Assessment and Feedback Policy

Document Title: Assessment and Feedback Policy			
Version No.	1.2	Policy Owner	Academic Registrar
Superseded version	Assessment and Feedback Policy 2018/19	Author Role Title	Principal Lecturer Learning & Teaching Excellence
Approval Date	10.07.19	Approved by	UAB
Effective Date	September 2019	Review Date	Annually

Contents

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK POLICY

This Policy provides a 'course-focused' framework for effective, relevant and fair assessment practice that promotes future facing learning, engaging the multiple purposes of assessment and feedback. These include:

Assessment of Learning: making judgments about students' summative achievement of learning outcomes for purposes of certification and institutional quality assurance processes.

Assessment for Learning: providing information about student learning achievement that allows active and student-led approaches to be adapted to respond to the changing needs of the learner.

Assessment as Learning: involving students in assessment, the effective use of feedback, participating in peer assessment, and self-monitoring of progress as key aspects of their long-term learning development.

The Assessment & Feedback Policy applies to all students undertaking taught components and courses, including online provision.

2. GLOSSARY OF TERMS RELATING TO THE ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK POLICY

Assessment Criteria

A description of the criteria used to judge whether the desired level of performance in the assessment has been achieved. Assessment criteria are developed by analysing the learning outcomes and identifying the specific characteristics that contribute to the overall assignment.

Academic Integrity

Assessment is designed to minimise opportunities for students to commit academic misconduct, including plagiarism, self-plagiarism and contract cheating (UK Quality Code for Higher Education, QAA: Assessment).

Assessment

The process of evidencing and evaluating the extent to which a learner has met the learning outcomes (of the course or module).

Formative Assessment/Work/Processes

Learning tasks that are used to provide developmental feedback to a learner so that they can improve their future performance. As such, they usually take place during the module(s) rather than at the end.

Summative Assessment

Assessment undertaken in order that a learner's achievement of learning outcomes can be measured and the level of performance judged, graded and recorded.

Component of Assessment

A constituent part or aspect of a module's overall assessment strategy. Where a module employs multiple components, each should assess different learning outcomes. Each component will be awarded an individual mark that will be recorded in SITS separately. Components of assessment may be comprised of multiple elements.

Assessment for learning

The process providing information about student learning achievement that allows active and student-led approaches to be adapted to respond to the changing needs of the learner.

Assessment Literacy

The process of engaging staff and students in an understanding both of the purposes of

assessment and the institutional contexts in which that assessment takes place. The development of such literacy is essential to everyone involved in assessment practice insofar as learning is most effective when students and staff share an understanding of academic and professional standards and the regulatory environment which frames those standards (see Price et al., 2012)[1].

Assessment Strategy

The overall plan for assessment of a specific course, including reassessment, which encourages students' understanding of content and promotes the acquisition of appropriate skills.

Examination

A form of assessment that is time constrained. Separate "Examination Instructions for Students" and "Examination Invigilators Instructions" are included within the [Academic Misconduct Regulations.](#)

Feedback

Information given to students about the quality of their performance in an assessment.

Formative Feedback

Information generate for and/or with students about the quality of their performance in Formative Assessment/work/processes. The marks awarded do not count towards the final mark of the module/course/award.

Summative Feedback

Information given to students about the quality of their performance in Summative Assessment. The marks awarded normally count towards the final mark of the module/course/award.

Unratified Feedback

Feedback given to a student before the mark has been agreed (ratified) by the relevant Board.

Learning Outcomes

Define what a student is expected to know, understand or be able to do on completion of a given unit of learning (for module, level or course). Module Outcomes, Level Outcomes, and Course Outcomes are all detailed and

---

[1] Price, M., Rust, C., O'Donovan, B., Handley, K. and Bryant, R. (2012). Assessment literacy: The foundation for improving student learning. Oxford Brookes University. Assessment Standards and Knowledge Exchange.

	considered as part of the Approval/Review process.
Level (of study)	An indicator of the relative demand, complexity, depth of learning and learner autonomy which will be required of a student undertaking either a module or level of study.
Marks	A value given to a piece of assessed work. The University has generic marking criteria for each academic level to assist with marking.
Moderation	The processes that take place following first marking to verify the judgement of the first marker(s). This could include double marking, concealed double marking or internal sampling, depending on the complexity of provision.
Module Specification	A proforma detailing the specific details of an individual module including title, level, credits, description, outcomes and assessment.
Course	The package of modules that lead to a named award. All courses at undergraduate degree level will comprise of modules organised into levels. Aims, objectives and learning outcomes are defined for each level within a course. Each course is further defined within a Course Specification.
Course Specification	A Course Specification is a concise description of a course that leads to a University award. For each course it describes: the aims and outcomes; the structure; the teaching, learning and assessment methods and any professional accreditation associated with the completion of the course.
Progression	The move from one level to the next within a course of studies.
Reassessment	A further attempt at a failed assessment (component and/or module). Students are normally entitled to one reassessment attempt per module and there will normally be a cap on the mark that can be achieved (see section 4.5 of the Assessment Regulations).

3. COURSE-FOCUSED ASSESSMENT

This policy explicitly advocates a course-focused view of assessment, placing emphasis on the overall coherence and connectedness of learning outcomes and learning, teaching and assessment practices at the scale of the course. It requires a strategic, collaborative and planned approach by course teams to 'design in' how the elements that make up the student learning and assessment experience support each other and are structured to help guide students' progression towards attainment of course learning outcomes.

Course-focused assessment strategies actively recognise and accommodate the different purposes and approaches of assessment in higher education. Such a course-focused view helps to frame curriculum and assessment design to fully consider the learning journey and experience of the student and to critically evaluate what needs to be assessed and how.

A course-focused approach to assessment is characterised by three main features: (1) *Transparency*: assessment and feedback processes are clearly articulated, relevant to context, and designed to enable action in the ways they foster student learning and improve success. (2) *Validity*: courses are constructively aligned ensuring assessment is authentic and designed to achieve key outcomes and directs students towards appropriate learning. (3) *Inclusivity*: assessment processes provide an accessible, engaging and relevant learning experience for all students across the entire course of study.

These features underpin this Assessment and Feedback Policy, informing its three core dimensions (outlined below), supporting principles and implementation notes for designing course-focused assessment and feedback.

— **Assessment Design**

— **Assessment Feedback**

— **Assessment Standards**

3.1 ASSESSMENT DESIGN

AD1: Assessments are explicitly aligned to learning outcomes and set at an appropriate academic level.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Each learning outcome is assessed.	The University Credit Level Descriptors, based on the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) descriptors, must be used to inform course and module learning outcomes. All course and module learning outcomes must be summatively assessed but, where formative assessment is embedded and linked to summative assessment, then Module Approval Panels can use discretion in allowing some learning outcomes to be formatively assessed. The module specification must include: 1) details of learning outcomes and assessment strategies; 2) Information about which learning outcomes each assessment component is aligned to.
b) Assessment is designed to focus students on learning appropriate to the academic level of study.	Assessments must be appropriate to assess the specific type of learning outcomes. Assessment design must consider all modes of course delivery and environments, including where employers may be involved in assessment, such as Higher Degree Apprenticeships. Where there are required course-level Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body standards and criteria to be met, assessment processes should be appropriately aligned and designed to account for key threshold (competency) standards. The Course Specification must give an overview of the assessment strategy for the course and detail how this strategy will play out across levels of study,

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	referencing key points of progression. All individual assessment tasks (both formative and summative) must be clearly detailed in Module Specifications. Assessment strategies are reviewed as part of the Course Approval/Review process and will be subject to regular monitoring through Continuous Monitoring and Enhancements (CME) processes.
c) A range of summative assessment is utilised that encourages learning and counters possible bias associated with individual assessment methods.	Course and module assessment strategies will be developed considering how assessments/tasks integrate within and across modules and levels of study. Details of the module assessment strategy must be included in the Module Specification clearly articulating how it connects to the overall course assessment strategy. An overarching assessment schedule will be agreed and placed on the VLE for each level of a course and captured in the Course Handbook specifying: — Details of the form of each assessment (essay, examination etc.) — The weighting attributed to each component of assessment. — The date, time and mechanism for submission for each assignment. — Details of the form that feedback will take for each assignment for each assignment (written, audio/visual) and the latest date by which students will receive feedback. The range, spread and appropriateness of assessment for the course must be summarised in the Course Specification. This is will be reviewed as part of the Course Approval/Review Process.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
d) Clear and appropriate learning expectations and criteria are provided for all assessment activities.	Each module assessment component requires specific assessment criteria based on the module learning outcomes. Students and staff will be provided with a brief for each assessment component task that clearly articulates the criteria by which students are assessed, its size/time limit, weighting, and arrangements and dates for submission and return. Each Module Specification must give details of the assessment tasks and assessment criteria and how they align to key learning outcomes. Assessment criteria are developed with regard to the generic marking criteria and level descriptors in addition to the relevant module and course learning outcomes (see **Appendix B – University Generic Marking Criteria**). Generic marking criteria **are not** intended to replace specific assessment criteria which indicate what must be met to demonstrate achievement of the stated learning outcomes. — The generic marking criteria can also be used to develop specific marking grids or rubrics for individual assessment and whole modules. — It is important that marking schemes and processes are used consistently across modules and courses and created to encourage use of the full range of marks available.
e) Course-focused assessment strategies are intentionally designed to align with and respond to the Future Facing Learning themes. Cont'd	Course-focused assessment strategies should align with clearly articulated course learning outcomes that explicitly respond to the Future Facing Learning themes. It is important that the Course-focused assessment strategy is explored with key stakeholders as part of the Course Approval and Review process.

