

Marking Procedures

Approved by: Education and Student Experience Committee	Effective date: 25 January 2021	Next review: January 2024
--	---	-------------------------------------

Procedural statement

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

Who needs to know about the procedure?

- Heads of School and Department
- Programme Directors
- Academic Staff
- Programme Administrators
- Registry

Purpose of the procedure

The purpose of this document is to provide clear and consistent procedures for marking student work, These procedures cover the mode of submission, marking illegible scripts, marking where a student has not followed the instructions of an examiner, penalties for the late submission of assessed work, the definitions and arrangements for moderation and double marking, requirements for the consideration of marked samples by External Examiners, the arrangements for collaborative provision, and procedures for feedback to students on marked assessments.

Contacts

The University Quality and Standards Office is responsible for:

- Providing advice and guidance on the procedure
- Maintaining the procedure and any related templates

The team can be contacted by emailing: quality@canterbury.ac.uk

Marking Procedures

Contents

Marking Procedures	3
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	5
6. Moderation and Double Marking.....	6
7. External Examiner moderation	9
8. Collaborative provision	10
9. Feedback to students on marked assessments	11

Marking Procedures

Marking Procedures

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 <https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/policies/electronic-assignment-management.aspx>. 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:
 - (i) the student notifies the Programme Team or Planning & Academic Administration of the error;
 - (ii) the date, time and location of the submission can be established;
 - (iii) there are no clear indications that the submission was not intended as a final submission for marking;
 - (iv) 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.

Marking Procedures

- 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 maker and moderator for the component of assessment and a re-marker appointed by the Head of School or nominee for this purpose.
- 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 or grades 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 a sufficient mark or grade 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.

Where too many questions have been answered in a formal examination

- 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. For example, a student who has answered four questions when three questions should have been answered will receive the aggregate mark for the best three answers.

Where coursework exceeds the prescribed length

- 4.3. Where a dissertation or other coursework exceeds the prescribed length by more than 10 per cent (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 percentage points (of the eligible marks) shall be applied.

Where assessment is not undertaken

- 4.4. Where coursework has not been submitted or where an examination or a timed assessment has not been undertaken the student will be awarded a mark of zero.

Marking Procedures

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 components 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 five per cent per day, for up to seven days, after which a mark of 0 will be recorded.
- 5.4. The 5 per cent penalty will be five per cent of the eligible mark. 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% where the work is one day late, 40% where the work is two days late, and so on.
- 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 component of assessment has been first marked, moderated and externally examined to ensure the transparency of the process.

Marking Procedures

6. Moderation and Double Marking

Principles

6.1. The following principles apply to the marking of assessed work:

- (i) The University is committed to ensuring that all marks and grades awarded for summative assessment are accurate, fair and equitable and are, therefore, reliable.
- (ii) The University utilises a moderation process to ensure that summative assessment is reliable, except in those specific instances, where it requires assessment(s) to be double marked.
- (iii) In both moderation and double marking, the student will receive only a single mark and a single piece of feedback.

Definitions

6.2. The following definitions apply:

- (i) Double Marking is the process by which two markers assess the work against the assessment criteria, coming to an independent conclusion, before together agreeing a single mark or grade.
- (ii) Moderation is the process by which the mark or grade of the first marker of any summative assessed work is reviewed by a moderator, who must assure themselves, through sampling the first marking, that the assessment criteria have been applied accurately, fairly and equitably.

Allocation of markers

6.3. It is the responsibility of the Programme Director, or other person so appointed by the Head of School or their formally-appointed nominee, to allocate for the assessed work of each module:

- (i) a first marker(s) to each component of assessment;
- (ii) a moderator, where the component of assessment is to be moderated;
- (iii) a double marker(s), where the component of assessment is to be double marked.

6.4. No piece of work may be given a mark or grade unless a full member of the Board of Examiners has acted either as a moderator or as a double marker.

Marking Procedures

6.5. It is good practice to allocate all markers before the assessment task is set prior to the commencement of the module to ensure that all markers participate in the setting of the summative assessment.

