

University Assessment Policy

Yellow highlighted text identifies the most recent revisions to the document/regulations. If you require these revisions to be identified in an alternative format, please contact the responsible Policy Officer.

Overview

The policy establishes principles, processes and good practice in all aspects of the management of student assessment.

Scope

The intended audience for the policy is academic and learning support staff, including those involved in the design, approval and review of courses. The policy is also made available to students.

Whilst the majority of the University's courses are subject to the provisions of this policy; some courses, primarily related to the requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies, may operate with approved variations to assessment regulations or policy. In such cases, the specific arrangements will be clearly set out in the Programme Specification and Course Handbook and approved through the normal course approval processes.

The Policy

- 1 [Purpose](#)
- 2 [Terminology](#)
- 3 [Principles of Assessment and Feedback](#)
- 4 [Assessment Scheduling and Loading](#)
- 5 [Word Count Policy](#)
- 6 [Academic Referencing](#)
- 7 [Language of Assessment](#)
- 8 [Formative Assessment](#)
- 9 [Feedback to Students and Return of Student Assessments](#)
- 10 [Assessment Briefs and Assessment Criteria](#)
- 11 [Anonymous Marking](#)
- 12 [Verification, Standardisation and Moderation of Marking:](#)
 - [University minimum requirements for internal standardisation and moderation of marking](#)
 - [University minimum requirements for external moderation of marking](#)
- 13 [Reassessment](#)
- 14 [Dissertation and Project Modules](#)
- 15 [Ownership and Archiving of Students' Assessed Work](#)

[Appendix 1 - Guidance on designing module and course assessment strategies](#)

[Appendix 2 - Good Practice Principles for the management of Project and Independent Study modules](#)

[Appendix 3 – Guidance on using numeric marks for student work](#)

[Appendix 4 – Guidance on course closures, major changes and implications for student progression](#)

[Appendix 5 – Guidance on the moderation of assessed student presentations](#)

[Appendix 6 – Proforma for internal standardisation and moderation of marking](#)

1 Purpose

1.1 The policy provides a comprehensive statement of the principles and processes that govern the design and management of student assessment within the University. It is, therefore, an essential reference point for Schools and course teams, particularly in relation to the design of assessment strategies at course and module level, and the quality assurance of assessment from the approval of items of assessment through to the marking, standardisation and moderation of student work. The policy indicates those matters where responsibility is devolved to Schools or course teams – usually within a framework of minimum requirements, and those matters where University determined policy and processes apply. The policy is supplemented by more detailed guidance on effective practice.

1.2 The policy is intended to stand alongside the Taught Courses Regulatory Framework (TCRF). On matters of interpretation or application, reference should be made to the Academic Registrar or Director of Quality and Educational Development, as appropriate.

2 Terminology

Note: these terms apply as they are used in this document, and take account of the TCRF – they are not intended to be authoritative or definitive.

Assessment: a coursework assignment or examination (practical or written) which evaluates student learning and performance against specific learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Assessments can be either formative or summative.

Assessment brief: guidance provided for students on how to complete a specific item of assessment, to include information about the nature of the task, the format for presentation, and assessment criteria, and, if used, the marking scheme.

Assessment criteria: specify the qualities of student work required to successfully complete the assessment item, and reflect the learning outcomes of the module and the course. These may be generic in nature or may reflect the specific assessment item set.

Assessment item: a piece of assessed work, e.g. an essay, project, assignment or examination. Assessment items should be valid, reliable and authentic:

- i. validity relates to the need to ensure that the assessment task measures student attainment of the intended learning outcomes
- ii. reliability relates to the need to ensure that the assessment is accurate and repeatable
- iii. authenticity relates to the design of assessments that require students to demonstrate skills and capabilities that represent problems and situations likely to be encountered in the 'real' world.

