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Purpose of Policy
The policy applies to all taught course students including the taught elements of postgraduate research awards). The policy applies to assessment contributing to a mark at all levels, including the bridging year, level three, level four, as well as the mark appearing on the Examination Board grids from which a student’s final degree classification is derived. A list of definitions and marking policies is given below, followed by a table showing the requirements applied to different forms of assessment. Where a particular mode of assessment requires moderation, second-marking or double-marking the requirements outlined in the policy are a minimum. Departments can moderate, second-mark or double-mark more work if they wish, or if they are required to do so by a professional body.

1. Definitions
1.1 Summative assessment
Summative assessments are those which contribute to a module mark, award mark, degree classification or any professional requirements of a course.

1.2 Formative assessment
Formative assessments are those for which students may receive a mark, but which does not contribute to any module mark, award mark, degree classification or any professional requirements of a course.

1.3 Examination
1.3.1 Only an examination which is invigilated should be classed as an examination and displayed as such on the transcript. This definition would also cover open-book examinations and Stage 1 MCQ tests in Biological Sciences.
1.3.2 Take-home examinations should be classed as coursework and departments would need to make this clear in the module information.
1.3.3 Invigilated in-class tests and progress tests are classed as coursework.

1.4 Single Marking
Student work is marked by one individual. Only for assessments up to and including 40% of an individual module. Students have the right to request that the work is re-marked if they disagree with the original mark (see section 3 below Requests from students to have their work re-marked).

1.5 Single Marking Using a Marking Schedule or Optical Mark Recognition (OMR)
This is usually found in science departments. Normally there should be some kind of clerical check to ensure that the marks have been added up correctly, and assigned to the correct candidates where OMR is used. Where marking schedules are used for exams, they must be sent with draft exam papers to the External Examiner for comments and approval.
1.6 Single Marking with Moderation
Moderation must take place on individual assessments worth more than 40% of an individual module. Moderation must also take place where the original marker is a Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) or recently appointed member of staff, or where a team of markers is involved in marking coursework. All fails must be second-marked and a random sample (10%) must also be moderated.
A moderator would not change the individual marks for the work, but would liaise with the first marker if s/he believed that the marks were not at the correct level, with a view to the first marker reviewing and adjusting the marking. In the case of a major discrepancy it might be necessary for all the work to be second marked.

1.7 Second Marking
This is where a second marker marks the work but has access to the first marker’s marks and/or comments. Marks must be reconciled – see section 4 below.

1.8 Double Marking
Two markers mark the work independently without access to each other’s marks or comments about the work. Marks must be reconciled – see section 4 below.

1.9 Monitored Assessment
This is all assessment carried out under invigilation or supervision – for example: examinations, multiple-choice tests, time-controlled essays, open-book essays, presentations, performances, group discussions.

1.10 Unmonitored Assessment
This is assessment that that is written in a student’s own time – for example: essays, journal articles, lab reports.

1.11 Performance-based Coursework with Non-permanent Output
This is coursework such as presentations, acting and dance, where the student does not provide an output capable of being shown to the external examiner. (A presentation where output such as a PowerPoint presentation is submitted would still count as performance-based coursework with non-permanent output, unless the key learning outcome being assessed is academic content rather than presentation skill.)

2. Marking Policies

2.1 Assessment Strategy (requirement of all departments)
Departments should develop an assessment strategy for each course, or set of courses, for approval in the annual monitoring process. The assessment strategy should address the following issues:
2.1.1 Diversity of assessment within a course;
2.1.2 Coverage of module learning outcomes by assessment methods;
2.1.3 The balance between monitored and unmonitored assessment;
2.1.4 Approaches to prevent and detect plagiarism in assessment;
2.1.5 Professional Body Requirements, if appropriate;

and in cases of Departments proposing to have modules assessed by 100% coursework:

2.1.6 Appropriate use of the academic year;
2.1.7 Approaches to assessment for the discipline at other comparable institutions.
2.2 Assessment of Performance-based Coursework (including oral presentations)
Performance-based assessment with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner should be subject to the normal policy for essays/assignments, but only where the permanent output relates directly to the assessment criteria. For example, a presentation where output such as a PowerPoint document is submitted would still count as performance-based coursework with non-permanent output, unless a learning outcome being assessed is academic content rather than presentation skill.

