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# **Introduction**

* 1. This document sets out University Procedures for submission, marking and feedback of assessed work.

# **Mode of submission**

* 1. The mode of submission for assessment will depend on the nature of the work being assessed.
  2. Where technically possible, all work must be submitted in an electronic format through one of the University’s supported systems.[[1]](#footnote-1)
  3. A paper copy must not be required where electronic submission through the University’s supported systems is possible.
  4. Where the nature of the work being assessed prevents electronic submission through one of the University's supported systems, an alternative mode of submission is permitted.
  5. Where an electronic submission of assessment is made to the incorrect location, provided the submission has been made by the correct deadline, the submission may be considered valid and marked accordingly, provided the below criteria are met:

(a) The student notifies the Programme Team or Planning & Academic Administration of the error.

(b) It is possible to locate the submission.

(c) The date and time of the submission can be established.

(d) There are no clear indications that the submission was not intended as a final submission for marking.

(e) The submission complies with all other requirements for the assessment other than being submitted to the wrong location.

# **Marking Illegible Scripts**

* 1. The University has specific requirements when students submit illegible scripts for assessment.
  2. An illegible script, either in its entirety or in part, is one that is not possible for an examiner to decipher in such a way that a fair assessment can be made.
  3. At least three examiners must ascertain that they have failed to decipher the script before work is treated as illegible.
  4. An indication of work deemed to be illegible should be made on the script.
  5. No marks shall be given or deducted for work deemed illegible.
  6. If, as a result of decisions on illegibility, a piece of work does not attract sufficient marks to pass, the work will be treated in line with the University’s reassessment regulations.

# **Marking of work where a student has not followed the instructions of the examiners**

* 1. The University has procedures in place where a student does not follow the instructions in an examination or time constrained assessment activity.

Cases where too many questions have been answered

* 1. A student who completed more questions than required will receive the aggregate mark for the best among the answers up to the number required, e.g. a student who has answered 4 questions when 3 questions should have been answered will receive the aggregate mark for the best 3 answers.

Where coursework exceeds the prescribed length

* 1. Where a dissertation or other coursework exceeds the prescribed length by more than 10% (or by any amount where precision is required due to the nature of assessment e.g. writing in a set poetic form) a penalty reduction in marks of 10% (of the eligible marks) shall be applied.

Failure to attempt an examination or timed assessment

* 1. In the case of failure to attempt an examination or a timed assessment without good cause the student should be awarded a mark of zero.
  2. If a student who fails to attempt an examination or a timed assessment submits a ’Extenuating Circumstances Request form’ then the Deputy Chair should refer to ‘Extenuating Circumstances Requests’ and advise the Board of Examiners accordingly.

# **Penalties for the late submission of assessed work, including dissertations, extended essays, projects, and coursework**

* 1. In the case of late submission of course work for a component of assessment without an approved extenuating circumstance, the work will be penalised.
  2. The penalty to be applied by all programmes, will be 5% (of the eligible marks) per day, for up to 7 days, after which a mark of 0 will be recorded, unless, EITHER:

1. a special regulation has been approved by Academic Board, OR
2. the work is marked on a pass/fail basis and it is not possible to give a numerical mark.
   1. For a component of assessment that has been validated to be marked on a pass/fail basis for which it is not possible to give a numerical mark, the late submission of work without an approved extenuating circumstance will be recorded as a fail, unless a special regulation is approved by the Academic Board. The final module outcome will be subject to the decision of the Board of Examiners in accordance with normal reassessment regulations.
   2. Where the penalty is applied to a reassessment it will be applied to the marked assessment before the cap of the pass mark is applied.
   3. Where a request is made for a special regulation:
3. this will normally be as a result of professional body or employer expectations;
4. the penalty will be for the mark of 0 to be applied where work has not been submitted by the deadline.
   1. All work that is penalised because of late submission will be subject to the normal reassessment regulations.
   2. The application of any penalties will be made after the work has been first and second marked and external examined to ensure the transparency of the process.