AD2: There is a course-wide emphasis on assessment for learning.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Course focused assessment strategies include an appropriate mix of summative and formative assessment	It is important to establish an effective balance between the use of low stakes (formative) and high stakes (summative) assessment, aligned to the kinds of learning required at module and course level. Careful consideration must be given to how the combination of low and high stakes assessment component tasks is 'developmentally appropriate' for, and aligns with, learning outcomes at all different levels. Assessment components should be scheduled to ensure that there is time within the course structure for students to put their learning (feedforward) into practice in subsequent tasks and activities. Due regard should be given to the inclusion of early formative work to promote skills development in Level 4 (and/or Level 3 as appropriate) of an undergraduate course or the transition phase in postgraduate courses. This enables students to develop skills in a safe environment and receive timely and constructive feedback.
b) Course strategies include a range of formative methods/processes that encourage learning. Cont'd	Courses must incorporate a range of formative processes – including oral, written, and where feasible, peer assessment and feedback – with careful consideration of student and staff assessment workload in the context of the course as a whole. Formative tasks need to be planned as part of the whole-course strategy to ensure student learning will 'feedforward' to appropriate tasks and challenges. Appropriate processes for providing formative feedback on progress must be included in all modules. Details of such

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	formative processes should be clearly identified as part of the course-focused assessment strategy in the Course Specification and must be included in the assessment strategy of each module.
c) Assessment practices are carefully structured and scheduled to ensure students have opportunity to build their confidence and ability in becoming independent learners.	Courses will provide a variety of assessment formats to encourage students to demonstrate varied understandings, showcase different skills and produce a range of student learning outcomes.

Where less familiar types of assessment are used, timely opportunities will be made available for students to practise and to receive constructive feedback. Mechanisms for enabling this support must be detailed in the relevant Module Specifications. |
| d) Assessment is efficient, manageable and supports student learning development.

Cont'd | The spread, number and methods of assessment are considered alongside concurrent modules to ensure that the burden of assessment is not excessive for students and staff.

Assessment processes and deadlines should be timed to give students adequate time to reflect on learning and develop the required skills before engaging in 'high stakes' summative assessment.

Information about which learning outcomes each assessment component assesses, along with an assessment schedule giving details of the deadlines of specific assessments must be completed as part of the Approval/Review documentation and reviewed at the Approval/Review Event. A schedule of assessment (including activities and deadlines) for the course must be provided to all students at the start of each academic year for that level of study. |

AD3: Course-wide assessment practices are designed to ensure all students have equal opportunities to demonstrate achievement.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Students will be given equal opportunity to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes.	Every student should have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement through the assessment process, with no group or individual disadvantaged. This is promoted by the use of a range of assessment and feedback methods, guidance and support at course level. Assessment tasks should only be selected for grading if they can be assessed equitably. Course teams should be proactive in considering the needs of students at the point of assessment design, including those studying at different locations, from different cultural/educational backgrounds, with additional learning needs, or with protected characteristics. For further guidance on the development of inclusive provision see the University's Principles for Inclusivity. Further guidance and support on the development of competence standards can be sought from Student and Library Services as part of the course approval and review process.
b) Assessments will be designed on the basis that they are accessible and appropriate to assess the type of learning outcomes. Cont'd	The appropriateness of assessments will be reviewed as part of the Approval/Review process. Where group work forms part of an assessment strategy, consideration should be given to whether the individualisation of marks is appropriate and practicable in respect of the learning outcomes to be assessed. — Where there is a shared mark for all group members, it is recommended that the weighting of this component

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	does not exceed 30% of the total module assessment. Where it is necessary to agree additional details – e.g. specific examination assessment papers – the process for internal scrutiny and External Examiner approval is detailed in **Appendix A – Assessment Approval**.
c) Where students have a confirmed disability, reasonable adjustments to assessment will be made where possible.	Reasonable adjustments are identified in the student's Study Needs Assessment Report. Student and Library Services are able to provide further guidance on making appropriate use of reasonable adjustments. Assessment of dyslexic students should be undertaken with reference to the Guidance on Marking the Work of Dyslexic Students (AFP-Annex 1).
d) Student progression and achievement are supported through clear, consistent and coherent assessment approaches and practices. Cont'd	Assessment activities are carefully balanced and viewed holistically across a course to demonstrate and model clear progressions in core skills/knowledge between assessment points and levels. All assessment tasks should be considered in the context of the course assessment diet to ensure students are able to develop new academic skills and to demonstrate emerging abilities in a variety of ways appropriate to expectations and outcomes at each level of study. Clear links need to be made between modules and tasks both horizontally (between modules at the same level of study) and vertically (tracing student progress over time).
e) A course-wide re-assessment strategy is provided.	A course-wide re-assessment strategy must be developed as an extension of

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	the course assessment strategy, clearly articulating for students the re-assessment tasks and procedures for each module assessment component.

Where feasible, reassessment should involve the completion of a new piece of work with details of reassessment tasks clearly communicated to students and appropriate support and guidance provided via the provided 'Re-assessment Strategy'.

It is the responsibility of the Course Leader to ensure this information is provided as part the Course Handbook which is regularly up-dated and made easily accessible online at the beginning of a course. |

AD4: Assessment approaches value student diversity by enabling appropriate opportunities to personalise the learning journey.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Assessments are designed to be flexible so that they can be accessed and engaged in multiple ways by students throughout a course.

Cont'd | Assessment processes should be designed and scheduled to provide all students with a range of appropriate formative opportunities to engage in the development of the required skills so that individual students are not disadvantaged by a bias toward certain types of method.

All assessment should, where appropriate, be designed to enable individual learner preferences for accessing information and tasks (i.e. written briefs, audio descriptions). Careful consideration must be given to how assessment is presented and represented at course and module level making use of available learning technology (see Guidelines for Inclusive Learning Resources).

The course-focused assessment strategy must clearly and consistently |

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	set out the range of assessments that are to be made available to students.
b) Where practicable and appropriate to do so, assessment is designed to include elements of student choice and ownership.	Enabling choice and ownership in how assessment is experienced enables students to personalise their learning to align with topics or activities in which they have a personal interest or are better matched to their capabilities. Deciding on the nature and extent of student choice included in the assessment experience should be considered in the context of the broader skills/knowledge to be developed at each level of study. It should also be considered alongside the level of support and preparation students have received in relation to being able to make informed choices regarding their learning preferences. The extent to which students are able to exercise choice within assessment processes and tasks should be clearly communicated in Programme and Module Specifications.
c) Consideration will be given to how students may be more actively involved in shaping the assessment and feedback processes of a course.	Greater learner involvement in assessment and feedback processes at course level raises awareness of the purposes of assessment and how criteria are used. Learner involvement should be encouraged and evidenced as part of a transparent course review process through Continuous Monitoring and Enhancements (CME) processes, including reference to Module Evaluation Data.