Boards of Examiners: there is a two tier system of examination boards:

Subject Assessment Board: first tier Board and responsible for:

- i. acting in accordance with the Regulations and Procedures of the University and to meet as necessary after each assessment point to fulfil this requirement
- ii. scrutiny and approval of assessment items and their marking
- iii. assuring the appropriate standards for modules
- iv. considering the performance of students on modules
- v. confirming the grades achieved by students on modules
- vi. noting the decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee
- vii. noting the decisions of the Academic Misconduct Committee
- viii. making recommendations on a student's retrieval of failure to the appropriate Board of Examiners.

Board of Examiners: second tier Board and responsible for:

- i. reviewing the students' entire profile of module results
- ii. making decisions regarding progression
- iii. confirming eligibility for awards on the basis of accumulated credit
- iv. ensuring any award-specific requirements have been met
- v. agreeing the appropriate award and, if appropriate, agreeing the classification of each student.

Formative assessment: any task or activity that creates feedback (or feedforward) for students about their learning. It has a developmental purpose and does not carry a grade which is subsequently used for summative purposes.

Grade descriptors: describe in broad terms the typical performance required to achieve a particular band of marks or degree class, and are linked to assessment criteria. The University publishes generic grade descriptors for undergraduate and postgraduate programmes to be used by course/subject teams as a reference point or benchmark in establishing specific course, subject or assignment related criteria and descriptors.

Marking scheme: a detailed framework for assigning marks, where a specific number of marks is given to individual components of the assessment.

Moderation: process to assure assessment criteria, and thus academic standards, have been applied consistently and that assessment outcomes are fair and reliable. Summative assessment is subject to internal and external moderation:

Internal moderation: a process of professional engagement by University staff to demonstrate that the grades awarded are reliable and consistent to ensure parity of standards; normally carried out through blind or non-blind double marking on a sample basis.

External moderation: a process of objective engagement by experienced academic peers (external examiners), independent of the University, to ensure that the level of achievement of students reflects the required academic standards and is comparable to similar programmes nationally.

Reassessment: assessment items required to retrieve an initial failure in an examination, course work item or other summative assessment.

Standardisation: process used to ensure all members of the course or module teaching team have a common understanding of the marking standards and conventions, and feedback protocols.

Summative assessment: Summative assessment is any assessment that contributes to the final grade/mark of a module or course to provide a measure of student achievement in relation to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria.

Verification: process used to ensure the form and content of assessment tasks and associated briefs are appropriate, fair and valid, reflecting the learning outcomes and presenting an appropriate level of challenge in terms of academic standards.

3 Principles of Assessment and Feedback

3.1 Assessment is an integral part of the curriculum design process, underpinning holistic and authentic learning experiences at module and course level:

- i. A holistic consideration of assessment and feedback enables consistency, enhances engagement and promotes student motivation;
- ii. Authentic and sustainable assessment and feedback means that assessment is grounded in the real world and this best prepares students to meet their future learning needs;
- iii. Assessment and feedback supports students to make transitions at differing stages of their educational and work experiences, this encourages learner autonomy and resilience for learning and assessment;
- iv. Assessment design considers item validity and reliability and ensures alignment with the intended learning outcomes, the learning activities and the level of study;
- v. Module assessment methods allow for summative assessment of each intended learning outcome.

3.2 Assessment and feedback are dialogic in nature to develop students' learning:

- i. Students and teaching teams are partners in the learning, assessment and feedback process and need to engage in a dialogue about these processes;
- ii. Assessment processes must be made accessible, explicit and transparent for students;
- iii. Appropriate use of peer and self-assessment strategies support students to make judgments about their own and others' work;
- iv. Students require opportunities to discuss their assessments and feedback with the module teaching team;
- v. Feedback is most effective when it is accessible, constructive and timely.

3.3 Understanding academic requirements, judgements, standards and processes is established through the development of staff and student 'assessment literacy':

- i. Opportunities to practice and develop assessment literacy are built into module and course development;
- ii. The development of feedback literacy allows students to understand, make judgments about and use feedback effectively;
- iii. Staff involved in the assessment processes require appropriate experience and professional development, promoting student confidence in the process and standards of assessment;
- iv. Assessment and feedback should be fair, transparent, and consistent promoting student trust in the process;
- v. Annual evaluation processes provide opportunities to monitor assessment and feedback processes.