# **Second sample marking**

* 1. Second sample marking is the process whereby a second internal member of the Board of Examiners ensures that the criteria for assessment and arrangements for feedback have been appropriately applied through the sampling of the work assessed by the first marker.
  2. All assessed work must be second sample marked in line with these procedures.
  3. Unless double marking is applied, second sample marking will be through a process of sampling, as set out in this procedures document.
  4. It is the responsibility of the Programme Director to establish a system of second sample marking for all assessed work that includes all fails and a sample of the other marks or grades spread across the range. The sample is to consist of either 10 pieces of work for each assessment or 20% of the submitted pieces of work for each assessment, whichever is the greater.
  5. It is the responsibility of the second sample marker to ensure that the criteria for assessment and arrangements for feedback have been appropriately applied in a sample of work across a module.
  6. It is the responsibility of the second sample marker to provide a brief report on the second sample marking process to the Board of Examiners, using the appropriate University template issued by the Quality and Standards Office, to provide evidence of the completion of the process. The template is provided at <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulation-and-policy-zone/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx#S>
  7. The second sample marker will not be responsible for providing any feedback to students.
  8. Where the second internal marker for a unit of assessment indicates significant inconsistencies in the marking, systematic deviations from the making criteria or inappropriate feedback to students, all assessment for that unit of assessment will be double-marked.

# **Double marking**

* 1. Double marking is the process whereby a second internal member of the Board of Examiners ensures that the criteria for assessment and arrangements for feedback have been appropriately applied through the review of every piece of assessment.
  2. The Programme Director will ensure that, where a Third Internal Marker has been appointed, it is the marks of the Third Internal Marker that are reported to the Board of Examiners.
  3. Double marking may not be applied to the work of selected students or to selected pieces of work.
  4. Double marking is required in the following circumstances:

1. where a piece of work is undertaken only by a single student, such as independent study, dissertation, negotiated module assessment;
2. where it is impossible to revisit the assessment that is not part of a sample performance and exhibition, or where a piece of work is taken only by a single student;
3. where, because of a requirement of an external regulatory body, the programme validation imposes double marking and binds the Board of Examiners to adopt the practice as a policy decision;
4. where the Academic Board requires double marking to take place;
5. where the second sample marking for a unit of assessment indicates significant inconsistencies in the marking, systematic deviations from the marking criteria or inappropriate feedback to students.
   1. It is the responsibility of the double marker to ensure that the criteria for assessment and arrangements for feedback have been appropriately applied in every piece of assessment.
   2. The double marker will provide a brief report on the double marking process, using the appropriate University template issued by the Quality and Standards Office, to provide evidence of the completion of the process. This is provided at <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulation-and-policy-zone/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx#D>
   3. The double marker will not be responsible for providing any feedback to students.
   4. In the case of a disagreement following double marking, between two double markers, and a resolution with the first marker and second sample marker is not possible, the Chair of the Board of Examiners will appoint a senior member of staff to review the work of the whole cohort and whose marks will be those reported to the Board of Examiners.

# **Moderation**

* 1. Moderation is the process of reviewing summative assessments to ensure consistency in the application of the marking criteria where there is more than one pair of first and second internal markers.
  2. The role of the moderator is to report on the fairness and consistency of the marking process and not to change marks.
  3. It is the responsibility of the Programme Director to establish arrangements for moderation, reviewing summative assessments to ensure consistency in the application of the marking criteria where there is more than one pair of first and second internal markers.
  4. The Programme Director will ensure that moderation is only undertaken by those members of a Board with Full Internal Examiner Status as defined by the Regulations.
  5. Moderation may not be undertaken by Affiliate Examiners.
  6. Moderation requires the work of all first markers to be sampled. The sample is to consist of either a minimum of five pieces of work for each assessment or 10% of the submitted pieces of work for each assessment, whichever is the greater.
  7. The Programme Director will ensure that moderation is based on a sample of all first markers. The sample is to consist of either a minimum of five pieces of work for each assessment or 10% of the submitted pieces of work for each assessment, whichever is the greater.
  8. It is the responsibility of the moderator to report on the fairness and consistency of the marking process where there is more than one first and second sample marker, based on a sample of assessments of first markers.
  9. Where a moderator believes that marking has been applied inappropriately and a resolution with the first and second markers is not possible, the Chair of the Board of Examiners will appoint a senior member of staff, who will review the work of the whole cohort and whose marks will be those reported to the Board of Examiners.
  10. The Programme Director will ensure that, where a Third Internal Marker has been appointed, it is the marks of the Third Internal Marker that are reported to the Board of Examiners.
  11. It is the responsibility of the moderator to provide a report to the Board of Examiners, in line with the University Template, which is provided at <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulation-and-policy-zone/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx#M>
  12. The moderator will not change marks or will not be responsible for providing any feedback to students.

