

Section 24 Marking and moderation policy and procedures

24.1 Marking principles

- 24.1.1 Assessments will be marked according to the assessment criteria agreed for the subject-area or programme which are communicated to the student via publication on Moodle.
- 24.1.2 Assessments will be marked using the University marking fixed scale and conventions, including the Generic Assessment Descriptors.
- 24.1.3 Staff should not use AI tools to generate marks on student assessments and must not submit students' assessments to AI tools.
- 24.1.4 The University's policy is that marking should be completed and feedback returned within **15 working days of the assessment submission or examination date for taught modules**. This includes completion of all internal marking and moderation processes. The 15 days begins the working day after the assessment or examination date. Schools have discretion to set a longer deadline for returning feedback for dissertations and research projects; the expectation is that if discretion is applied this would be 20 working days and not exceed 30 working days.
- 24.1.5 Individual marks for group assessments must be awarded to each student, which reflects their individual achievement.
- 24.1.6 Any exceptions to the marking turnaround times must be approved by School Quality Panels and Quality and Standards Committee and be communicated clearly to students.
- 24.1.7 In cases where a student submits work late and is eligible to receive a capped mark, the 15 days would begin the working day after the student submits their work.
- 24.1.8 Marking will not be adjusted as part of a Learner Adjustment Plan or approved exceptional circumstances.
- 24.1.9 Module Directors/Leads or markers are expected to undertake the marking of the assignments electronically if the work is submitted electronically. Where assignments are submitted electronically, feedback is expected to be returned to students through the same system, for example, Moodle or Turnitin (refer to [section 8.7](#)).
- 24.1.10 Assessment results provided within the VLE (Moodle) are indicative until ratified by the School Assessment Board. All final assessment results must be entered into [e:Vision](#) via SITS (refer to [section 46](#)). Students must be made aware that any assessment results given via the VLE are provisional, until ratified by the School Assessment Board.
- 24.1.11 If academic misconduct is suspected during the marking process, then refer to the Academic Misconduct Policy (refer to [section 27](#)).
- 24.1.12 Poor academic practice should be managed through normal marking and feedback procedures.

24.2 Sanctions when marking

- 24.2.1 Details for overlength work sanctions and for late submission sanctions are found in [section 26](#). Marking must be completed in the normal way.
- 24.2.2 In cases where a student submits work late that incurs a sanction mark of zero (for example, a first attempt submitted after 5 working days from the submission date, or a late reassessment attempt), the work should not be marked (for more information refer to the Agreed Sanctions Policy [section 26.3](#)).
- 24.2.3 Where students have not followed the instructions as expected in an examination, for example, they have answered too many questions or they have not answered compulsory questions, refer to [section 9.17](#) for the protocol for marking.
- 24.2.4 Where a handwritten examination script is unreadable, the marker should refer to [section 9.18](#) for the protocol for marking.

- 24.2.5 If a student is asked to submit a new piece of work for their reassessment and then submits exactly the same piece of original work without changes for reassessment, this would be classed as self-plagiarism and would be academic misconduct (refer to [section 27](#)).
- 24.2.6 If the student is asked to improve on the original submission for their reassessment and they submit the same piece of work, the same mark would stand as it would be of no greater or lesser quality than the work they submitted the first time. This would therefore receive the same failure mark as the original.
- 24.2.7 Refer to [section 8.7.11](#) for information on the treatment of errors made during the submission process, for example, submitting an incorrect file, or to the wrong Moodle site.

24.3 Calibration exercise

- 24.3.1 A calibration exercise **must** take place where:
- A marker is newly appointed to the institution.
 - A team of markers is involved in first marking on a module (except where all assignments are double marked).
- 24.3.2 The preferred process of calibration is as follows:
- The Module Director/Lead selects at least 2 pieces of work at random from the module assignments submitted. These 2 scripts are independently marked by all tutors involved in the marking of the assignment.
 - For practical and any live exams or performances one of the two following methods can be used:
 - One or two students are assessed (random selection) by one marker. All markers involved in the marking of this module are present during the exam, as soon as the assessment is complete each marker independently marks each assessment.
 - One or two students are assessed (random selection) by one marker. The exam is video/audio recorded. As soon as the assessment is complete all markers review the assessment and then independently mark each assessment.
 - All the markers meet to calibrate the marking and agree marks for each marked script, referencing the marking criteria and/or scheme. A brief rationale for the final agreed mark is clearly identified on the calibration sheet or equivalent. Agreeing the approach to feedback consistency is also good practice at this stage (refer to [section 29](#)).

