

## Section 30 Marking and moderation policy and procedures

### 30.1 Marking principles

- 30.1.1 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.
- 30.1.2 Assessments will be marked using the University marking scales and conventions, including the Generic Assessment Descriptors.
- 30.1.3 Marking will not be adjusted as part of a Learner Adjustment Plan or approved exceptional circumstances.
- 30.1.4 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 i.e., Moodle or Turnitin (refer to [section 10.6](#)).
- 30.1.5 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 (see [section 48](#)). Students must be made aware that any assessment results given via the VLE are provisional, until ratified by the School Assessment Board.
- 30.1.6 If academic misconduct is suspected during the marking process, then refer to the 'Academic Misconduct Policy' (see [section 23](#)). For further information, please visit our [Managing and Report Academic Misconduct page](#). Poor academic practice should be managed through normal marking and feedback procedures.

### 30.2 Sanctions when marking

- 30.2.1 Details for over-length work sanctions and for late submission sanctions are found in [section 32](#). Marking must be completed in the normal way.
- 30.2.2 In cases where a student submits work late that incurs a sanction mark of zero (i.e., a first attempt submitted after 5 working days from the submission date, or a late reassessment attempt), the work should not be marked.
- 30.2.3 Assessment criteria, aligned to the Generic Assessment Descriptors, should ensure they capture any matters related to spelling, grammar and presentation. In addition, feedback should support students to identify and enhance any concerns around spelling, grammar and presentation.
- 30.2.4 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 11.17](#) for the protocol for marking.
- 30.2.5 Where a handwritten examination script is unreadable, the marker should refer to [section 11.18](#) for the protocol for marking.
- 30.2.6 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 23](#)).  
  
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.
- 30.2.7 Refer to [section 10.6.10](#) for information on the treatment of errors made during the submission process for example, submitting an incorrect file, or to the wrong Moodle site.

### 30.3 Calibration exercise

30.3.1 A calibration exercise **must** take place where:

- a) A marker is newly appointed to the institution.
- b) A team of markers is involved in first marking on a module (except where all assignments are double marked).

30.3.2 The preferred process of calibration is as follows:

- a) 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.
- b) 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 (see [section 33](#)).

### 30.4 Double marking (also known as second marking)

30.4.1 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').

30.4.2 Double marking can be undertaken on all items of assessed work for an assignment.

30.4.3 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.

30.4.4 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.

30.4.5 A first marker may also request that a particular assessment script is double marked where they have some uncertainty or concerns.

### 30.5 Resolution of disagreements between first and second marker

30.5.1 The Module Director/Lead will seek to make a judgement based on the evidence, drawing in additional marking or specialist expertise as necessary.

30.5.2 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.

30.5.3 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.

### 30.6 Internal moderation process

30.6.1 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.

30.6.2 **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 assessments decisions are fair and equitable across the sample; as a guide this typically takes the form of the first mark awarded being within 5 marks either side (based on the 0-100 marking scale) regardless of grade borderlines.

30.6.3 First marker(s) complete the marking and provide the internal moderator with access to all the student work.

30.6.4 Internal moderators review a sample as follows:

Modules	Sample
<b>For modules where calibration has taken place</b>	<p>For assessment that does not contribute to the final award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All academic fails</li> </ul> <p>For assessment contributing to the final award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All academic fails</li> <li>A selection across the classifications/bands based on 5% of the module cohort and with no less than 1 at each classification/band</li> </ul> <p>For cohorts with 10 students or fewer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All assessments</li> </ul>
<b>For modules where calibration has not taken place</b>	<p>For assessment that does not contribute to final award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All academic fails</li> </ul> <p>For assessment contributing to the final award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All academic fails</li> <li>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</li> </ul> <p>For cohorts with 10 students or fewer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All assessments</li> </ul>
<b>Reassessments</b>	<p>For assessment that does not contribute to final award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All academic fails</li> </ul> <p>For assessment contributing to the final award:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All academic fails</li> </ul> <p>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.</p>

30.6.5 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.

30.6.6 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:**

- 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:**

- 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.

## 30.7 External examiners

30.7.1 For information relating to external examiners refer to [section 42](#).

## 30.8 Process flowchart for marking, moderation, agreeing and releasing marks