# Feedback to students on marked assessments

* 1. Formal feedback on assessment is key aspect of assessment for learning. It is important for enabling student development and progression. Feedback on assessment should be given to students as soon as possible to enable students to review progress and to identify areas for improvement in future work.
  2. All students should receive formal feedback (including the mark) as soon as possible and within the maximum time of 15 working days post assessment submission, except for the following:

(a) Dissertations, extended projects, independent studies (usually work of a word equivalence of 5,000 words or more).

(b) Formal examinations supported by Planning & Academic Administration.

(c) Work submitted for Research Degrees and taught Doctorates.

(d) Negotiated Learning plans where students have an approved learning agreement in place.

(e) Work submitted after the deadline.

For a., b., c., d and e. the deadline dates will be set at the discretion of the programme team, but must be as soon as possible and timely to inform students’ development and must be clearly communicated to students as per the procedures for formal feedback outlined in this section.

* 1. Working days are defined as Monday to Fridays when the main University functions are open for business. They are not limited to term times.
  2. Formal feedback should include qualitative comments and the mark, as confirmed by second or double marking processes.
  3. Where there are substantive logistical reasons for a revised assessment deadline on an ongoing basis beyond the normal maximum times, application for a revised deadline should be made via the 15 Day Deadline Variation Request Form as per the guidelines, which is provided at: <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx.#F>
  4. Where the return of feedback to students will be unusually delayed (e.g., a one-off instance because of staff illness), students should be notified in writing of the delay by the original feedback deadline. They should be given a revised date for feedback. Every effort should be made to ensure feedback is given to students in good time for them to utilise feedback in preparing their next relevant submission.
  5. If a significant system outage (defined as one formally confirmed by Learning and Teaching Enhancement [LTE]) occurs on the day of a submission deadline, the deadline for the return of feedback for the relevant work should be extended by 24 hours. LTE (acting on behalf of Planning & Academic Administration) will liaise with the central support services and notify programmes via Staffnet regarding any outages and revised deadlines. The programme teams will be responsible for communicating revised deadlines to students. Where a systems outage occurs outside of office hours, the outage will be confirmed retrospectively as soon as possible.

### **Responsibilities of Staff**

* 1. The Programme/Pathway Director is responsible for having oversight of the assessment mechanisms/processes for the programme which enable all students to receive formal feedback (including the mark) as soon as possible and within the given deadlines.
  2. Where the Programme/Pathway Director identifies a significant issue in relation to meeting obligations for assessment feedback, this should be brought to the attention of the relevant Head of School/Centre or nominee.
  3. Where the return of feedback is unusually delayed the Programme/Pathway Director should ensure that the appropriate notification and revised deadline has been given to students.
  4. Where the programme team believes that the standard feedback deadline should be extended for a programme or module for substantive logistical reasons (e.g., nature of programme delivery, etc), the Programme/Pathway Director is responsible for applying in writing to the relevant Faculty Quality Committee for a variation of the deadline date.
  5. Applications should be made on the University template [15 Day Variation Request form](http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulation-and-policy-zone/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx#F) and will need to include a clear rationale and duration of the variation in deadline.

### **Responsibilities of the Faculty Quality Committee**

* 1. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to monitor the timeliness of feedback to students on summative assessment.
  2. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to consider 15 Day Variation Requests for approval.
  3. Deadline variations will be made for a set period of time as determined by the Faculty Quality Committee through the approval process. After which, if a deadline variation is still required, a new application should be made.

1. A list of the University’s supported systems is available on the following webpages: on <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/EMA> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)