3.2 ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK

AF1: Assessment and feedback approaches are transparent and clearly communicated.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Clear information regarding University Assessment Regulations	Details of the University Assessment Regulations and Assessment and

Supporting Statements	Implementation
and processes will be provided to students and stakeholders.	Feedback Policy are provided to students via the University website and the University Student Handbook. Students will be informed of the penalties relating to late submissions of assessments via the relevant Assessment and Progression Regulations.
b) Each student will receive timely information clearly stating how and when they will receive feedback for each module they are undertaking, including the date and time that feedback will be made available.	It is the responsibility of Schools to ensure that information about the form(s), release date(s) and timing(s) of student feedback is included in the Module Guide on the relevant module site and should be made accessible to students at the beginning of each module.
c) Unratified feedback will be provided for all first attempt summative assessments, normally by 20 working days of the date of submission. All unratified feedback must be made available to students no later than 4.00 pm on the day that feedback will be released.	Before unratified feedback is released to individual students, all internal marking and moderation processes for the cohort must be completed. — Students should be informed at the beginning of each module of the date by which unratified feedback will be released and the format this information will take. — Unratified feedback will normally be made available to students via the VLE within 20 days of the date of submission. — Unratified feedback **should not** be provided for work submitted for reassessment.

AF2: Feedback is designed to be accessible, relevant and timely.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) All courses must have a clear feedback strategy that includes both formative and summative feedback.	Course Teams must include both formal and informal feedback mechanisms as part of the overarching course-focused assessment strategy. Commentary on this must be included in the Course Specification and reviewed at the Approval/Review Event.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
b) Individual formal feedback is provided electronically to students on summative assessment.	It is acknowledged that not all feedback is suitable for electronic return and where this is the case, alternative arrangements can be agreed. Staff guidance and support for designing effective online feedback via Blackboard can be found here. It is expected that student feedback will include areas of strength and identify aspects for further enhancement providing appropriate guidance to enable improvement through future work. Feedback must be linked explicitly to the module learning outcomes and assessment criteria, as appropriate. Course Teams should explore alternative mechanisms for providing feedback, e.g. audio feedback. Where audio feedback is used, this can replace written feedback as long as copies of the feedback can be retained and made available to the External Examiner. Feedback on Examinations: There is no University requirement that students will be given individual feedback where the form of assessment is an examination. However, any feedback provided on examinations needs to be specific enough to enable the student to improve his/her performance. To promote more meaningful use of examination feedback for learning, all students should be provided with an opportunity to view their examination answer booklet alongside feedback and/or model answers if available. For students who have failed, this opportunity must be provided prior to the reassessment examination and timed to allow the learner sufficient time to prepare for the reassessment. It is good practice to have a module tutor

Supporting Statements	Implementation
Cont'd	available to discuss the feedback at this point. For students who have passed, this opportunity must be provided on request around the start of their next level/module.
c) Opportunities will be made available for students to discuss their feedback with an appropriate member of academic staff.	Mechanisms for providing general (thematic) feedback to groups of students (i.e. via timetabled feedback seminars) should be considered to lessen the burden on individual staff. For students who have failed, this opportunity must be timed to ensure that appropriate support is offered prior to reassessment.

AF3: Students are supported in developing their ability to seek and use feedback information from a variety of sources.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Mechanisms are in place to prepare students for meaningful dialogue and engagement with feedback information.	It is important to provide a variety of tutor- and peer-led engagement opportunities around assessment tasks to promote student self-regulatory skills. Clarifying student responsibility when using peer-based activities is important; this requires clarity regarding student expectations with regards to peer engagement opportunities, and student access to resources to ensure full preparation for meaningful dialogue. Information regarding tutor-/peer-led engagement opportunities should be clearly set out in Module Specifications and appropriate assessment briefs. Such activities should also be considered in the context of the Course Assessment Strategy to ensure course-wide consistency and continuity.
b) Where appropriate, assessment tasks will be designed to encourage students to apply formative feedback (from staff or peers) to improve their performance in subsequent work.	Reflection on feedback may be included as part of personal development planning. In addition, it is good practice to design this into specific module assessments. Details of this must be

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	included in the relevant Module Specification and its use as part of a formative assessment and feedback strategy included in the Programme Specification/Course Approva*l* documents.

AF4: Feedback promotes the development of students' ability to self-evaluate (including self-monitoring / self-assessment and critical reflection skills).

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Students regularly receive specific information, not just marks and grades, about how to improve the quality of their work.	'Designing in' formative processes that help students self-correct by systematically referring to assessment criteria and providing guidance on how to improve. Course teams need to carefully consider the use of modelling of approaches using appropriate digital tools to provide inclusive and accessible means of supporting students in both generating and engaging with feedback information in different/alternative ways – e.g. making use of online discussion forums and blogs. In order for students to critically reflect on their learning it is important to consider how their reflexivity can be developed through wider formal and informal support structures (e.g. student study groups; direction to new sources of information; ensuring sufficient challenge in and through tasks set so that students have to re/consider their approaches to learning).
b) Assessment and feedback activities promote development of students' critical thinking abilities, which include self-critique, independent judgement and decision-making for continued learning.	Assessment tasks need to be designed and distributed across assessment points and levels of study to promote regular opportunities for students to develop the capabilities to make judgements beyond immediate tasks or learning outcomes, and consider the implications of their learning for future work.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
	Promoting student engagement with criteria for learning facilitated through peer-review, self-evaluation and analysis of exemplar or sample work helps to develop their 'evaluative expertise' - the capability to make decisions about the quality of work of self and others.
c) Students are presented with opportunities to routinely monitor and evaluate their own learning progress.	All students are provided with opportunities to demonstrate they have learnt from and responded to feedback. It is important to design and position formative and summative assessment processes to encourage and enable students to regularly reflect on their progress and engage with feedback information to improve performance. Considering alternative means of representing and recording claims of student achievement through reflective tasks such as digital portfolios or journals encourages the integration of several tasks and facilitates the collection of a range of evidence over time, including: text, audio, narrative accounts, and digital videos. This also opens up the possibility for peer feedback and reflective thinking on current and future work.

3.3 ASSESSMENT STANDARDS

AS1: Approaches to assessment actively foster development of student assessment literacy.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Regular opportunities are provided for dialogue and interaction between staff and students about assessment tasks and criteria are provided.	Positioning assessment as part of an interactive, course-wide, process in which students gradually acquire understanding of assessment practices, criteria, and standards through active engagement and participation in assessment processes. This is particularly important at the early stages of a course to familiarise students with the role(s), method(s) and expectations associated with different forms of assessment.
b) Assessment processes clarify for students how assessment elements fit together.	It is important that students are able to self-manage the requirements of assessment and part of this is being clear about how the overall assessment design fits together and what support is available and when. Module and course leaders need to agree and clarify with students from the outset what student engagement in assessment involves and what the protocols are across a course. This should include agreed procedures and parameters for students submitting and receiving feedback on draft work. — Designing opportunities for students to submit draft work or work on 'staged' assessment tasks that facilitate early 'formative' feedback on their progress ahead of submission helps support students in learning to manage their own learning approaches and strategies. It is important that such mechanisms are considered in the context of staff and student workloads at a course-level, so as not to be overly burdensome.

AS2: Assessment processes and tasks promote academic integrity.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Assessments will be developed with due regard to preventing academic misconduct.	Details of expectations relating to assessment must be outlined in the Course Assessment Strategy on the Course Specification and included in the Module Specification. Further guidance and advice on designing assessment with due regard to preventing academic misconduct can be obtained here.
b) All assessed work will be submitted online via Turnitin, unless inappropriate to do so.	Opportunities for all students and staff to make use of plagiarism e-detection software (via Turn-it-In) should be made available where appropriate and practicable to do so. It is acknowledged that some assessment formats may not be suitable for online submission and where this is the case, alternative arrangements can be agreed. To ensure consistency of the student experience the University adopted a standard hand in time of 4.00 pm on the day of submission for all summatively assessed coursework. Where this is not feasible for a particular module or course, School management may agree a different hand-in time and this will be clearly communicated to students by Schools. Where coursework is submitted later than the agreed deadline without the prior agreement of an extension or mitigation, penalties may apply as detailed in TU Assessment Regulations Section 3.10. Guidance and support for the online submission of student work must be provided at course-level, with details clearly captured in the Course

Supporting Statements	Implementation
Cont'd	Handbook. This should be factored in to assessment processes, with particular emphasis placed on early, first-year, assessment experiences and reinforced as student progress. Staff guidance and support for creating Turnitin assessments can be found [here]().
c) Students are informed about academic misconduct and its consequences using standard course information.	Standard information must be included in all relevant Student Handbooks and course documentation that are reviewed at the Approval/Review Event. Staff should make use of and refer students to the [Essential Information For Students on University Regulations]().
d) Appropriate support for the development of 'good' academic practice will be provided to all students.	Mechanisms for promoting the development of good academic practice should be incorporated within the curriculum and detailed in the Course Specification. Additional support should be made available from the Learning Hub and integrated into course-wide assessment processes as and where appropriate.