Moderation

6.6. All summative assessment will be moderated unless it falls into a category of assessment where double marking is required.

6.7. There must only be one moderator for any single component of assessment.

6.8. Where moderation takes place, the sample of each component of assessment must:

- (i) comprise the higher of either (a) ten pieces of the submitted pieces of work, or (b) 20 per cent of the submitted pieces of work, up to a maximum of 30 pieces of work;
- (ii) include a sample of work from marks or grades spread across the range;
- (iii) must include work marked by all first markers, where there is more than one.

6.9. There is no requirement for all failed pieces of work to be in the moderation sample.

6.10. It is the role of the moderator to ensure that:

- (i) the first marker(s) has allocated an appropriate mark or grade and that that mark or grade reflects the assessment criteria accurately;
- (ii) the first marker(s) has provided feedback that reflects the alignment of the piece of work with the assessment criteria.
- (iii) there is consistent marking across a component of assessment.

6.11. The moderator will be provided with:

- (i) the appropriate sample of assessed work;
- (ii) the feedback to students for that sample of work;
- (iii) the marks or grades for all pieces of assessed work;
- (iv) access to all pieces of assessed work with feedback, if required.

6.12. The moderator will not alter or propose alterations to the marks or grades determined by the first marker.

Marking Procedures

6.13. On completion of the moderation process, the moderator will submit the appropriate University template to the Programme Director in order to provide evidence of the completion of the moderation process, prior to the Module Board of Examiners.

6.14. The moderator may decline to agree to the marks or grades of the first marker(s) where, in the professional judgement of the moderator, there are:

EITHER

- (i) significant inconsistencies in the marking;

AND/OR

- (ii) systematic deviations from the making criteria;

AND/OR

- (iii) inappropriate feedback to students.

6.15. Where the moderator declines to agree to the marks or grades of the first marker(s), the Head of School will appoint a second moderator, who will review the sample of work. The second moderator will be a member of staff who is identified by the Head of School as having appropriate experience and subject expertise.

6.16. Where the second moderator:

- (i) confirms the marks or grades of the first marker(s), the marks or grades of the first marker will stand and those marks or grades will be submitted to the Module Board of Examiners;
- (ii) confirms the judgement of the moderator, all the assessed work for the component of assessment will be marked by the moderator (or other marker appointed by the Head of School for that purpose) and those marks or grades will be submitted to the Module Board of Examiners.

6.17. Where there is more than one first marker and the deficit established by the moderator relates only to the marking of one first marker, the procedures set out in 6.15 and 6.16 above should apply only to assessment conducted by that first marker.

6.18. Where there are more than two first markers and the deficit established by the moderator relates to the marking of more than one first marker, the procedures set out in 6.15 and 6.16 above should apply in full.

Marking Procedures

6.19. The moderator will not provide feedback to students.

6.20. No indication may be made to students that a piece of work has been included in a sample that will be or has been moderated, and a piece of work must not be recorded as having been moderated on the VLE or elsewhere.

Double Marking

6.21. 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 or negotiated module;
- (ii) where it is impossible to revisit the assessment (such as a live performance or exhibition) and no permanent record, e.g. video recording, can be kept;
- (iii) where it is the requirement of an external regulatory body.

6.22. There will normally be only one double marker, but this may not be possible in some instances, where specialist knowledge is required.

6.23. Double markers should assess the work independently and should not be provided with marks, grades, or feedback from any other marker.

6.24. The first marker will be responsible for feedback to students. 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. Two sets of feedback must not be given to students.

6.25. Double marking may not be applied to the work of selected students; it must be applied to the whole cohort for the relevant component of assessment.

6.26. Where the double markers cannot agree the marks or grades for the component of assessment and a resolution is not possible, the Head of School will appoint a re-marker, who will mark all the assessment for the component of assessment. The re-marker will be a member of staff who is identified by the Head of School as having appropriate experience and subject expertise, who has not acted as one of the double markers for the component of assessment. The marks or grades of the re-marker will be those reported to the Module Board of Examiners.