3.4 A range and choice of assessment opportunities at module and course level best facilitates students' capabilities to evidence learning outcomes:

- i. Assessment will be equitable, acknowledging every student learns differently;
- ii. A diversity of assessment methods, co-ordinated at a course level, provides flexibility and choice, promotes inclusivity and removes barriers to achievement;
- iii. Assessment methods and feedback processes must provide opportunity for students to consolidate and master the skills of assessment.

3.5 Formative and summative assessment strategies are planned, so that feedback and related learning processes provide opportunities for students to prepare for summative assessment items. Thus, assessment and feedback entails:

Assessment as learning:

- i. Assessment enables students to learn about themselves as learners, reflecting on their learning experiences. This is particularly valuable when learning is authentic and when dialogue emerges from formative stages of the assessment process;

Assessment for learning:

- ii. Assessment should engage students in valuable and positive learning;

Assessment of learning:

- iii. Assessment experiences provide a balance of formative (developmental) and summative (formal) opportunities;
- iv. Formative and summative assessments are scheduled in a reasonable and balanced manner ensuring assessment is manageable for students and staff;
- v. Assessment provides a valid and reliable representation of student achievement and competencies;
- vi. An annual assessment calendar provides an overview of the differing assessment types and weighting;
- vii. Assessment outcomes provide an important indicator of the effectiveness of the course, the curriculum and approaches to learning and teaching in meeting the aims and learning outcomes of the course.

4 Assessment Scheduling and Loading

- 4.1 Each module/unit of a course will specify the summative assessment items, together with any specific requirements for passing the modules (eg requirement to obtain a pass grade in each assessment item) in the module specification, as set out below. The assessment details for each module will be subject to formal approval.

Assessment item	Indicative word or time length	Weighting	Learning outcomes to be assessed	Anonymous marking

- 4.2 In determining the assessment for a module, account will be taken of the guidance provided in Appendix 1 on assessment loading, together with consideration of the assessment design, schedule and loading for the course as a whole, also provided in Appendix 1. This guidance aims to ensure some equivalence of the assessment loading across different modules and courses.
- 4.3 Where courses utilise end-of-course/module/unit formal examinations as a part of their assessment strategies, such examinations will take place in the last week of the semester, or at scheduled points in the academic year as published in the Course Handbook.
- 4.4 Where courses utilise 'within module' or 'in class' tests, the arrangements for the organisation and management of such assessments must ensure the assessment is conducted with rigour, probity and fairness and with due regard to security. This will mean consideration of:
 - i. arrangements for disabled students

- ii. arrangements for preparation and verification of the test papers/activities and associated security at all stages
 - iii. arrangements for students with mitigating circumstances, for example who may not be able to attend the assessment
 - iv. arrangements for recording results
 - v. in the case of multiple choice tests, determination of the pass mark (see Appendix 3).
- 4.5 Course teams should keep under review the assessment loading on students across modules within a level to try to avoid unnecessary 'bunching' of hand-in dates. Hand-in dates should normally be set within semester/term dates taking account of designated assessment weeks, and examination dates where relevant.
- 4.6 Course teams should agree protocols for when and where course work assignments will be published (eg at the start of the module via the module outline, or x weeks in advance of the submission deadline via the VLE). Students should also be provided with a calendar or schedule of submission and feedback dates for assignments.

5 Word Count Policy

5.1 Purpose of specifying a word limit

The purpose of a word count is to give all students a clear indication of the maximum length of a piece of assessed written work, the amount of work expected, and therefore how much detail they should go into and how they should allocate time to one piece of assessed work in relation to others. Writing to set word count limits is a skill required within some professions, as well as an academic skill.

5.2 Setting a word count/time limit

Assessment briefs should clearly state a maximum word count for the assignment. There will be a +10% margin, beyond which nothing will be marked.