Performance-based assessment with a non-permanent output worth up to and including 40% of a module may be single marked. Where this type of assessment contributes to more than 40% of a module, work must be either double-marked, team marked, video/audio recorded or attended by the external examiner based on 100% coverage of the whole cohort.

2.3 Assessment of Group Work
2.3.1 Group work with a permanent output should be subject to the normal moderation process for essays/assignments.
2.3.2 Group work with a non-permanent output should be subject to the policy for the assessment of performance-based coursework.
2.3.3 The maximum amount that a joint mark (where a single group mark is derived from people working together in a group) can contribute to a single module is 25%.

2.4 Marks for Participation in Tutorial, Class or Seminar discussions
Marks for participation may contribute no more than 5 percent of the overall mark of a module and the marks should relate to a module learning outcome.

2.5 Moderation of Work-based Learning/Placement
The University publishes guidelines on work-based learning which state that ‘the assessment of work-based learning/placement should be subject to the normal departmental procedures in respect of moderation and external examining’.

2.6 Moderation of Study Abroad Work
The University should take the mark awarded by the host institution and use the established conversion tables to convert the mark to the standard University scale. The External Examiner should have oversight of the marks awarded by a host institution and the conversion used. The External Examiner should be invited to provide comment, through his/her report, if he/she observes any anomalies between the converted marks and the rest of the students’ marks profiles.

2.7 Anonymous Marking
2.7.1 Formative and Summative Assessment
Anonymous marking only applies to summative assessment. It does not apply to formative assessment. (see 1.1 and 1.2)

2.7.2 Anonymous Marking in Examinations
The University operates an institution-wide policy of anonymous marking in all formal examinations. (see 1.3 for definitions of formal examinations).

2.7.3 Anonymous Marking in Coursework
The University does not operate an institution-wide policy on anonymous marking in coursework. Departments should make clear to all students (including students taking optional modules) whether anonymous marking in coursework is used, and the rationale for doing so.
3. Requests from students to have their work re-marked

3.1 The following apply to all requests for a re-mark:

3.1.1 Students may only request a re-mark of work under the circumstances set out in 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 below.

3.1.2 If a request for a re-mark is approved, work will be either second or double-marked and marks must be reconciled (see Section 4).

Where there are exceptional circumstances that prevent the second or double-markers from reconciling the marks, the work will be marked by two new markers who will reconcile their marks (see Section 4 below).

Departments should explain the process for re-marking to students.

3.1.3 Departments must make clear to students their policy on how to request a re-mark and are advised to set an appropriate deadline for requests. Please note the particular deadlines and procedure for requesting a re-mark set out in 3.3.2 below cannot be changed.

3.1.4 Departments must warn students that marks can increase, decrease or remain the same after a request for a re-mark.

3.1.5 Departments must determine the appropriate level of feedback to give students after a re-mark in line with University expectations on feedback.

3.1.6 The right to request a re-mark can only be requested on one occasion for any particular piece of work (unless a procedural/administrative error is suspected).

3.2 Coursework which is single-marked (see 1.4)

Where coursework has a permanent output and is single marked, students have the right to request formal re-marking of a piece of work if they disagree with the original or if they suspect there has been a procedural/administrative error. Requests for a re-mark should be made following the department’s policy.

3.3 Coursework which is moderated (see 1.6)

Where coursework has a permanent output, has been single marked with a sample being moderated, students have the right to request formal re-marking of the piece of work under one or both of the following criteria:

3.3.1 Procedural/administrative error is suspected.

Students have the right to request formal re-marking of a piece of work if they suspect there has been a procedural/administrative error. Requests for a re-mark should be made following the department’s policy.

