for development which require either a significant change in approach by an identified student, or a significant percentage of the cohort, shall be led by an educator and also be communicated to Student Support.

2.9 Resitting Assessments

If you achieve less than the assessment pass mark you will be required to undertake a resit of the assessment. You may resit each assessment once (unless you have evidenced [Extenuating Circumstances](#)). The assessment mark will be capped at 40% for FHEQ Levels 4, 5 and 6 and capped at 50% for FHEQ Level 7.

The deadline for resitting will be agreed upon by the Module Lead and Academic Registrar and confirmed to you in writing.

2.10 Appealing Assessment Marks

While you may not appeal against academic judgment, you do have the right to appeal against the decision of the Assessment Board. Details of the Appeals Procedure can be found within the [Student Academic Appeals Policy](#).

2.11 Substitution of Alternative Assessments

In cases of resits or other adjustments, you may be asked to complete a substituted alternative assessment designed to measure the necessary learning outcomes. This substitution will have been approved and moderated using the standard assessment protocols.



2.12 Options for the Retake of Study

If, having exhausted all permitted compensation and resit opportunities, you are still unable to pass a module, the Assessment Board may, at its discretion, permit one of the following options:

- Partial retake as a fully registered student;
- Partial retake for assessment only;
- Full retake.

Further details can be found in the [NMITE Academic Regulations](#).

2.13 Deferral / Postponement

If you want to delay the completion of an assessment, you may be able to withdraw from a module and then rejoin at a later date to complete it. This is known as deferral. Please refer to the [Leave of Absence Policy](#) for more information. If you defer, you may be able to carry scores for assessments you have already completed over to your new start date.

2.14 Degree Classifications

For details on degree classifications, please see your Programme Handbook. Once results have been presented to the Assessment Board and marks are agreed (and therefore no longer subject to change), results will be uploaded into the student record system (NMITE Source) and a final mark reflected on Canvas.

3. Assurance of Standards

Assessment Boards and External Examiners have a quality assurance role in reviewing and confirming the assessment standards between modules and of the assessment process and grading as a whole.

Due to NMITE's module scheduling, it is necessary to agree marks in principle outside the traditional cycle of Assessment Boards, which External Examiners attend, and which are typically the primary opportunity for External Examiners to view and judge the appropriateness of marks. To facilitate this, NMITE has agreed with its validating partner the Open University that marks can be approved by External Examiners after review of them remotely via Canvas.

3.1 Assessment Boards

Module results are reported to the Assessment Board for approval. Details of the membership and remit of the Assessment Board can be obtained from the Registrar. The membership includes the subject External Examiner, who has specific roles in the assurance process. Normally, module results will be ratified at an Assessment Board no more than four weeks following the end of the module cluster.

3.2 External Examiners

External Examiners have an important role within the quality assurance mechanisms in assuring comparability of academic standards outside and within NMITE and ensuring the fairness of the operation and assessment of modules and programmes. They also contribute towards the assurance and enhancement of the quality of learning and teaching, and the attainment by students of learning outcomes.



External Examiners are senior academics from outside NMITE, from another university or higher education institution. They are nominated by NMITE, but once approved are appointed and employed by The Open University, NMITE's validating partner, and they typically represent differing areas of expertise. Details about the External Examiners for your programme may be found in your Programme Handbook.

As soon as assessments have been internally marked (at most 5 working days after the completion of a module) they will be available to External Examiners through Canvas. Assessments will be sent to the External Examiner whose expertise most closely matches the material being considered. Marks and assessments will be made available to the External Examiner(s) via secure and auditable processes (including via Canvas or secure postage/courier).

External Examiners will have 10 working days to review marking. This ensures that students who have failed an assessment are able to resit within a month of their first attempt. During the first year of operation all assessments will be made available to the External Examiners, in the second year borderline cases will be made available, and in subsequent years a selection of borderline cases will be available.