5.3 What is included in the word count?

The word count should normally refer to everything in the main body of the text. Everything before (i.e. abstract, acknowledgements, contents, executive summaries etc.) and after the main text (i.e. references, bibliographies, appendices etc.) is NOT included in the word count limit. **Tables in the main body of the assignment are included in the word count.** Students should be given clear guidance on the use of appendices etc. Where there is an exception to this approach, it should be clearly stated in the assessment brief and explained in full.

5.4 Penalty for exceeding the word limit

There is no fixed penalty for exceeding the word count, but students should be made aware that the marker will not consider any work after the +10% word count has been reached, within the allocation of marks. Students may therefore be penalised for a failure to be concise and for failing to conclude their work within the word count specified.

5.5 Other assignments

A similar approach should be adopted for pre-recorded presentation assignments with regard to a +10% time limit.

6 Academic Referencing

6.1 The adoption of official styles requires some compromise on the part of individual academics and subject areas in terms of their own preferences, but the policy is intended to offer a better, more consistent learning experience for undergraduate students, where the focus is on understanding and applying the principles of referencing, rather than on having to tackle competing preferences.

6.2 It is recognised that accurate referencing following a defined style is part of good academic practice. However, the primary focus of teaching and marking with regard to referencing at undergraduate level will be on pedagogic principles:

- i. understanding of when and why to cite and reference
- ii. consistency of referencing style throughout assignment
- iii. ability to trace citations.

Marking and therefore assessment criteria at undergraduate level should align with these principles, and avoid focusing on, for example, stylistic accuracy or use of a particular version of Harvard referencing.

6.3 To help achieve this consistency, all undergraduate students will be directed to use a single, appropriate referencing style for their subject, agreed by the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee. For most subjects this will be Harvard (Cite Them Right version), except where academic convention or professional needs dictate that a different style is used, e.g. APA for Psychology, OSCOLA for Law, MHRA for History and English Literature, Vancouver for medical subjects.

6.4 Joint Honours students should be supported in using the referencing style suitable for each of the subjects taken, and it is expected they will be competent in applying the tenets and fundamental principles of the subject appropriate style/s by level 6. It follows that Joint Honours students who are required to learn two different referencing styles may, especially at levels 4 and 5, make stylistic errors or use the same system across both subjects. At undergraduate level, as stated, the primary focus of learning, teaching and assessment with regard to referencing will be on the understanding and application of the principles of referencing and not stylistic accuracy, and this will be reflected in marking practices. Library Services will provide support in using tools to assist students in navigating two separate styles. In practice most Joint Honours students will be studying across two disciplines that use the same style.

- 6.5 Library Services' referencing webpages will include a list of all subjects and the referencing style used by each: <https://library.worc.ac.uk/guides/study-skills/referencing>.
- 6.6 To avoid confusion, inconsistency and duplication of effort, Schools and course teams will neither use variants of the official Worcester styles, nor produce bespoke guidance for the styles. Exemptions to the requirement to use agreed styles may be granted by the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee. To be agreed, new styles must have good online guidance and be available as a style in online tools (e.g. Mendeley). Library Services can advise.
- 6.7 All Course Handbooks, including module handbooks, will clearly state the referencing style that is used by the School/subject and will direct students to the official guidance for that style on the Library Services webpages. This statement will include guidance for Joint Honours students, where appropriate, based on para 6.4.
- 6.8 Heads of Department and Learning and Teaching Co-ordinators have ongoing responsibility for ensuring that the policy is communicated, enacted and adhered to within each School and communicated to external examiners. They will also have responsibility for ensuring that marking criteria regarding referencing align with the pedagogic principles outlined above.
- 6.9 There is no specified referencing system to be used for postgraduate and research students who are expected to acquire a more in-depth understanding of citing sources and referencing. Schools and supervisors will provide guidance and support materials on the most appropriate referencing style.

7 Language of Assessment

- 7.1 All assessments contributing to a University of Worcester award will be conducted in the language of English, except in the case of awards or modules in modern foreign languages. Dictionaries will not be permitted in formal examinations.