3.3.2 If the work was not initially included in the sample for moderation.

The student may only request a re-mark under this criteria if:

- The student has met with the initial marker (or suitable nominee appointed by the relevant Director of Education) to obtain further feedback on the reason for the initial mark before making a formal request for a re-mark; and
- The form requesting a re-mark has been completed and submitted with the signature of the first marker (or nominee, see above) confirming that the meeting has taken place, no later than two weeks of term time from the date of the initial feedback to students.
3.4 Other circumstances
There may be exceptional circumstances where approval is given for a piece of work to be re-marked which falls outside those defined in 3.2 and 3.3. Where this is the case, the conditions set out in 3.1.1 – 3.1.6 apply. Students should contact their department for advice, and should also note that approval will only be given in exceptional cases.

3.5 Examinations
Students may only request a re-mark of examination scripts if procedural/administrative error is suspected.

4. Reconciliation of Marks
4.1 Where two members of staff are involved in marking a piece of work, the markers should make every effort to agree a mark, rather than merely averaging the two marks. Departments must keep a full record of both individual and agreed marks for all work which is second or double marked.

4.2 Where the two internal markers are unable to reach agreement, the department should make every effort to resolve the matter internally, for example by involving a third person to arbitrate or, if necessary, to act as a third marker. Work should only be sent to an External Examiner, who will be asked to arbitrate, in exceptional circumstances. The External must be given access to written comments from internal markers on the piece(s) of work involved.

5. The Use of Internal and External Staff for Marking
5.1 Examination Marking by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs)
It is generally desirable that examinations should be marked by permanent teaching staff. Where it is necessary for graduate students to undertake this role, the following policy applies:

5.1.1 A graduate student should be employed to mark examinations only when the individual has taught the whole or a significant part of the module. Permission to employ a graduate student for marking must be sought in advance from the relevant Dean, on the basis of a case made by the Head of Department or partner institution, indicating the monitoring arrangements proposed. There is an application form which must be completed and submitted to the relevant Dean.

5.2 Coursework marking by GTAs
It is generally desirable that coursework should be marked by permanent teaching staff. Where it is necessary for graduate students to undertake this role, the following policy applies:

5.2.1 A graduate student should be employed to mark coursework only when the individual has taught/demonstrated a relevant part of the module in the current or previous academic year(s) or the relevant Dean has accepted a case made by the Head of Department on the competence of the graduate student.

5.3 The Role of the External Examiner
Unless the External has been specifically sent work to arbitrate on a dispute between internal markers, the External’s role will be as a moderator. Externals should not act as second markers. In moderating student work the Module External is providing an independent overview of the consistency of approaches to assessment. As such, the Module External’s primary concern is with the overall marking standard in the module rather than with marks obtained by individual students. The External should not alter the marks of any individual student.

5.4 Marking the Work of Students who are Partners or Close Relatives
Staff should not mark the work of partners or close relatives unless approval is given by the Head of Department. In the case of a query, the Head should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.

5.5 Moderating/Second Marking/ Double Marking the Work by Staff who are Partners or Close Relatives
Staff should not act as moderator or second marker where their partner or close relative is the first marker unless approval is given by the Head of Department. In the case of a query, the Head should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.