24.4 Double marking (also known as second marking)

- 24.4.1 This is where work for an assignment is marked by more than one marker. It includes one of the following approaches:
- Double marking where the first marker's mark and comments are known to the second marker (sometimes referred to as 'seen double marking'), **or**
 - Double marking where the first marker's mark and comments are not known to the second marker (sometimes referred to as 'blind double marking').
- 24.4.2 Double marking can be undertaken on all items of assessed work for an assignment.
- 24.4.3 It is at the discretion of the School to determine which modules should be double marked. Where double marking takes place, individual marks can be amended after discussion between all markers, with a brief rationale recorded for any change.
- 24.4.4 Where performance-based assessments are double marked:
- The assessment is joint marked simultaneously by at least 2 markers; **or**
 - The assessment is recorded in a way that facilitates double marking afterwards.
- 24.4.5 A first marker may also request that a particular assessment script is double marked where they have some uncertainty or concerns.

24.5 Resolution of disagreements between first and second marker

- 24.5.1 The Module Director/Lead will seek to make a judgement based on the evidence, drawing in additional marking or specialist expertise as necessary.
- 24.5.2 If the Module Director/Lead is one of the markers involved in the original dispute, then an additional marker identified by the relevant Chair of the School Assessment Board, or nominated representative, must be used.
- 24.5.3 If the disagreement cannot be resolved at module level, the Chair of the School Assessment Board (SAB), or nominated representative, will make a recommendation to the Board based on the evidence. The Chair of the SAB's decision will be final.

24.6 Internal moderation process

- 24.6.1 Where double marking does not take place, a process of internal moderation will be undertaken, on a sampling basis, to ensure first marking reflects the appropriate standard for the assessment and for the level of study. Internal moderators will be from within the subject discipline. Normally, the internal moderator will not have been a first marker for the assessment under scrutiny. However, where a group (2 or more) of markers is involved in the assessment, internal moderators may be drawn from that group to consider a sample first marked by others.
- 24.6.2 **Internal moderation is not a marking process:** internal moderators are neither marking the work nor providing additional feedback – they are providing a check that, in their judgement, the proposed assessment decisions are fair and equitable across the sample.
- 24.6.3 First marker(s) complete the marking and provide the internal moderator with access to all the student work.
- 24.6.4 Internal moderators review a sample as follows:

Modules	Sample
For modules where calibration has taken place	For assessment that does not contribute to the final award: • All academic fails For assessment contributing to the final award: • All academic fails • A selection across the classifications/bands based on 5% of the module cohort and with no less than 1 at each classification/band For cohorts with 10 students or fewer: • All assessments
For modules where calibration has not taken place	For assessment that does not contribute to final award: • All academic fails For assessment contributing to the final award: • All academic fails • A selection across the classifications/bands based on 10% or the square root of the module cohort and with a minimum of 5 and no less than 1 at each classification/band For cohorts with 10 students or fewer: • All assessments
Reassessments	For assessment that does not contribute to final award: • All academic fails For assessment contributing to the final award: • All academic fails If the original cohort went through the internal moderation process, then it is not necessary to internally moderate reassessments of passing standard provided the marker is the same.

- 24.6.5 If the internal moderator(s) consider that marks are fair and equitable then no further action is required, all first marks stand, and standards are deemed internally assured. This will be recorded for internal and external purposes, with evidence of the process (including identification of student work sampled) provided to the external moderator(s) for the programme.

24.6.6 If the internal moderator(s) considers that there are clear patterns of difference between their judgement and the first marker's judgement, then one of the following options should be followed:

Either:

- a) Agree a further sample to be internally moderated which, if it supports the trend, may lead to an agreed moderation of **all** marks in line with the findings of the internal moderator(s). If the review of the further sample does not support the trend, then **all** the first marks stand.

Only changing marks for the sample is unfair and inequitable for those within and out with the sample and should not be done.

Or:

- b) Agree that all work for that assignment be double marked and individual marks agreed between markers.

At each stage where changes are made, a brief rationale for the change should be evident on the relevant paperwork. In addition, the final agreed mark should be clearly identified.

24.7 External examiners

24.7.1 For information relating to external examiners refer to [section 39](#).

24.8 Process flowchart for marking, moderation, agreeing and releasing marks