8 Formative Assessment

- 8.1 All courses should have an assessment strategy that includes provision for formative assessments, and all modules/units/course elements should include opportunities for formative assessment.
- 8.2 Formative assessments do not carry a grade contributing to the final mark or grade for the module; their primary purpose is to improve the learning of students. Formative assessment can include peer-assessment and self-assessment as well as tutor-assessment, and may include evaluation of the effectiveness of the learning process carried out while the module is in progress. It is recognised that summative assessments also have a formative function.

- 8.3 Early formal formative assessment feedback from tutors is especially important at level 4, when students are new to the conventions of higher education. All students should undertake formal formative assessments within the first four to six weeks of semester one of the first year.
- 8.4 Courses are also expected to use Turnitin® as an educational tool for level four students, and to provide them with structured opportunities to submit formative work and discuss originality reports.
- 8.5 Staff should provide timely feedback on formative assessments, well in advance of summative assessment deadlines.

9 Feedback to Students and Return of Student Assessments

- 9.1 Effective and timely feedback (ie commentary on performance identifying strengths and ways in which improvements could be made with an emphasis student learning for future assessments) should be given to students for all formative and summative assessments, including examinations.
- 9.2 Timely feedback means that students should have feedback on one assignment before they submit the next assignment, and feedback on summative assignments should be provided electronically within 20 working days.
- 9.3 In addition to the written or oral feedback provided to individual students on their work, other types of feedback include, but are not limited to:
- i. model answers
 - ii. generic written or oral feedback, eg assessor's or examiner's report
 - iii. peer feedback
 - iv. discussion of exemplars.
- 9.4 Where appropriate, feedback may be given in advance of the return of individual assessment items to students. Staff are particularly encouraged to use generic forms of feedback in class or via other media, where appropriate, to ensure students receive speedy feedback whilst assessments are still fresh in their mind.
- 9.5 Feedback to students on their assessments should:
- i. promote learning, and enable students to improve their performance in subsequent assessments, by indicating areas for improvement and/or setting specific targets or goals for improvement
 - ii. be clearly linked to learning outcomes and assessment criteria
 - iii. provide the students with an understanding of the way in which their grade was derived and their relative success in meeting the learning outcomes
 - iv. be based on a consistent course team approach to providing assessment feedback to students
 - v. be provided electronically.

- 9.6 The details of all assessment items should be included in module outlines, together with the deadline for submission and the date by which students will be able to access feedback and/or collect the marked assessment item.
- 9.7 In normal circumstances assessment items should be marked, internally moderated, and returned to students with personalised feedback within **twenty working days** of the date of submission. Where, for valid reasons, this cannot be achieved, the member of staff concerned should consult with the course leader and inform the students affected of the delay and the revised date of return.
- 9.8 Staff should enter grades for marked assessment items onto the student record system within the twenty working days turnaround period. All grades for assessment items remain provisional until confirmed by an examination board.
- 9.9 Feedback on performance in examinations should be provided for students. This may take the form of generic feedback to a student group, eg in the form of an 'examiner's report' on each question or similar. Additionally and/or alternatively students may be offered the opportunity to discuss their examination scripts and receive personal feedback. With the exception of multiple choice examinations and tests where questions are drawn from a question bank, students are entitled to see their marked examination script; however, this remains the property of the University. The arrangements for providing feedback on examinations should be specified in the module outline.

10 Assessment Briefs and Assessment Criteria

- 10.1 Students must be provided with written assessment guidelines describing the nature of the task, the format for presentation and the assessment criteria (see below) for all items of assessment. This normally takes the form of an assessment (or assignment) brief, and provides clear information for students on what they are expected to do, how they are expected to go about it, and how their work will be marked.
- 10.2 Assessment briefs should include:
- i. an explanation of how the particular item of assessment relates to the learning outcomes and skills requirements of the module
 - ii. any specific constraints or requirements, eg word limits, and the need for good academic practice, eg referencing of sources
 - iii. assessment criteria - the basis upon which the quality of a student's work will be graded
 - iv. details of any marking scheme (if used) and/or grade descriptors
 - v. submission procedures and deadlines, and the consequences of late, incomplete or non-submission
 - vi. details of the arrangements for standardisation and/or moderation if these are specific to the course/subject or assessment.
- 10.3 Assessment criteria can be specified at different levels: for example criteria can be set for each individual item of assessment, for each type of

assessment (eg essays, laboratory reports, presentations), for each module, or they can be set at the level of the discipline (although in such cases it is usual to establish specific criteria for individual assessments also). There is no right approach to establishing assessment criteria and a variety of approaches are acceptable; however, course/subject teams should have a consistent approach to assessment criteria, for example whether they are specified at the assignment or module level and how they are presented to students.