AS3: Assessment standards and procedures are regularly reviewed and, where appropriate, revised.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) The course-focused assessment strategy is regularly reviewed and amended where appropriate and necessary to do so.	Course Leaders will coordinate course-wide reflection annually on the appropriateness of the course assessment strategy and assessment components in light of student feedback, performance, and External Examiner comments, implementing enhancements as appropriate. The Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement process prompts Course and Module Leads to record any actions that arise from this reflective process.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
Cont'd	It is the responsibility of the Course Leader and School more broadly to facilitate regular course team meetings to consider module and course performance in a timely manner. Modifications made to assessment tasks should be monitored and considered in the context of the course assessment strategy (for guidance see Quality Handbook Section C, Annex 2 'Module & Course-Programme Modification).
b) Detailed analysis of student performance data should be undertaken as part of Continuous Monitoring and Enhancement and periodic course review processes.	Module Assessment Board agendas must include a prompt for performance review. Where issues related to student performance and experience are identified, course teams will implement an agreed action plan. Schools are required to confirm that critical modules have been considered and that subsequent decision and action have been collectively agreed at course team level. Course Journals and a Course Leader's CME Report and Periodic Review documentation prompts Course Leaders to do this and the outcomes of analysis are discussed via SSLESC.

AS4: Marking and moderation processes and practices are clear, consistent and reliable.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
a) Marking and internal and external moderation processes will be carried out in accordance with recognised institutional processes (see **Appendix C – Marking and Moderation Processes**).	The implementation of the marking and moderation practices identified in Appendix C ensures that assessment criteria are consistently applied. Details are also provided regarding the sample of work and information that must be made available to the External Examiner.

Supporting Statements	Implementation
b) Assessment of students and the marking of work is carried out by appropriately prepared and supported staff, including Partner institutions, who are competent to undertake these roles.	All staff, including Partners, part-time staff and Postgraduate Research (PGR) students who assess students' work, have access to a range of support and development including: — Assessment and Feedback Workshops — Individual and course team training and support on assessment and feedback related priorities. — Learning and Teaching and Enhancement guidance and case studies. It is the responsibility of Schools to take steps to ensure that inexperienced members of staff involved in assessment are supported by experienced academic staff at all stages of the assessment process for at least the first academic cycle. The range of structured support and development provided to all staff will be considered as part of the approval and review processes with appropriate staff development facilitated on an ongoing basis.
c) Students are informed about second marking and moderation processes for the course.	Course-wide marking and moderation processes will be clearly set out in the Course Handbook and communicated to students directly through course assessment processes. Where work has been second marked this will be made clear to students via their feedback.
d) The University will ensure that all External Examiner feedback is responded to appropriately and will take account of any necessary actions where concerns are raised and disseminate good practice when explicitly highlighted.	All serious concerns raised by External Examiners in Box 10 of their report are formally responded to by Schools and a report detailing concerns, responses, and actions is received by Academic Board.

Appendix A – Assessment Approval

This is a process whereby the form, content, structure, allocation of marks and assessment criteria for any piece of proposed summative assessment are shared amongst internal colleagues and agreed prior to normally being made available to Module External Examiners to comment on the appropriateness and standard of the summative assessment.

All summative assessment proposals (whether ICA or end of module assessment) should be subject to approval. This should normally apply to both first sit and reassessment proposals, which should both be presented at the same time. Where the nature of the assessment allows for specific details of the assessment and related criteria to be included, then these must be included and scrutinised and agreed as part of the module approval process. Where the nature of the assessment requires an assessment proposal or examination paper to be developed for each occurrence of the module then these should be developed, normally by the Module Leader and subjected to a process of internal peer review, with any discrepancies being resolved by the relevant Head of Department or nominee. The peer review process should normally include a review of:

- the clarity of the task(s)
- the level and difficulty of the task(s)
- relevance to and coverage of the Learning Outcomes being assessed
- appropriateness/suitability to type and mode of study
- overlap with other assessments
- clarity and appropriateness of assessment criteria
- appropriateness of marking scheme, model answers etc. to questions posed and as a means of discriminating performance and attainment
- topicality of the assessment within the developing subject area
- over time, range and variation of assessment topics

The outcome of this will be an agreed package of summative assessment proposals to be forwarded, where practicable, to the Module External Examiner for comment (except CAMS Level 3 modules and CAMS Level 4 modules forming an award of 60 credits or less, where the agreed proposal is not subject, normally, to Module External Examiner scrutiny).

All proposals should identify:

- the assessment task
- the learning outcomes being assessed
- the relevant assessment criteria
- a marking scheme

or

- specimen/model answers, plus such other guidance as may reasonably be required

and this information must go to students at the beginning of the module.

Where, because of the pattern of delivery or other valid reasons, it is not possible to seek Module External Examiner pre-approval of summative assessment proposals, then the Assessment Strategy and key aspects of the process should be agreed with the External Examiner.

Unless educationally appropriate, assessments should not be re-used from one year to the next and staff should ensure that assessments do differ. It is however accepted that in some cases it may be appropriate to re-use the same assessments from one year to the next, particularly in modules that may be project based, or where the assessment's focus is on the student's own organisation.

Appendix B – University Generic Marking Criteria

UNIVERSITY GENERIC MARKING CRITERIA

UNDERGRADUATE

Level 3	Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
90%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of a very high standard. Demonstrates an extremely thorough knowledge and understanding through identification and description of key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Evidence of wide and relevant reading, very effective use of appropriate source material and accurate referencing.	**90%-100%** Exceptional work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with very effective use of source material and accurate referencing.	**90%-100%** Exceptional work with presentation of the highest standard. The work contains coherent arguments and ideas. There is a detailed understanding of subject matter and critical analysis of issues/problems. Points are made clearly and concisely, always substantiated by appropriate use of source material. There is evidence of a sound ability to critically interrelate theories with examples from practice where appropriate.	**90%-100%** Exceptional work. Presentation is logical, error-free and, where appropriate, creative. There is an in-depth understanding of issues/problems and excellent critical/deep engagement with the material and concepts involved. Very skilful interpretation of data. Arguments, ideas and, where appropriate, solutions are presented coherently and fully underpinned by thorough research and reading.
80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. Demonstrates a very good knowledge and understanding of the key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Evidence of significant independent reading and effective use of source material, accurately referenced.	**80%-89%** Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with effective use of source material and accurate referencing.	**80%-89%** Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is comprehensive understanding of key concepts and knowledge and evidence of critical analysis and insight. Accurate interpretation of data with arguments, ideas and solutions presented effectively and based on strong research and reading.	**80%-89%** Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is comprehensive understanding of key concepts and knowledge and clear evidence of critical analysis and insight. Accurate interpretation of data with arguments, ideas and solutions presented effectively and based on strong research and reading.
70%-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Demonstrates strong knowledge and understanding of the key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Evidence of independent reading and good use of source material, accurately referenced.	**70%-79%** Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with appropriate use of source material and accurate referencing.	**70%-79%** Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Evidence of strong knowledge and understanding together with some critical analysis and insight. Source material is used effectively to support arguments, ideas and solutions.	**70%-79%** Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Demonstrates an excellent knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some effective critical and analytical application of relevant research and reading.

