



Senate

Paper title	Late submission of assignments
Outcome requested	<p>The Senate is asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. consider proposals on late work penalties; 2. agree the need for a consistent approach across Queen Mary; 3. agree to a consultation exercise based upon the proposals made in this document.
Points to note and further information	<p>QMUL’s policy on penalties for late submission was introduced in 2014/15. Notwithstanding efforts at the time to agree a single approach across the university, the established policy permits schools and institutes to opt for either a ‘scaled’ or ‘immediate zero’ scheme of penalties, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) where an assignment is submitted late, five per cent of the total marks will be deducted each day, up to five days, after which a mark of zero is applied (‘scaled’ scheme); b) where an assignment is submitted late, a mark of zero is applied immediately. <p>More recently, a number of schools have expressed concern that the scaled scheme of penalties may be disproportionate and overly complex. Although the scheme is broadly in line with practices at other Russell Group universities, the strength of opinion is such that there would be merit in re-opening the consultation with schools. This also presents a further opportunity to agree a single approach across the university.</p> <p>The Education Quality and Standards Board considered a detailed paper on approaches to late work penalties at Queen Mary and elsewhere. The Board agreed that Queen Mary should seek to establish one single model for use across the institution, and proposed consulting on three models (the third of which was amended at the meeting, and differs from that in the paper).</p> <p><i>Model 1</i> The existing policy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Where an assignment is submitted late (and there are no extenuating circumstances) a mark of zero (OFL – zero, fail, late) shall be applied immediately, unless the School/Institute has made it explicit that the alternative penalty of graduated deductions applies.

- b. Where the penalty of graduated deductions applies, five per cent of the total marks available (i.e. five marks for an assignment marked out of one hundred) shall be deducted for each 24-hour period or part thereof after the submission date and time, including weekends and bank holidays. An assignment submitted more than 120 hours late shall be awarded a mark of zero (0FL).
- c. Where the penalty of graduated deductions applies, a school/institute must make students aware of the penalty in advance, or else the default penalty (an immediate mark of 0 FL) will apply. This may be published in the programme handbook and/or - where a school/institute does not use the same policy for all assessments - in module handbooks.
- d. Where a student fails a module as a consequence of one of these penalties in an assessment, normal resit provision shall apply (where attempts remain).

Model 2

Based upon the existing policy, with enhancements drawn from the review exercise.

- a. If an assignment is submitted after the specified deadline, it shall be recorded as late and a penalty shall be applied.
- b. For every period of 24 hours or part thereof that an assignment is overdue there shall be a deduction of five per cent of the total marks available (i.e. five marks for an assessment marked out of 100). After five working days (120 hours or more late) the mark shall be reduced to zero, and recorded as 0FL (zero, fail, late).

Model 3

A fixed deduction and a much longer timeframe. This would be at the very most lenient end of the Russell Group scale.

- a. If an assignment is submitted after the specified deadline, it shall be recorded as late and a penalty of minus ten marks shall be applied. Deductions shall not be made below the minimum pass mark.
- b. After ten working days (120 hours or more late) the mark shall be reduced to the minimum pass mark
- c. After a further ten working days (240 hours or more late), the mark shall be reduced to zero and recorded as 0FL (zero, fail, late).

The following points would be common to proposals 2 and 3:

- a. Deductions shall not be applied on weekends or days on which QMUL is closed. Schools and institutes are advised not to set deadlines on days preceding non-working days.

- b. In a case where a student has submitted work of passing standard but fails the module because of the late submission penalty and the student has a resit attempt remaining, the student shall be deemed to have passed the module with the minimum pass mark for that module. This gives the same outcome as putting the student into reassessment, but without delaying progression or award outcomes or requiring resubmission of the late assignment. Where a student does not have a further resit attempt remaining, this provision shall not apply and the penalty shall be applied in its standard form.
- c. Certain assessments may cease to be a valid measure of a module's learning outcomes prior to the five working day cut-off. For example, where feedback is provided to the class, any submission made after that would not be an accurate measure of attainment. In such cases, the late submission policy shall apply as normal up to the day on which feedback is given; at that point, a mark of zero (0FL) shall be applied, even if this is within five working days of the deadline. Schools and institutes must make clear to students in advance where this variant policy applies, or else the general policy shall be applied.
- d. A late work penalty may be removed where a student provides good reason for the late submission under the extenuating circumstances policy. A student must submit a formal claim with supporting evidence in line with that policy in order for the circumstances to be considered.
- e. Schools and institutes may award extensions to submission deadlines. This is at the discretion of the school/institute. Where a school/institute does consider the award of an extension, a student must apply before the submission date with an extenuating circumstances claim and supporting evidence. In no circumstances shall an extension set a new deadline beyond the next meeting of the relevant subject examination board.

Questions to consider

The Senate is asked to endorse EQSB's proposal for a consultation, with a view to establishing the use of a single Queen Mary policy from one of the three options outlined above.

The Senate may bear in mind the policies of other Russell Group institutions when considering the proposals. These have been ranked from the most lenient to most the stringent. QMUL has two policies):

Rank	Institution	Policy
=1	Birmingham LSE Nottingham QUB Warwick	-5 per day until zero is reached. Warwick deducts only 3 marks per day for PGT, but 5 for UG – the logic is unclear, but this may be because

			the (higher) PG pass mark would be reached faster through deductions.
	2	Leeds	-5 per day for 14 calendar days, then zero.
	=3	Edinburgh Sheffield	-5 per day for seven calendar days, then zero.
	=4	QMUL (2)	-5 per day for five calendar days, then zero.
	5	Bristol	-10 immediately, and a mark of zero after seven days. Faculty level policies for the interim deductions.
	6	UCL	-10 for the first 48 hours, cap to the pass mark between 2 and 5 days, then zero.
	=7	Manchester Southampton York	-10 per day for five days, then zero.
	=8	Durham Newcastle	Cap to the pass mark immediately, then zero after five working days.
	=9	Imperial KCL	Cap to the pass mark immediately, then zero after one day.
	=10	QMUL (1) Cardiff	Immediate mark of zero.
	<p>Liverpool, Exeter, Oxford and Cambridge do not have centralised policies. However, Liverpool requires that there <u>is</u> a penalty, Exeter requires that all local policies result in a mark of zero after 14 days, and example local policies from Cambridge give an immediate mark of zero).</p>		
Regulatory/statutory reference points	QMUL Assessment Handbook		
Strategy and risk	Aligns with SA3.		
Reporting/consideration route for the paper	<p>Full paper considered by EQSB. Senate to consider this summary cover sheet. EQSB to direct a consultation exercise. Senate to consider EQSB's final recommendation for approval.</p>		
Author	Simon Hayter, Assistant Academic Registrar (Assessment Governance)		
Sponsor	Professor Rebecca Lingwood, Vice-Principal (Student Experience, Teaching & Learning).		