3.3 Assessment Security

NMITE takes assessment security seriously, and is guided by principle 10 in the UK Quality Code for Higher Education: *Assessment is carried out securely. Staff carry out all aspects of assessment in a way that ensures the integrity of the assessment process and, in turn, the integrity of the academic standards of each award.*

To mitigate against potential risks to the integrity of assessments, NMITE has adopted the following procedures:

- All assessment materials are created and housed on Canvas, which is secured by two-factor authentication. External Examiners will also use Canvas to access the assessments they review. Staff working on assessment materials will ensure their computers are not left unattended.
- When timed, unseen assessments are given, at least two members of academic staff will be present to invigilate.
- Students submit all assessments via Canvas, which requires their personal and unique log-in authentication details.
- Academic offices are kept locked and are only accessible using a valid ID swipe card restricted to staff only.

3.4 Retention of Assessed Work

The Academic Registrar will be responsible for arranging the collection, storage, retrieval, and subsequent secure disposal of assessment material, in accordance with NMITE's [Records Management Policy](#) and/or the requirements of Professional and Statutory Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).



Appendix 1 – Marking Criteria Example

| MARKING CRITERIA | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area: | 0-19 Marks | 20-39 Marks | 40-59 Marks | 60-79 Marks | 80-100 Marks |
| <u>Knowledge and Understanding:</u> Purpose of the Text Regime | There is no indication that product requirements have been studied or evaluated in order to determine an acceptable test methodology. | There is little indication that product requirements have been studied or verified. The employed methodology contains content to enable a solution to be tested, but with omissions or errors which result in features or functions being unassessed. | There is evidence that the majority of user requirements have been evaluated for relevance, feasibility, priority and affirmed. The employed methodology would enable a solution to be appropriately and thoroughly assessed. | The requirements have been studied and evaluated for relevance, feasibility, and priority. The report content demonstrates the minimum number of activities and resources have been used to evaluate the product. | The requirements have been studied and evaluated for relevance, feasibility, and priority in an innovative or insightful way. The report content demonstrates the minimum number of activities and resources have been used to evaluate the product with a high level of accuracy, precision, and confidence. |
| <u>Analysis, Interpretation, and Application of Theory / Skills:</u> Test Techniques and Conditions | The report indicates poorly selected, or incorrectly or inconsistently applied, test techniques. | The report contains test mechanisms that may have been poorly applied. | Most test techniques, and their conditions, have been justified and appropriately employed. | The report showcases an approach to product evaluation which would support effective product acceptance. | The report showcases a thorough, creative, and diligent approach to product evaluation which would support effective product acceptance. |
| Quality of Communication | The report contains significant problems with clarity and concision, along with errors in mechanics (spelling, punctuation, grammar). | The report is generally unclear and contains lapses in mechanics. | The report is overall clear but contains some lapses in mechanics. | The report exhibits concise diction and syntax, as well as correct mechanics. | The report is stylistically superior in its concision and correctness. |
| Quality of Work | The report uses the incorrect template, or the template has been modified or used in a | The report template may have been modified incorrectly at times and struggles with | The report uses the correct template with a combination of original text and graphical communication. | The report uses the correct template with a combination of both original text and | The report uses the correct template to great effect. The combination of |



| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|
| | manner which is not permitted. | text / graphical layout. | | graphical communication to a good standard. | original text and graphical communication is used to a high standard throughout. |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|



Appendix 2 – Student Submission and Declaration Proforma

| SECTION 1a | STUDENT ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Student name: | | | |
| Team submission: | <input type="checkbox"/> | Individual submission: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Assessor name(s): | | | |
| Module title: | | | |
| Module code: | | | |
| Assessment title: | | | |
| Data Assessment Submitted: | DD/MM/YYYY | | |
| Method of Assessment Submission: | | | |
| Additional Evidence or Materials Submitted: | | | |
| SECTION 1b | STUDENT DECLARATION | | |
| Declaration: | I hereby certify that the work submitted for this assessment is my own <i>[as part of a team]</i> ¹ . I have clearly referenced any sources used in the work. I understand that false declaration is a form of malpractice. | | |
| Learner signature: | | | |