Level 3	Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
60%-69% The work is well presented. There is evidence of sound knowledge and understanding through identification of key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Some evidence of independent reading and use of source material accurately referenced.	**60%-69%** The work is well presented and coherently structured. There is evidence of a sound knowledge and understanding of the issues with theory linked to practice where appropriate. Most material used has been referenced/ acknowledged.	**60%-69%** Very good presentation. Sound knowledge and understanding with an emerging ability to critically engage with and apply the concepts involved linking them to practice where appropriate. Good use of source material which supports most points clearly. Content is wholly relevant and is coherently structured.	**60%-69%** The work is very good, logically structured and presented to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some critical and analytical application of relevant research.
50%-59% Presentation acceptable but with some errors. Demonstrates adequate knowledge and understanding through the identification and use of key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Some use of source material.	**50%-59%** Presentation is acceptable but with some errors. There is knowledge and understanding of issues under discussion and some evidence of the application of knowledge and ideas where appropriate. Some use of relevant source material.	**50%-59%** Presentation is of a good standard but some shortcomings. Evidence of a sound knowledge base but limited critical and practical application of concepts and ideas. Content is largely relevant although points may not always be clear and structure may lack coherence. Contains some critical reflection and some use of source material to illustrate points.	**50%-59%** The work is clearly presented and logically structured. It shows evidence of a sound understanding of the topic and addresses major issues. The work contains some discussion and interpretation of relevant perspectives although further development of the arguments presented would be beneficial. There are examples of critical reflection and evidence of application of theory to practice.
40%-49% Presentation is acceptable but attention is needed to the structure. There is limited though sufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding through the identification and use of key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Some use of relevant source material.	**40%-49%** Presentation is acceptable but attention to structure and style is required. The content is relevant but largely descriptive. There is evidence of a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding but there is limited use of source material to support the arguments, proposals or solutions. Some links are made to practice where appropriate.	**40%-49%** Adequate presentation. The work is descriptive and/or lacks critical analysis where required but is relevant with limited though sufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of reading although arguments/ proposals/solutions often lack coherence and may be unsubstantiated by relevant source material or partially flawed. Links to practice are made where appropriate.	**40%-49%** Adequate presentation. The work displays basic knowledge and understanding of the topic but is largely descriptive. There is an attempt to bring together different ideas and concepts although this would have been strengthened by the inclusion of further key issues. The structure of the work requires attention to its coherence and logical development of content. The link between theory and practice, where appropriate, is somewhat tenuous and its development would enhance the work considerably.
30%-39% – Fail The work is poorly structured and presented. Demonstrates inadequate and flawed knowledge and understanding of key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Some material is irrelevant. Insufficient use of supporting material.	**30%-39% – Fail** The work is poorly structured and presented. Some material may be irrelevant. Content is based largely on taught elements with very little evidence of reading around the topic and little or no reference to practice where appropriate.	**30%-39% – Fail** Poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a weak knowledge base with some key aspects not addressed and use of irrelevant material. Flawed use of techniques. Limited evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. Little reference to practice where appropriate.	**30%-39% – Fail** The work is poorly presented and contains numerous errors, inconsistencies and omissions with limited use of source material. The work displays a weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. There is limited evidence of the application of theory to practice where appropriate. It contains many unsupported statements with limited attempts to bring issues together and lacks critical analysis and reflection.

Level 3	Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (Degree)
20-29% – Fail The work is very poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates seriously inadequate and flawed knowledge and understanding of key concepts and principles relevant to the topic area. Much material is irrelevant. Very little use of supporting material. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.	**20-29% – Fail** The work is very poorly structured and presented. Much material is irrelevant. Content is based almost entirely on taught elements with very little evidence of any purposeful reading around the topic. No effective reference to practice where appropriate. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.	**20-29% – Fail** Very poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a very weak knowledge base with many key omissions and much material irrelevant. Use of inappropriate or incorrect techniques. Very little evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. No links to practice where appropriate. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.	**20-29% – Fail** The work is very poorly presented and contains numerous serious errors, inconsistencies and omissions with little use of source material. The work displays a very weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. There is very little evidence of the application of theory to practice where appropriate. It contains many unsupported statements with very little attempt to bring issues together and there is a complete lack of critical analysis and reflection. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.
0-19 % - Fail The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant. No real use of supporting material. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	**0-19 % - Fail** The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant. No effective use of supporting material. No reference to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	**0-19 % - Fail** The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect or omitted. No evidence of critical thought. No effective use of supporting material. No links to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	**0-19 % - Fail** The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect, inconsistent or omitted. No evidence of critical analysis and reflection. No effective use of supporting material. No application of theory to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.

GENERIC ASSESSMENT GRADING DESCRIPTORS FOR HIGHER NATIONAL PROGRAMMES

This document should be used in conjunction with the Higher National Assessment Regulations.

Each component of a module should be graded as fail, pass, merit or distinction. An overall module grade should then be provided.

Grade descriptors

— A **Fail** grade is awarded where a student has not achieved all of the requirements of the assessment component(s) as specified in the assessment criteria for the module.

— A **Pass** grade is awarded where a student has achieved all of the requirements of the assessment component(s) as specified in the assessment criteria for the module.

In order to achieve a **Merit** grade, in addition to meeting the criteria for a Pass grade the student must:

Merit Descriptors	Indicative Characteristics
1. Identify and apply strategies to find appropriate solutions	• effective judgements have been made • complex problems with more than one variable have been explored • an effective approach to study and research has been applied
2. Select/design and apply appropriate methods/techniques	• relevant theories and techniques have been applied • a range of methods and techniques have been applied • a range of sources of information has been used • a selection of methods and techniques/sources has been justified • the design of methods/techniques has been justified • complex information/data has been synthesised and processed • appropriate learning methods/techniques have been applied

Merit Descriptors	Indicative Characteristics
3. Present and communicate appropriate findings	• the appropriate structure and approach has been used • coherent, logical development of principles/concepts for the intended audience • a range of methods of presentation have been used and technical language has been accurately used • communication has taken place in familiar and unfamiliar contexts • the communication is appropriate for familiar and unfamiliar audiences and appropriate media has been used

In order to achieve a **Distinction** grade, in addition to meeting the criteria for a Pass grade the student must:

Distinction Descriptors	Indicative Characteristics
1. Use critical reflection to evaluate o work and justify valid conclusions	• conclusions have been arrived at through synthesis of ideas and have been justified • the validity of results has been evaluated using defined criteria • self-criticism of approach has taken place • realistic improvements have been proposed against defined characteristics for success
2. Take responsibility for managing an organising activities	• autonomy/independence has been demonstrated • substantial activities, projects or investigations have been planned, managed and organised • activities have been managed • the unforeseen has been accommodated • the importance of interdependence has been recognised and achieved
3. Demonstrate convergent/lateral/ creative thinking	• ideas have been generated and decisions taken • self-evaluation has taken place • convergent and lateral thinking have been applied • problems have been solved • innovation and creative thought have been applied • receptiveness to new ideas is evident • effective thinking has taken place in an unfamiliar context

LEVEL 7 UNIVERSITY GENERIC MARKING CRITERIA

Band	Generic Criteria
90-100%	An excellent critical and complete demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and demonstrating an innovative and creative approach. Evidence throughout the work of a sustained ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts, to make inferences and to provide an original and/or compelling argument and discussion. Excellent structure and immaculate presentation, with cogent use of academic language and grounded in a pertinent and substantial selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and addresses ethical considerations in an informed and perceptive manner. Exceptional ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
80-89%	An excellent, critical and systematic demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts to provide a compelling argument and discussion. Very good structure and presentation, with confident use of academic language and grounded in a relevant and extensive selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and fully addresses ethical considerations. Excellent ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
70-79%	An excellent, critical and organised demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret diverse concepts to provide a sound argument and discussion. Good structure and presentation, with fluent use of academic language and grounded in an appropriate and comprehensive selection of source materials. Very effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical implications. Very good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.
60-69%	A proficient, clearly stated and analytical demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a rational and logical argument and discussion. Well-structured and clearly presented work, with fluent use of academic language and utilising a relevant and extensive range of source materials. Effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical issues. Good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate.

Band	Generic Criteria
50-59%	An acceptable and substantiated demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a reasoned and valid argument and discussion. Adequately structured and presented work, with clear use of academic language and reference to a sufficient range of relevant source materials. Adequate use of appropriate analytical and research methods and does address ethical considerations. Effective linking of theory and practice where appropriate.
40-49%	A limited, insufficient and/or inaccurate understanding in key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Insufficient evidence of ability to integrate and analyse concepts to provide a valid discussion. Unacceptably structured and presented work, with insufficient use of academic language and conventions. A limited range of source materials is used. Limited or ineffective use of analytical and research methods and limited coverage of ethical considerations. Inadequate linking of theory and practice where applicable.
30-39%	A descriptive and/or narrative account, with little critical and/or flawed understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Insufficient evidence of ability to discuss fundamental concepts. Unclear and and/or unevidenced argument and discussion. Poorly structured and presented work, with little use of academic language and conventions. A narrow and/or inappropriate range of source materials and analytical and research methods is used. Failure to identify ethical considerations and to link theory and practice where applicable.
20-29%	A weakly descriptive and/or narrative account, with no analytical content and/or significant inaccuracies in understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work. Little or no evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. No awareness of ethical issues. Unclear and unsourced arguments and discussion. Flawed structure and presentation, with negligible attention to academic language or conventions. Some or all source materials are unreferenced and/or irrelevant. Failure to link theory and practice where applicable. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to demonstrate some knowledge of the subject.
0-19%	The work is almost entirely derivative and therefore lacks analysis or reflection, and shows little or no knowledge or understanding of key areas relevant to the work. No evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. The presentation and referencing does not conform to the standards required.

