



## MARKING PROCEDURES

## Contents

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Mode of submission .....	3
3. Marking Illegible Scripts.....	3
4. Marking of work where a student has not followed the instructions of the examiners .....	4
5. Penalties for the late submission of assessed work .....	4
6. Second marking .....	5
7. Moderation .....	6
8. Note on collaborative provision .....	7
9. Feedback to students on marked assessments .....	7

## 1. Introduction

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

## 2. Mode of submission

- 2.1 The mode of submission for assessment will depend on the nature of the work being assessed.
- 2.2 Full details of the University's arrangements for the Electronic Management of Assessment [EMA] can be found at <http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/EMA>. These pages should be consulted.
- 2.3 Where technically possible, all work must be submitted in an electronic format through one of the University's supported systems.
- 2.4 A paper copy must not be required where electronic submission through the University's supported systems is possible.
- 2.5 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.
- 2.6 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) the date, time and location of the submission can be established;
  - (c) there are no clear indications that the submission was not intended as a final submission for marking;
  - (d) the submission complies with all other requirements for the assessment other than being submitted to the wrong location.

## 3. Marking Illegible Scripts

- 3.1 The University has specific requirements when students submit illegible scripts for assessment.
- 3.2 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.
- 3.3 At least three examiners must ascertain that they have failed to decipher the script before work is treated as illegible. These should comprise the first and second marker and a third marker appointed by the Head of School or nominee for this purpose. Where marking arrangements require more than one second marker, the third marker may be selected from among those individuals.
- 3.4 An indication of work deemed to be illegible should be made on the script, such as by underlining it and annotating it "ILLEGIBLE TO MARKERS".
- 3.5 No marks shall be given or deducted for work deemed illegible.
- 3.6 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.

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

4.1 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**

4.2 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**

4.3 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**

4.4 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.

4.5 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 Procedures' and advise the Board of Examiners accordingly.

#### 5. Penalties for the late submission of assessed work

5.1 In the case of late submission of work for a component of assessment (including dissertations, extended essays and projects) without an approved extenuating circumstance, the work will be penalized.

5.2 The standard penalty will apply to all component of assessed work for all programmes, unless:

EITHER:

(i) a special regulation has been approved by Academic Board;

OR

(ii) the work is marked on a pass/fail basis and it is not possible to give a numerical mark.

5.3 The standard 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.

5.4 The reduction of 5% will be applied to the total mark that the student can receive for the component of assessment and not to the mark that the student has earned. If, therefore, the component of assessment is marked out of 100 and the student has scored 50%, the student will lose 5 marks and receive 45%.

5.5 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.

- 5.6 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.
- 5.7 Where a request is made for a special regulation:
- (i) this will normally be as a result of professional body or employer expectations;
  - (ii) the penalty will be for the mark of 0 to be applied where work has not been submitted by the deadline.
- 5.8 All work that is penalised because of late submission will be subject to the normal reassessment regulations.
- 5.9 The application of any penalties will be made after the work has been first and second marked and externally examined to ensure the transparency of the process.

## 6. Second marking

- 6.1 Second marking is the process by which a second internal member of the Board of Examiners ensures that the criteria for assessment and arrangements for feedback have been appropriately applied.
- 6.2 Either the first or second marker must be a full member of the Board of Examiners; both cannot be affiliate examiners.
- 6.3 All summative assessment must be second-marked.
- 6.4 Second Marking will take one of two forms:
- (i) Double Marking, whereby the summative work of all students, undertaking a component of assessment, is reviewed by the second marker;
  - (ii) Sample Second Marking, whereby the summative work of a sample of students, undertaking a component of assessment, is reviewed by the second marker.
- 6.5 It is the responsibility of the Programme Director, or other person so appointed by the Head of School or their formally-appointed nominee, to:
- (i) allocate first and second markers to each component of assessment;
  - (ii) to determine where Double Marking should be applied;
  - (iii) establish a system of sample second marking.
- 6.6 On completion of the second-marking process, the Second Marker will submit the appropriate University template in order to provide evidence of the completion of the sample second marking process, prior to the Board of Examiners.
- 6.7 The Second Marker will not provide feedback to students.
- 6.8 Double Marking is required in the following circumstances:
- (i) where a component of assessment is undertaken independently by each student, such as independent study, dissertation, negotiated module assessment, or practical work, such as a live performance or exhibition;
  - (ii) where it is impossible to revisit the assessment;
  - (iii) where it is the requirement of an external regulatory body;
  - (iv) where the Academic Board requires Double Marking to take place;