5.6 Exemptions to the University’s Marking Policy
If a department believes it is not possible to comply with an aspect of the University’s marking policy, the department must apply for an exemption to this aspect and propose an acceptable alternative arrangement for approval by the Executive Dean of Faculty and PVC (Education).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Marking Protocol*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An individual item of coursework worth up to and including 40% of an individual module: Essays/assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework tests using written answer papers, including in-class tests and progress tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based coursework with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based coursework with a non-permanent output</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work with a permanent output</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work with a non-permanent output</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individual item of coursework contributing more than 40% of an individual module: Essays/assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework tests using written answer papers, including in-class tests and progress tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based coursework with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work with a permanent output</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework testing using OMR sheets or online testing tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework marked to a marking schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual items of coursework comprising at least 30 credits (including PGT Dissertation and final year undergraduate project reports)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based coursework with a non-permanent output that contributes to more than 40% of a single module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work with a non-permanent output that contributes to more than 40% of a single module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>Marking Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All exams at level 3 and 4; and exams at level 5 which count for 50% or less of the module mark***.</td>
<td>The scripts only need to be single-marked, but all fails must be second-marked and a random sample (10%) must also be moderated. Where a formal marking schedule is in place it is not necessary to second-mark or sample - but an independent check must be made on all marks calculations. Marking schedules must be reviewed as part of the department’s procedures for reviewing draft exam papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All exams at level 5 which count for greater than 50% of the module mark; and all exams at level 6 and 7***.</td>
<td>All scripts must be second marked, double marked or marked to a marking schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These are minimum requirements and departments can moderate, second mark or double mark more work if they wish, or if they are required to do so by a professional and/or regulatory body. If a department believes it is not possible to comply with an aspect of the University’s marking policy, then the department must apply for an exemption to this aspect and propose an acceptable alternative arrangement for approval by the Faculty Executive Dean and PVC Education.

It is for departments to determine how long moderation needs to continue for a new member of staff.

An independent check on all marks calculations must be made where a marking schedule is used. Marking schedules must be sent with draft exams to the External Examiner for comments and approval.
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**Appendix A: Form for requesting a re-mark of work which has not previously been included in a sample for moderation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and code of module affected and a brief description of the piece of work, with date on which feedback was given to students, for which you are seeking re-marking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of first marker (or substitute nominated by the Director of Education of the relevant Department, School, Centre or Partner Institution) to confirm that a meeting to discuss the initial feedback has taken place.

Signed: [Signature] Date: [Date]

Print name: [Print Name]

Very brief description of the grounds for wanting a re-mark:

Declaration by student: I declare that:
- this individual item of assessment was originally marked by one person (single marked) and that my work was not initially included in the sample for moderation;
- I have had a meeting with the initial marker (or substitute) to discuss the feedback on my work, and that I am still dissatisfied with the mark;
- I request remarking of the work. I understand that marks can go up as well as down as a result of re-marking. I further understand that the decision of the new marker is final relating to this piece of work (unless procedural irregularity is suspected).

Signed: [Signature] Date: [Date]
Annex B Section C of the current policy

C. Requests from students to have their work re-marked

Where coursework has a permanent output and is single marked, students have the right to request formal re-marking of a piece of work if they disagree with the original.

Where coursework has a permanent output and is marked by single marking with moderation, students have the right to request that a piece of work is re-marked if they disagree with the original mark in one or both of the following circumstances:

1. If procedural/administrative error is suspected.
2. If their work was not initially included in a sample of work moderated.

The right under 2 above can only be exercised if the student has had a meeting with the initial marker of the work (or a substitute appointed by the Education Director of the relevant Department, School or Centre where the initial marker is unavailable) to obtain further feedback on the reason for the initial mark, and had subsequently made the request for re-marking, on the form provided for that purpose, including the signature of the first marker or substitute as a confirmation that the meeting has taken place, within two weeks of term time from the date of initial feedback to students. Students must be aware that marks can decrease, increase or remain the same after the re-marking. The right to a remark under 2 above can only be requested, for any particular piece of work, on one occasion.

When work is re-marked on another basis, it must be second or double marked by another member of staff. The marks must be reconciled, see section D below. Departments must publish their policy on how students can request such re-marking, and they must warn students that marks can go down as well as up. Departments are advised to set a deadline for students to submit their requests for re-marking. Departments can determine the appropriate level of feedback to give the student on the re-marked work.

Students cannot request that their exams are re-marked unless a procedural/administration error is suspected.