UNIVERSITY LEVEL 8 GENERIC MARKING CRITERIA FOR PROFESSIONAL DOCTORATES

Band	Generic Criteria
90-100%	An excellent critical and complete demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Evidence throughout the work of a sustained ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts, to make inferences and to provide an original and/or compelling argument and discussion. Excellent structure and immaculate presentation, with cogent use of academic language and grounded in a pertinent and substantial selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and fully addresses ethical considerations in an informed and perceptive manner. Exceptional ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate. *For advanced independent work specifically:* Extensive evidence of the creation and interpretation of significant new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.
80-89%	An excellent, critical and systematic demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret complex concepts to provide a compelling argument and discussion. Very good structure and presentation, with confident use of academic language and grounded in a relevant and extensive selection of source materials. Excellent use of appropriate analytical and research methods and fully addresses ethical considerations. Excellent ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate. *For advanced independent work specifically:* Considerable evidence of the creation and interpretation of important new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.
70-79%	An excellent, critical and organised demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Evidence throughout of the ability to synthesise and interpret diverse concepts to provide a sound argument and discussion. Good structure and presentation, with fluent use of academic language and grounded in an appropriate and comprehensive selection of source materials. Very effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical implications. Very good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate. *For advanced independent work specifically:* Strong evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through original research or other advanced scholarship at the forefront of the discipline or profession.

Band	Generic Criteria
60-69%	A proficient, clearly stated and analytical demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a rational and logical argument and discussion. Well-structured and clearly presented work, with fluent use of academic language and utilising a relevant and extensive range of source materials. Effective use of appropriate analytical and research methods and consideration of ethical issues. Good ability to link and critically analyse theory and practice where appropriate. *For advanced independent work specifically*: Sound evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.
50-59%	An acceptable and substantiated demonstration of understanding in all key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Evidence of the ability to integrate and analyse diverse concepts in a reasoned and valid argument and discussion. Adequately structured and presented work, with clear use of academic language and reference to a sufficient range of relevant source materials. Adequate use of appropriate analytical and research methods and does address ethical considerations. Effective linking of theory and practice where appropriate. *For advanced independent work specifically:* Limited but sufficient evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.
40-49%	A limited, insufficient and/or inaccurate understanding in key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is not at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Insufficient evidence of ability to integrate and analyse concepts to provide a valid discussion. Unacceptably structured and presented work, with insufficient use of academic language and conventions. A limited range of source materials is used. Limited or ineffective use of analytical and research methods and limited coverage of ethical considerations. Inadequate linking of theory and practice where applicable. *For advanced independent work specifically:* Insufficient evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.

Band	Generic Criteria
30-39%	A descriptive and/or narrative account, with little critical and/or flawed understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is not at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Insufficient evidence of ability to discuss fundamental concepts. Unclear and and/or un-evidenced argument and discussion. Poorly structured and presented work, with little use of academic language and conventions. A narrow and/or inappropriate range of source materials and analytical and research methods is used. Failure to identify ethical considerations and to link theory and practice where applicable. *For advanced independent work specifically:* Little evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.
20-29%	A weakly descriptive and/or narrative account, with no evidence of analytical content and/or significant inaccuracies in understanding of key areas of knowledge relevant to the work and which is not at the forefront of an academic discipline or area of professional practice. Little or no evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. No awareness of ethical issues. Unclear and un-sourced arguments and discussion. Flawed structure and presentation, with negligible attention to academic language or conventions. Some or all source materials are unreferenced and/or irrelevant. Failure to link theory and practice where applicable. To obtain 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to demonstrate some knowledge of the subject. *For advanced independent work specifically:* No evidence of the creation and interpretation of new knowledge through advanced scholarship or original research at the forefront of the discipline or profession.
0-19%	The work is almost entirely derivative and therefore lacks analysis or reflection, and shows little or no knowledge or understanding of key areas relevant to the work. No evidence of research and the ability to discuss fundamental concepts. The presentation and referencing does not conform to the standards required.

Appendix C – Marking and Moderation Processes

Recognised marking and moderation processes are identified here to promote consistent, reliable and objective practices. Adherence to the marking and moderation processes ensures that summative assessments have been through a defined and evidenced set of processes that demonstrate consistency of judgement and security of standards for all students in any given cohort, irrespective of the number of staff involved in delivery and marking, location of students, method of delivery, etc.

1.   **DEFINITIONS**

Moderation	This is an overarching term to describe the processes that take place following first marking to verify the judgement of the first marker(s). This could include double marking, concealed double marking or internal sampling, depending upon the complexity of provision.
First Marking	A process whereby a member of staff awards marks/grades and produces feedback for the work of students.
Double Marking	A process whereby a second person or persons, marks the work in addition to the first marker and allocates a mark/grade and provides comments.
Concealed Double Marking	A process whereby a second person or persons, without sight of the first markers comments or feedback, marks the work and allocates a mark/grade and provides comments.
Internal Sampling	A process whereby a nominated person reviews a sample of work, including the mark/grade allocated and feedback, with the aim of confirming the judgement of the first marker(s).
Anonymous Marking	Marking where the student's identity is not known to the marker.
Checking	A process following first marking of objective assessments (e.g. MCQs) whereby a second person checks to ensure that marks/grades have been calculated and recorded accurately.

MODERATION

1.1   The minimum standard for all taught modules comprises internal sampling for each assessment component, apart from dissertations or equivalent projects involving 30 credits or more at undergraduate or postgraduate level (see 1.4.1 below). Under certain circumstances (see 1.4.3 below) additional verification processes may be required and where double marking of a sample or full cohort of work is required, further internal sampling will not normally be necessary.

1.2   Where assessments comprise solely of objective tools (e.g. Multiple Choice Questions, objective right and wrong answers) then internal sampling will be replaced by a process of checking by a second person to ensure that marks/grades have been calculated and recorded accurately.

1.3   Internal Sampling Process

1.3.1   At the commencement of the module, the Course Leader, Head of Department or nominee will identify a person (or persons) who would be suitable to undertake internal sampling of the work of all first markers (referred to hereafter as the internal sampler). For modules with large numbers of students, it may be appropriate to identify more than one person to undertake this activity together.

1.3.2   The internal sampler must have access to the work of all first markers for the cohort and will normally select a 'representative sample' - a selection of student work reflecting grade distribution and/or quality - based on all of the following parameters:

— A sample of work awarded a fail.
— A sample of work allocated a 70% mark or equivalent grade (or above).
— A sample of borderline pass work (3% below to 3% above the pass mark) at each band.
— A sample of work across all other bands (normally comprising approximately 10% of the work in those bands) to include some work from each marker.

1.3.3   The internal sampler will review the work selected and consider whether the assessment criteria for each module component have been applied appropriately and consistently and whether the mark/grade awarded and proposed feedback is appropriate.

1.3.4   Where the internal sampler confirms the marks/grades of the first markers, then the internal sampler will complete the Assessment Report in conjunction with the Module Leader, using the standard University proforma. This will then be made available to the External Examiner, in addition to a full list of marks/grades, as well as the sample of work (see 3.0 below).

1.3.5   Where the internal sampler identifies issues relating to consistency in the application of the assessment criteria, then this should be reviewed with the Module Leader and relevant markers. Where concerns are deemed to be significant then the relevant Head of Department or nominee will be informed and a course of action

identified to assure standards. This will normally entail initiating concealed double marking of either the work of all students or all the work of particular markers. Following this, marks/grades will be agreed as identified in 1.5 below. **The Assessment Report should provide the External Examiner with an overview of the process**.

1.4 Double marking and concealed double marking

1.4.1 All dissertations or equivalent projects involving 30 credits or more at undergraduate or postgraduate level must be double marked. Note it is **not** a requirement that dissertations or equivalent projects be 'concealed' double marked.

Each dissertation should be allocated a first and second marker. The second marker will normally be the designated supervisor for the work, with first markers allocated from outside the supervisory team.

1.4.2 For work submitted for reassessment, where the first marker awards a fail, concealed double marking, must be undertaken.

1.4.3 The University acknowledges that there are a variety of factors that can potentially reduce the reliability of marking and such factors need to be taken into consideration when deciding whether double marking (concealed or otherwise) is required. Factors that increase the likelihood that double marking is required include:

- The level of subjectivity required when reaching a judgement.
- Whether or not it is a new module.
- The experience of and number of markers.
- Whether or not the assessment technique is new or familiar to the markers.
- The credit size and level of the module.
- Large teaching teams and/or multi-site provision.
- Whether or not the work constitutes 100% of the module mark/grade.
- Whether there are specific professional, statutory & regulatory body requirements.
- Concerns raised previously by external examiners.