- (v) 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.
- 6.9 Where a component of assessment is Double Marked, the double marker may give feedback, but this should be incorporated into a single set of feedback provided by the first marker to the student.
- 6.10 Where there is no requirement for double marking, sample second marking will take place.
- 6.11 Double Marking may not be applied to the work of selected students.
- 6.12 If, following double marking, the First and Second Markers cannot agree of the marks of one or more of the students undertaking a component of assessment, and a resolution is not possible, the Head of School, or their formally-appointed nominee, will appoint a senior member of staff, who has not acted as either a First Marker or a Second Marker for the component of assessment, to review all the work covered by the first and second markers concerned, and whose marks will be those reported to the Board of Examiners.
- 6.13 Where sample second marking takes place, the sample of a component of assessment will include:
- (i) all fails, AND
  - (ii) a sample of work from marks or grades spread across the range.
- 6.14 Where sample second marking takes place, the sample of each component of assessment will comprise either (a) ten pieces of the submitted pieces of work, or (b) 20 per cent of the submitted work, whichever is the greater.
- 6.15 The second marker will not alter or propose alterations to the marks or grades determined by the first marker.
- 6.16 Where the second marker for a component of assessment indicates that there are either (a) significant inconsistencies in the marking, or (b) systematic deviations from the making criteria, or (c) inappropriate feedback to students, the submitted work of all students for that component of assessment will be double-marked.

## **7. Moderation**

- 7.1 Moderation is the process of reviewing summative assessment to ensure consistency in the application of the marking criteria where there is more than one pair of first and second markers.
- 7.2 It is the responsibility of the Programme Director, or other person so appointed by the Head of School or their formally-appointed nominee, to:
- (i) determine where Moderation should be applied;
  - (ii) allocate Moderators to each component of assessment, as required;
  - (iii) establish a system of moderation, as required.
- 7.3 The role of the moderator is to review the fairness and consistency of the marking process and not to change marks.
- 7.4 Moderation of summative assessment may not be undertaken by an Affiliate Examiner.
- 7.5 Moderation of summative assessment may not be undertaken by the first or second marker for the component of assessment.

- 7.6 Moderation of summative assessment requires the work of all first markers to be sampled.
- 7.7 Each sample for the moderation of summative assessment must consist of either (a) a minimum of five pieces of work for each component of assessment, or (b) ten per cent of the submitted pieces of work for each component of assessment, whichever is the greater.
- 7.8 The moderator will not alter or propose alterations to the marks or grades determined by the first and second markers.
- 7.9 The moderator will not provide feedback to students.
- 7.10 Where a moderator believes that marking has been applied inappropriately and a resolution with the first and second markers is not possible, the Head of School, or their formally-appointed nominee, will appoint a senior member of staff, who has not acted as either a First Marker or a Second Marker for the component of assessment, to review the work of the whole cohort, and whose marks will be those reported to the Board of Examiners.

## **8. Note on collaborative provision**

- 8.1 Academic Staff who are employed by a collaborative partner are affiliate examiners, except where Academic Board has appointed them as full members of the Board of Examiners.
- 8.2 Where Academic Staff employed by a collaborative partner are affiliate examiners, a full member of the Board of Examiners must either first or second mark each component of assessment.
- 8.3 Where Academic Board has appointed Academic Staff employed by a collaborative partner as full members of the Board of Examiners, they may first and second mark a component of assessment.
- 8.4 Where Academic Board has appointed Academic Staff employed by a collaborative partner as full members of the Board of Examiners and the language of assessment is other than English, all assessed work for each component of assessment must be moderated by a suitably-qualified member of University Academic Staff.

## **9. Feedback to students on marked assessments**

- 9.1 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.
- 9.2 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.

- 9.3 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.
- 9.4 Working days are defined as Monday to Fridays when the main University functions are open for business. They are not limited to term times.
- 9.5 Formal feedback should include qualitative comments and the mark, as confirmed by second or double marking processes.
- 9.6 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/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx#F>
- 9.7 If a significant system outage (defined as one formally confirmed by Planning and Academic Administration, informed 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. Planning & Academic Administration will liaise with central support services and notify programmes via Staffnet regarding any outages and revised deadlines. At Planning & Academic Administration's request, LTE will also post communications to Blackboard. 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**

- 9.8 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.
- 9.9 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.
- 9.10 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.
- 9.11 Applications should be made on the University template [15 Day Variation Request form](#) and will need to include a clear rationale and duration of the variation in deadline.

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

- 9.12 It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to monitor the timeliness of feedback to students on summative assessment.
- 9.13 It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to consider 15 Day Variation Requests for approval.
- 9.14 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.