- 10.4 In establishing assessment criteria, course teams should ensure they are benchmarked to the University's grade descriptors, and take account of level descriptors, the FHEQ, and subject benchmark statements as appropriate.
- 10.5 Assessment criteria should be subject to internal verification in order to assure academic standards.
- 10.6 Assessment criteria should be discussed with students, and feedback to students on their assessments should be informed by assessment criteria.
- 10.7 Formally, it is the responsibility of the Subject Assessment Board to ensure internal scrutiny and verification of all summative items of assessment (examination papers and coursework assignments, including reassessment items), including specific assessment criteria, before publication to students. The Subject Assessment Board may delegate this task to the course/subject team.
- 10.8 Internally verified assessment items and related assessment criteria (together, where appropriate, with assessment briefs) to include all examination papers must be provided to the external examiner for comment. Course/subject teams will agree with external examiners whether external scrutiny of assessment items and assessment criteria (including marking schemes/grids or model answers or similar) should take place before publication of assessment briefs to students, or alternatively may be carried out as part of the process of external moderation of student work.
- 10.9 Internally and externally verified assessments, including examination papers for both first and reassessments, must be completed prior to induction for semester 1 assessments, and by the end of November for semester 2 assessments.

11 Anonymous Marking

- 11.1 Wherever possible and practical the anonymity of students in the marking process should be maintained. Anonymous marking is a system whereby the student's identity is not made known to the internal/external examiner at the time of marking. Its purpose is to protect students and markers against the possibility of bias, whether conscious or unconscious. A student's assessed work should be identified only by a reference number, which will normally be the student number found on their identity card.

- 11.2 Anonymity must be retained until the grade for the assessment (which remains provisional until the examination board has confirmed it) has been formally recorded on the student record system.
- 11.3 It is recognised that certain forms of assessment cannot be marked anonymously as it is impossible for the students not to identify themselves. The following forms of assessment should normally be marked anonymously:
- i. essays
 - ii. written seminar or other presentation papers
 - iii. examinations
 - iv. book reviews
 - v. library assessments/projects
 - vi. data analysis
 - vii. case study analysis
 - viii. reports of practicals for taught courses.

12 Verification, Standardisation and Moderation of Marking

12.1 Verification, standardisation and moderation are employed to ensure that academic standards are appropriate and consistent across course/subject teams, and reflect agreed assessment policies and assessment criteria, and that the assessment outcomes for students are fair and reliable. For some courses, eg courses leading to medical qualifications, processes of standards setting also apply in determining the pass/fail standard for a given assessment or set of assessments.

12.2 **Verification:**

Purpose: to ensure that the form and content of assessment tasks and briefs are appropriate, fair and valid in terms of standards, and will effectively assess the achievement of the specified learning outcomes, presenting an appropriate level of challenge to students. Verification (sometimes referred to as standardisation) also applies to question items in examination and test papers.

When/how applied: Assignment tasks and briefs should be verified before being given to students. The verification of briefs should consider the consistency of the assignment task in relation to other modules at the same level in the same discipline, check that the learning outcomes will be fully addressed by the task and that the assessment criteria and grade descriptors reflect the learning outcomes and the level of the assessment.

12.3 **Standardisation:**

Purpose: to ensure that all members of the course team are familiar with, and have a common understanding of, the marking standards and conventions in relation to the provision of feedback.

When/how applied: Standardisation is completed in advance of marking and involves a group of assessors all independently marking a sample of student work and assigning grades using agreed criteria, and then comparing and discussing the outcomes, and may be applied in a range of circumstances. Whilst this list is not definitive, instances where standardisation might be

recommended include: the introduction of new or revised assessment items, multiple markers for an assessment, a number of new or sessional markers, and the involvement of partner institutions or multiple delivery sites.