1.4.4 The above list is not exhaustive and it may be a combination of more than one factor that is used to determine the requirement for double marking. For example, a new module with a familiar assessment type and experienced marking team would not necessitate double marking but a new module, with an innovative assessment type that constitutes 100% of the module mark/grade would.

1.4.5 Double marking could include a sample or may be required for all work. Where double marking a sample reveals any significant issues, then the remaining work should be concealed double marked.

1.4.6 Following consideration of the nature of their provision and potential impact on standards, Schools should agree, via their SSLESCs, any additional absolute requirements for double marking and any additional principles that need to be considered when making decisions about when double marking is required. Schools

must also agree the mechanisms by which they will confirm the appropriateness of processes proposed by Module Leaders.

1.5   Agreement of Marks/Grades Following Double Marking

1.5.1   Following double marking, the first and second markers meet and compare their judgements on the mark/grade awarded and the feedback. If there are no significant differences, the markers will agree the mark/grade and content of feedback to the student. The first marker will then make any necessary alterations to the feedback and the student will only receive one set of feedback which is signed by the first marker.

1.5.2   The names of both markers, their marks/grades and the agreed mark/grade are confirmed and recorded for inclusion in the Assessment Report by Module Leaders.

1.5.3   If there are significant differences in the marks/grades (e.g. spanning across classifications), then the reasons for allocating marks/grades will be explored in an attempt to reach agreement on the mark/grade to be awarded. If the two markers are able to resolve their differences, then they will agree a set of marks/grades for the work.

1.5.4   If the two markers are unable to resolve their differences, then the matter must be reported to the Head of Department or equivalent. The Head of Department or nominee will review with the markers the marks/grades allocated and attempt to reach a resolution. Where this cannot be easily achieved, an independent person will be asked to double mark (concealed) the work as third marker, and following discussion, the Head of Department or nominee will determine a final mark/grade for the disputed work to be given to the student.

2.   WORK TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE EXTERNAL EXAMINER

2.1   Please note that the 'Representative Sample' to be made available to Module External Examiners should include as a minimum for first sit assessments a 'representative sample' - a selection of student work reflecting grade distribution and/or quality - based on the work of 10 students (for modules with fewer than 10 students, then the work of all students).

— Work across all bands, but this can be expanded at the request of the External Examiner.

— The sample can include work that has been single marked, double marked and internally sampled, and not be restricted to the sample that was used for internal sampling.

2.2 Module Leaders will agree with External Examiners when they wish to see this material and they can, via attendance at the University or use of the VLE, access the work of all students if they so wish.

2.3 Following reassessment, External Examiners may choose to sample work but as a minimum, they should be provided with access to all failed work. Sight of such work may require attendance at the University prior to Board meetings (if not accessible though the VLE) but this can be negotiated at School and/or Course level as appropriate.

2.4 External Examiners should also be provided with relevant module information, assessment information including assessment criteria, results for the full cohort and the Assessment Report via the designated area within the VLE.

3. ASSESSMENTS LESS SUITABLE FOR INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL MODERATION

3.1 The use of certain types of assessment, e.g. practical examinations or oral presentations, present challenges in terms of the internal and external moderation processes. When deciding an appropriate way forward, Schools should consider how External Examiners will be provided with evidence on which to base their judgement regarding the maintenance of academic standards and how robustly it can defend challenges to the objectivity of the assessment process should this be required.

3.2 Assessments which cannot be internally and/or externally moderated, should normally be restricted to a maximum weighting of 30% of the total module overall mark/grade. The External Examiner should be provided with a sample of any artefacts produced by the student, where relevant and practicable, in addition to feedback for the usual sample as identified in 3 above.

3.3 Where such assessments are weighted at greater than 30% of the module mark/grade, the Module Leader should propose to the relevant Associate Dean or nominee, the approach to be taken for moderation and the Associate Dean or nominee will confirm the suitability of the proposal. This will normally involve the use of double marking for all students undertaking the assessment activity and providing the External Examiner with an opportunity to attend to observe some of the assessment activities. Where relevant, artefacts produced by the student should be made available to the External Examiner for the usual sample of work (see 3 above), in addition to the feedback given to the student.

3.4 Alternatively, where it is possible, recordings can be made of the assessment activity and these can be used as part of the internal sampling and external examining process. Where recordings are available, this could replace the requirement for double marking. Students should be informed of the requirement to make a recording and the rationale for it and their permission sought.

Example 1 – Presentation weighted at 30%

For the first occurrence of a new module/assessment, a double marker is present for all presentations and marks/grades agreed using the process identified in 2.5 above. Internal sampling is not necessary and artefacts and feedback can be made available for external sampling. Unless concerns are raised by the External Examiner, subsequent occurrences can be single marked and artefacts internally sampled and then sampled by the External Examiner.

Example 2 – Practical Assessment weighted at 100%
For the first occurrence all assessments are double marked and the External Examiner is invited to attend. Where attendance is not possible, then arrangements to record the assessment should be made for the purpose of internal and External Examiner sampling. Following discussion with the External Examiner, future moderation could:

— Continue with the same approach.
— Involve double marking of all assessments and provision of a sample of feedback to the External Examiner.
— Revert to single marking, with recordings made available for internal and external sampling.

3.5 Moderation of Practice Placement Assessments

Where assessment of professional competence of students is undertaken in the workplace, this is generally undertaken by practice assessors . Such assessments should be undertaken by suitably prepared assessors via mechanisms agreed at Course Approval. The form of moderation should also be agreed at Course Approval and should involve the relevant academic link tutor and practice assessor.

4.   ANONYMOUS MARKING

4.1 The University operates a process of anonymous marking for **all summative examinations**. There is no requirement to mark in course assessment components anonymously, although Schools may wish to operate this where practicable.

5.   MULTIPLE OCCURRENCES OF MODULES

5.1 This relates to module delivery with different start/completion dates to different discrete cohorts and may include multiple deliveries across different sites.

5.2 For the purposes of marking, moderation and external examining processes, the default position would be that each location and each cohort is regarded as being a separate delivery and should be managed accordingly. Schools wishing to regard particular multiple provision as being a single delivery are required to submit proposals to the Student Learning & Experience Committee (SLEC) for approval. When multiple provision is regarded as being a single delivery, the samples selected for internal and external scrutiny should include work from all locations/cohorts.

5.3   Where the volume of work and number of occurrences result in the appointment of more than one External Examiner, the role of each External Examiner in relation to the occurrences must be agreed in advance at the start of the academic year. A mechanism must also be agreed for facilitating communication regarding the achievement of standards between the two External Examiners.

6.   LARGE TEAM TAUGHT/MARKED MODULES AND MULTI-SITE OPERATED MODULES

6.1   Schools should specify any requirements over and above the minimum for modules with large teaching teams and/or multi-site operated modules, and any other special circumstances. In all such cases, the strategy for moderation should be designed to ensure consistency of standards and mitigate the risk posed by complex/larger scale delivery, taking into account the processes identified in 8 below if partnership provision is involved.

7.   PARTNERSHIPS

7.1   For the first occurrence of the module, in terms of its delivery by the Partner, following first marking and internal sampling by the Partner, double marking of the work of all students should be undertaken by appropriate University staff.

Where significant discrepancies in the application of the assessment criteria by Partner staff are identified, this should be reported to the relevant Associate Dean and appropriate actions initiated. The University reserves the right to decide on the mark awarded to individual students.

7.2   Double marking of all work, or a sample, should continue until there is sufficient evidence, taking into account any concerns raised by the External Examiner, that the assessment criteria are being applied appropriately and consistently. For future occurrences, following first marking and internal sampling by the Partner staff, internal sampling by University staff should replace double marking.

7.3   For mature partnerships, dependent upon other risk factors, moderation could consist of internal sampling by Partner staff followed by External Examining.

7.4   Where courses are delivered by more than one Partner, a further activity should take place to enable representatives from all Partners to discuss the application of assessment criteria and sample work across all Partners.

7.5   Partners must be provided with appropriate staff development opportunities to ensure that they are familiar with the University's assessment processes and once this has been undertaken, they can act as first marker.

Appendix D – Retention of Assessment Work

What work should be retain and for how long?

1. All assessed work, including that submitted electronically (with the exceptions below) and the samples contained in Module Boxes (*see* **Appendix D**: *Minimum Specification for Information to be Retained on Modules [Module Boxes]*) should normally be retained by a School for the current Academic Year, plus one further Academic Year, subject to any Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body [PSRB] requirements, delays due to ongoing issues (e.g. Complaint/Academic Appeal, and any specific quality sampling purposes).