7. External Examiner moderation

This section does not apply to Level 0 or Level 4 for unless stipulated by a PSRB.

Marking Procedures

7.1. It is the role of the External Examiner to moderate the marks or grades awarded by the University in order to:

- (i) review the marking to determine if it is of an appropriate standard;
- (ii) make a judgement on the overall standards of student performance on the modules to which they are appointed;
- (iii) ensure that written University procedures for marking are observed for the modules to which they are appointed.

Paragraph 7.2 regarding details of all summative assessments being sent to the External Examiner (as opposed to examination papers only), applies from September 2021 onwards.

7.2. Before an assessment is set, the Programme Director / Module Leader will ensure that details of all summative assessments, including essay questions, examination papers, presentation titles and their equivalents for other assessments are shared with the External Examiner and that the External Examiner is given the opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of the assessment task as a means of assessing the achievement of the module learning outcomes.

The Learning Teaching and Assessment Working Group has discussed in principle a proposal to recommend a shift in inviting the External Examiner to select a sample from Turnitin with guidance. This proposal will be brought forward as separate paper next semester with the intention that 7.3 will be changed in semester 2, 2020-21.

7.3. The External Examiner will moderate a sample of assessed work for each component of assessment for each module. The sample should be selected by the Programme Director and drawn from across all bandings. The External Examiner may, in addition, request to see further assessed work, and must not be refused.

8. Collaborative provision

8.1. Academic Staff who are employed by a collaborative partner are affiliate examiners.

8.2. Where Academic Staff employed by a collaborative partner are affiliate examiners, a full member of the Board of Examiners must act as one of each pair of examiners, so that:

- (i) where assessed work is moderated, a full member of the Board of Examiners must act either as the first marker or as the moderator;
- (ii) where work is double marked, a full member of the Board of Examiners must act as one of the double markers.

Marking Procedures

8.3. Where language of study is other than English, the arrangements set out in Framework for Teaching and Assessment in a Language of Study other than English (<https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/collaborative-provision/management-of-collaborative-partnerships.aspx>) should be followed.

9. Feedback to students on marked assessments

9.1. Students are entitled to comprehensive feedback on all forms of assessment.

9.2. Formal feedback on assessment is a 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.

9.3. All students should receive formal feedback (including the mark) as soon as possible and within the maximum time of 15 working days after the assessment submission date, except for the following:

- (i) Dissertations, extended projects, independent studies (usually work of a word equivalence of 5,000 words or more).
- (ii) Formal examinations supported by Planning & Academic Administration.
- (iii) Work submitted for Research Degrees and taught Doctorates.
- (iv) Negotiated Learning plans where students have an approved learning agreement in place.
- (v) Work submitted after the deadline.

9.4. Where 9.3 (i)-(v) applies, 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.

9.5. Working days are defined as Monday to Fridays when the main University functions are open for business. They are not limited to term times.

9.6. Formal feedback should include qualitative comments and the mark, as confirmed by moderation or double marking processes.

9.7. 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>

Marking Procedures

9.8. 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

9.9. 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.

9.10. 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 or nominee.

9.11. 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.

9.12. 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

9.13. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to monitor the timeliness of feedback to students on summative assessment.

9.14. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Quality Committee to consider 15 Day Variation Requests for approval.

9.15. 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.

Marking Procedures

Policy Information	Description of Policy Information
Policy Title	Marking Procedures
Department Owner	Quality and Standards Office
Policy Category	Academic - directly affecting research, assessment or teaching within the University.
Policy Owner	Director of Quality and Standards
Policy Administration	quality@canterbury.ac.uk
Related University Policies	Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards
Related University Procedures (*)	
Approved by	Education and Student Experience Committee
Date Approved	18 November 2020
Date of Commencement	25 January 2021
Review Date	January 2024
Version	2
History of revisions of the policy	Version 1, approved by Education and Student Experience Committee, 20 September 2017 Version 2, approved by Education and Student Experience Committee, 18 November 2020
Website Address	https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulation-and-credit-framework.aspx