

# Extraordinary Teaching Committee

Thursday 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2pm, Room 5.42

Present: Alan Smaill (Convenor), Björn Franke (Director of Teaching), Sharon Goldwater, Gillian Bell, Colin Stirling, Julian Bradfield

In Attendance: Gregor Hall (administrator)

- 1. Apologies for Absence:** Paul Anderson  
Frank Keller

- 2. Late Submission of Coursework:**

The Convenor went over the agenda item, and read out input from Committee members who were unable to be at the meeting. One Committee member put forward that any proposal should be safe, robust and clear to the students. Another raised the need for a “no later than” deadline. The DoT mentioned that changes to deadlines cause problems and that the Year Organiser should be involved should a deadline have to change. The Convenor was of the opinion that Special Circumstances should not allow deadlines to accumulate, and that any changes to the “submit” DICE function will require DoT support.

The DoT said he would inform staff that the Deadline Google calendar was the golden copy for deadlines (in case any were unaware.) It was also mentioned that the practice by some lecturers of allowing a brief grace period after a deadline – to mitigate for submission issue, for example - would no longer be required due to the reduction of the hard zero-percent penalty.

Changes to the submit function were discussed. Currently submit retains only the last submission. It was pointed out that some courses with formative assessments encourage multiple submissions – Computer Programming Concepts and Skills, for example. The fact that some Schools only permit one submission was raised. One board member asked about the effect of submission problems, which are not uncommon.

It was proposed that only one submission should be permitted after the deadline. Another proposal was that students could submit as often as they wished before the deadline, but if they did submit before the deadline, the system would not accept submissions after the deadline.

Another proposal was a system whereby students could submit as many times as desired before the deadline, but only after the deadline if they had not already

submitted. It was acknowledged there will always be students who submit and then decide that they did something wrong and wish to resubmit post–deadline. It was suggested that it would be necessary to provide a warning to students should they attempt to submit after the deadline – telling them that either

- (a) they could not submit as they had already done so before the deadline, or
- (b) if they had not yet submitted, they would be penalised accordingly

One issue with the submit system was that students could not see what they had submitted – at the very least it would be useful for students to be able to see the submission file(s) date stamp, and ideally the contents too. The issue of opting out of the increasing-penalties system was discussed. It was mooted that course lecturers who wished to opt out would have to make a case for doing so.

The method of dealing with hard copy submissions was brought up. It was deemed important that extensions not be used to accumulate time after the deadline. For example, a student given a three day extension would not then be able to submit it five days after the extension date; they would only be permitted 2 days in which to submit it late.

The Committee discussed the application of penalties. Lecturers need to have the submit times and dates for all students and a list of extensions immediately after the deadline as dealing with multiple emails about individual deadlines is inefficient. It was proposed that the course lecturer, and not ITO, be responsible for applying penalties and would provide the ITO with course marks in spreadsheet format with both an “original” mark and an “final” mark, the latter being adjusted for penalties.

ITO will be using Euclid’s Assessment and Progression Tool for the first time in 2017/18. It was explained how marks will be uploaded to APT, and following a ratification process, would be visible as provisional marks. Marks would then be edited to apply penalties, leaving an audit trail of changes.

**ACTIONS:** The Convenor, DoT and Gillian Bell shall contact Computing Support about the process of adapting the submit command so that it supports the proposed functionality. The DoT would also contact the Teaching Staff about the proposed changes.