What if the students seeks academic appeal?

2. In the event that a student seeks academic appeal or is otherwise in pursuit of redress through litigation or complaint, then the work of such a student should be retained.

3. In all other cases (except as below), student work may be destroyed at the close of this period. All work should be destroyed as confidential waste.

4. It is not the policy of the University to normally return work to students. Students should be advised to keep a copy of conventional assignments, if they so wish.

5. Certain types of work (e.g. original artwork or artefacts) may not be easily copied and students may have a legitimate need to use such work to demonstrate their abilities to potential employers and others.

6. *Students may request the return of such work and Schools will make appropriate arrangements. Students should be required to complete a proforma, which should contain the following:*

   "If you are considering applying for academic appeal you should, if possible, apply before requesting the return of any assessed work which may be subject to such appeal, and which then will not be returned to you until completion of the appeal process.

   Note that if an application for academic appeal is accepted, the Assessment Board will not be able to reconsider work which has already been returned".

Appendix E – Minimum Specification for information to be retained on Modules (Module boxes)

The University standard approach for Module Boxes is virtual through Blackboard. In exceptional cases, it is recognised that due to the nature of some modules, physical Module Boxes are still be utilised (some physical Module Boxes may also contain some virtual content). Some physical Module Boxes may also contain some virtual content.

Schools need to ensure that the content of Module Boxes (either virtual or physical) is available and that where any part of the information required is in paper format, this can be accessed by School central records and External Examiners as required.

1.   Schools are required to maintain Module Boxes as follows:

— There must always be a live Module Box relating to the current delivery of the module and containing all updates. This live Module Box is the responsibility of the Module Leader.

— Beyond that, Schools may decide:

— Whether or not they wish to have only a live Module Box or whether they wish to keep, in any year, the previous year's Module Box and the variations for the current year (the live box).

2.   Schools are responsible for:

— Ensuring that Module Boxes are adequately maintained.

— Peer review practices to share judgements re. the quality of materials in Module Boxes.

3.   Module Boxes should contain (at least) the minimum sample of work for External Examiners, as identified in Appendix B, Section 2.0.

4.   Module Boxes should contain the requirements as set out in the Module Box Checklist as detailed in Appendix F.

5.   Where assessed work has been returned to students, Module Boxes should contain a record of the nature of such work, e.g. photographic evidence, videos, etc.

6.   Schools should maintain a small evidence base to illustrate specific practice where such evidence cannot be provided through Module Boxes, e.g. special needs.

Appendix F – Module Box Checklist

The following is the list of requirements for an electronic Module Box, which can be made available to the External Examiner via Blackboard when they visit to view the student work.

This checklist has been based on guidance provided by APR (Academic Policy & Regulations) in Academic Registry.

This is the responsibility of the Module Leader.

Your Blackboard module contains a unique "Module Box" area which is pre-populated with a template based on this checklist.

This area is hidden from students and should be made available to External Examiners by the Module Leader when required. For instructions on how to do this, please see the document titled "**Making Your Module Box Available to External Examiners**".

1. Internal Moderation Pack
2. Sample of ICA Work & Feedback
3. Additional Information (as appropriate)

1. Internal Moderation Pack

This folder should contain the Internal Moderation Pack. The aim of this pack is to provide guidance on the process of internal moderation and documentation that must be completed to evidence that due process has been followed, and to demonstrate to External Examiners what processes have been followed.

An Internal Moderation Pack must be completed for each assessment component.

A separate pack should be completed for reassessments.

The pack should contain:

- **Assessment Report** - this is to be completed by the Module Leader following completion of marking and moderation processes and it gives details about the module, its assessment and the process used for internal moderation.
- **Internal Sampling Report** - this is to be completed by the Internal Sampler where internal sampling has taken place.
- **Record of Double Marking** - to be completed by the Module Leader when double marking has taken place.
- **Record of Checking Process** – to be completed where assessments comprise solely of objective tools (e.g. Multiple Choice Questions, objective right and wrong answers) to replace the Internal Sampling Report. This record should identify the process of checking by a second person to ensure that marks have been calculated and recorded accurately.

You should also upload a School-specific marks sheet which must:

- include the name of each student and their agreed mark in an appropriate format (E.g. percentage, Pass / Fail, Pass / Merit / Distinction)
- demonstrate component marks (where appropriate)
- indicate which work has been internally sampled by placing a tick in the IS column or annotation next to the name
- indicate which work has been included in the External Examiners sample by placing a tick in the EE column or annotation next to the name

2. Sample of ICA Work & Feedback

This folder should contain 10 ICAs (for modules with fewer than 10 students, then the work of all students) as a sample for the External Examiner.
- The sample must include work across all boundaries.
- The sample can include work that has been internally moderated, but does not have to be restricted by this.
- Ask the External to look at any student work where the student has raised issues with the marking etc. This helps with assessment reviews/complaints.

You may wish to provide a link to the My Grades tool in this folder as this will provide the External Examiner with access to all electronically submitted assignments and related feedback. If you do this, please remember to identify which work has been selected for the sample by indicating on the mark sheet in the Internal Moderation Pack. To create a link to My Grades:

1. Select **Tools** > **More Tools** > **My Grades**.
2. Click **Submit**.

3. Additional Information (as appropriate)

This folder should be used to store any additional information that you may wish to provide to the External Examiner which does not fall into any of the above areas. Some suggestions for additional information include:

- Link to UTREG Online Module Specification
- Assessment Board Schedules
- Module Variances
- List of relevant School contacts
- Course Structure (I.e. where the module fits in to the broader course structure)

INTERNAL SAMPLING REPORT

This record is to be completed by the nominated Internal Sampler and returned to the Module Leader for inclusion in the Internal Moderation Pack.

Module Title:	
Module Code:	
Module Assessment:	
Name(s) of Designated Internal Sampler(s):	

Please confirm that:

	Yes	No
You have had access to the work of all students who submitted for assessment for sampling purposes and a completed marks sheet		
You have sampled work in accordance with paragraph *1.3.2 of Appendix C: Assessment & Feedback Policy*		
You have indicated on the marks sheet, using the abbreviation **IS**, which students work you have sampled		
The assessment criteria have been applied fairly and consistently		
Feedback to students is appropriate and consistent with the mark awarded[2]		

---

2   Please note that feedback for examinations may not always be available for internal sampling and if so please state not applicable

If you have answered **NO** to any of the above questions please give an overview of action taken in the box below, which can also be used for any additional comments you would like to make.

Additional Comments/Actions

Signature:		**Date:**	
Designation:			

RECORD OF DOUBLE MARKING

Name of Student	1st Marker's Name	1st Mark/ Grade	2nd Marker's Name	2nd Mark/ Grade	Agreed Mark/ Grade	Brief Comments on how Agreed Mark/Grade was Reached

Please indicate on the attached mark/grade list those that have been double marked by using the abbreviation DM and those that have been included in the sample accessed/sent to the External Examiner by adding EE.

Teesside University

RECORD OF CHECKING PROCESS

This form is to be completed where assessments comprise solely of objective tools and a process of checking replaces internal sampling.

Module Code:	
Module Assessment:	
Name and Designation of Person Checking:	

Please confirm that:

	Yes	No
You have checked that all marks/grades have been calculated and recorded accurately.		

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Module Title	
Module Code	
External Examiner	

Assessment Details including type of assessment (taken from Module Specification) or attach separately

☐ **First Attempt** *(including any resubmissions)*   ☐ **Reassessment**

Module Leader	
Module Team/Markers' Names	

Method of Internal Moderation *(please tick those that apply)*

☐ Internal Sampling

☐ Concealed Double Marking   ☐ sample   ☐ full cohort

☐ Double Marking   ☐ sample   ☐ full cohort

☐ Additional Internal sampling following double marking

Please give a brief rationale for methods, e.g. new assessment, new marking team, collaborative delivery etc.

Total number of students eligible for assessment		**Total number of scripts/assessments submitted for marking**	

Range of marks

Lowest:		**Highest:**		**Average** (if available)	

Details of any Assessments for Particular Attention of the External Examiner
Overall Comments on Assessment including Proposed Actions/enhancements

Module Leader Signature	
Date	

The Module Leader should attach the Internal Sampling Report and Record of Double Marking as appropriate. A complete set of marks for the cohort should also be attached (i.e. a copy of the module mark sheet).