¹ Please delete as appropriate



Appendix 3 – Assessment Brief Proforma

| SECTION 1a | MODULE DETAILS | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Assessment title: | | | |
| Module title: | | Programme title: | |
| Module code: | | Credit value: | |
| FHEQ level: | | Cohort name and cluster: | |
| Module lead: | | Assessors: | |
| Release date: | DD/MM/YYYY | Submission date: | DD/MM/YYYY |
| Assessment Number: <i>(Number assigned alphabetically)</i> | <i>i:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>ii:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>iii:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | Number of Assessments for Module: | 2: <input type="checkbox"/> 3: <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Assessment aims: | | | |
| Assessment description and detailed instructions: | | | |
| Indicative Learning Outcomes: <i>Please indicate alignment with Programme Level and PSRB Learning Outcomes</i> | Indicative Learning Outcomes | | Programme Level LOs |
| | ILO1: | | |
| | ILO2: | | |
| | ILO3: | | |
| | ILO4: | | |
| | ILO5: | | |
| | ILO6: | | |
| | ILO7: | | |
| ILO8: | | | |
| Assessment sizes (as defined by Credit value and FHEQ level): | | | |
| Marking process: | | | |



| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|
| Other assessment materials attached to this brief (if applicable): | | | | | |
| SECTION 1b | MARKING CRITERIA | | | | |
| Area: | 0-19 Marks | 20-39 Marks | 40-59 Marks | 60-79 Marks | 80-100 Marks |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| SECTION 2a | INTERNAL: VERIFIER CHECKLIST | | | | |
| Does the assessment: | | | | | |
| Allow for demonstration of the Module ILOs? <input type="checkbox"/> | Align to subject benchmark statements? <input type="checkbox"/> | Meet PSRB and Programme Level learning outcomes? <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| Enable assessment variety within the cluster and level? <input type="checkbox"/> | Account for learning hours required in the module <input type="checkbox"/> | Compare to other assessments in terms of level qualification and descriptors? <input type="checkbox"/> | | | |
| <i>Comments:</i> | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Is the assessment designed to reinforce appropriate stages of student development? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the assessment valid in measuring achievement against Programme Learning Outcomes? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Does the assessment have criteria that are fairly and appropriately weighted according to level expectations? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Does the assessment clearly indicate the way in which marks are allocated for team assessments? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Does the assessment process guard against academic misconduct? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Does the marking scheme relate to learning outcomes and assessment criteria? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the marking scheme clear and well-defined? | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |



| SECTION 2b | | SUBMISSION DETAILS | |
|---|--|--------------------|--|
| Submitted by: | | Position: | |
| Signature: | | Date: | |
| Verifier: | | | |
| Signature: | | Date: | |
| SECTION 2c | | OUTCOME | |
| Verifier: | | Date: | |
| Academic Council Decision: | | Date: | |
| Approved (subject to further actions): <i>Details provided</i> | | | |
| Rejected: <i>Details provided</i> | | | |
| Name: | | Position: | |
| Signature: | | Date: | |

Appendix 4 – Module Completion Student Feedback Proforma

| SECTION 1 | | STUDENT FEEDBACK | |
|-----------------------|--|------------------|--|
| Name: | | | |
| ID Number: | | | |
| Programme code: | | Module code: | |
| Start date of Module: | | | |
| Module educator: | | | |



| | | | |
|---|--|-----------|--------------------------|
| SECTION 2 | PERSONAL ASSESSMENT OF EFFORT | | |
| | <i>Select which applies to your approach to this assignment</i> | | |
| I have invested the minimum amount of work required to pass the assessment; I was aiming for a minimal Pass | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I have put sufficient effort into this assignment to get a safe grade, I was aiming for a Pass | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| I have tried really hard to maximise my marks, I was aiming for greater than a Pass | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| SECTION 3 | FEEDBACK REQUEST | | |
| What do I want feedback on? | | | |
| What prior feedback have I acted upon in this assessment? | | | |
| What do I want feedback for? | | | |
| SECTION 4 | HOW CAN FUTURE WORK BE IMPROVED | | |
| | <i>To be completed by the Module Educator and to include how future work can be improved (e.g. identified errors in practice; procedural errors and guidance for learning). Comments must identify improvements that should be made for similar assessments.</i> | | |
| | | | |
| Feedback completed by: | | | |
| Name: | | Position: | |
| Signature: | | Date: | |