12.4 **Blind double marking:**

Definition: where two separate assessors each independently assess a piece of student work, assigning a mark and providing comments to justify the marks in relation to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria. Both examiners record their marks and comments separately, and then compare marks and resolve differences to produce an agreed mark and feedback.

When/how applied: blind double marking is normally carried out as a universal exercise, that is, every piece of student work is considered by two assessors. The University requires all Projects and Dissertations of 30 credits or more to be blind double marked.

12.5 **Non-blind double marking:**

Definition: where an assessor marks a piece of student work, assigning a mark and providing comments to justify the mark, and then a second assessor also assigns a mark and provides comments, having seen the marks and comments of the first assessor. An agreed mark and feedback is provided for the student.

When/how applied: non-blind double marking is normally carried out as a universal exercise. Non-blind double marking should be used to confirm the pass/fail boundary, and may be appropriate in the case of new staff members, or in relation to new partners, or new and innovative assignments, or where as a result of initial moderation, a re-mark of the whole set of assignments is required.

12.6 **Internal moderation:**

Purpose: to ensure that academic standards are appropriate and consistent across course/subject teams and that feedback reflects agreed assessment policies and assessment criteria, and therefore the assessment outcomes for students are fair and reliable.

Definition: where an assessor marks the set of student assignments, providing a grade and comments to justify the grade, and a second assessor (the moderator) then reviews a sample of marked assignments from across the grade profile. The moderator's role is to confirm (or not) the grades awarded by the first marker, and the quality of the feedback, in the light of course/University protocols and expectations.

When/how applied: moderation is normally carried out on a sample basis, in order to corroborate the accuracy of the marking standards and quality of feedback applied by the first marker. It is the most usual form of moderation activity, and should be used for all assessments where other forms of moderation do not apply.

University minimum requirements for internal standardisation and moderation of marking

- 12.7 All assessment tasks must be verified internally before being published to students.
- 12.8 All course/subject teams are required to maintain a formal published statement of standardisation and moderation procedures as an annexe to the Student Course Handbook. This statement should inform students, external examiners and others about the arrangements for assuring the validity and reliability of marking and grading decisions, and the quality of feedback, as related to different types of assessment, eg written assignments, formal examinations, presentations, group work, etc.
- 12.9 The course/subject formal statement must specify how differences between markers are to be resolved (eg discussion between the two markers, resort to a third marker). In the case of sample double marking, normally the process will confirm the appropriateness of the standard of marking; however, where this is not confirmed, the policy must provide for the review of the student work and/or the marks of the whole cohort.
- 12.10 The course/subject formal statement must also specify the method for recording whether a piece of work has been moderated and what the outcome was; a standard proforma is provided for this (see Appendix 6).
- 12.11 Where a course is taught across different sites or through different partnerships, the course management team must specify in the formal statement the arrangements for assuring standards across the sites or partnerships.
- 12.12 Minimum requirements apply to the internal moderation of all summative student assessments that receive a grade or are marked as pass/fail:
- i. standardisation exercises must take place on an annual basis where modules are delivered across different sites and for large teaching teams
 - ii. specific arrangements to double mark assessments first marked by new inexperienced staff, must be put in place
 - iii. where there are multiple markers for a defined assessment, a standardisation exercise must be undertaken before marking begins to ensure consistency between markers
 - iv. all projects and dissertations weighted 30 credits or more must be blind double marked
 - v. all assessments falling into the pass/fail boundary (all grade E and a sample of grade D-) must be non-blind double marked
 - vi. fails must be sampled through non-blind marking
 - vii. a sample of assessments deemed to have passed drawn from across all grade bands including the highest graded assessment, must be moderated as follows -

The minimum number of pieces of work of a pass standard to be moderated (ie those used to verify the upper side of the pass/fail boundary, plus the

sample of work of a pass standard) should be 10% of the total work submitted that is of a pass standard as follows:

Number of pieces of work of a pass standard	Minimum sample size for moderation (excluding failed work)
< 7	All pieces of work
7 - 59	6 pieces of work across all grade bands including work in the highest category
60 - 199	10% of work across all grade bands including work in the highest category
200 or more	20 pieces of work across all grade bands including work in the highest category

- 12.13 Internal moderation should be completed within the 20 working days assessment feedback period and before provisional marks are made available to the students. External moderation can take place after this.
- 12.14 Assessed work, feedback and provisional marks may be returned to students prior to external moderation being completed. All marks are subject to confirmation by the relevant Exam Board. The 'subject to confirmation by the Exam Board' status of marks must be made clear to students.

University minimum requirements for external moderation of marking

- 12.15 Assessment relating to level 4 modules in three-year degree courses is not normally subject to external moderation after the first year of delivery.
- 12.16 In order to carry out their responsibility for external moderation, external examiners should be consulted on and agree a schedule for standardisation and internal and external moderation of assessments.
- 12.17 In addition to the sample of student work, external examiners must be provided with:
- i. the module outline
 - ii. examination papers and/or assessment briefs
 - iii. assessment and grade criteria, together with the
 - iv. provisional statistical profile of marks for the modules/units for which they are responsible.
- 12.18 External examiners are not expected to arbitrate in the event of disagreement between first and second markers, and are not expected to change marks for individual items of student work, unless there is agreement with internal markers that the change corrects an error.
- 12.19 A minimum sample of 15% of the work for each item of assessment for individual modules must be made available to the external examiner(s). This must include student work across all grade bands, and student work in the highest and fail categories. In the case of small cohorts (ie 6 or fewer) all work should be provided to the external examiner. Normally the sample size for an item of assessment will be between 9 and 25 pieces of work.

Number of pieces of work	Minimum sample size for external moderation (including failed work)
< 10	All pieces of work
10 - 59	9 pieces of work across all grade bands including work in highest and fail categories (or 7/8 if cohort size is 7 or 8)
60 – 166	15% of work across all grade bands
167 or more	25 pieces of work across all grade bands

- 12.20 Where student work is provided to external examiners in electronic format, it is good practice to permit access to all pieces of work, so that the external examiner may select their own sample for moderation. In order to support the external examiner to do this a spreadsheet/report listing all students and provisional grades should be provided. Records of internal moderation activity should also be provided.
- 12.21 The external examiner is expected to use the sample to ensure that marking standards are appropriate, feedback is of appropriate quality and internal moderation has been effective. The sample provided should not be the same as that which has been internally moderated.
- 12.22 Where a course or module is delivered at more than one site, the external examiner should be provided with the provisional statistical profile of marks for each site of delivery, so that they are able to comment on the marking and student achievement standards for each delivery site. If the provisional profile of marks indicates significant discrepancies, then the external examiner and/or the Board of Examiners may require a review or re-marking to be carried out.

13 Reassessment

- 13.1 The full terms of reference and details of membership of Subject Assessment Boards and of Boards of Examiners are set out in the TCRF, as are the regulations relating to reassessment and progression.
- 13.2 The decision on whether a student has passed a given assessment and a module, and whether they have an opportunity for reassessment or to retake the modules can only be confirmed by a properly constituted Subject Assessment Board and Board of Examiners.
- 13.3 The reassessment requirements for failed modules, can be made available to students before a Board of Examiners has confirmed grades and module results. However students should be reminded that grades are provisional until confirmed, and therefore a provisional 'fail' grade can be turned into a 'pass' grade or vice versa by the Board of Examiners. Students should be given guidance about the completion of reassessments alongside undertaking study for new modules.
- 13.4 As the TCRF states, reassessment normally involves the completion of a new task, and takes place during the summer reassessment period at the end of the academic year.

- 13.5 For the academic year 2020/21, for level 4 modules only, the following policy will operate:
- i. requirements for reassessment should, where possible and appropriate, be a re-working of the original piece of work together with a short reflective statement on how the student has engaged with the feedback provided on the first attempt
 - ii. where a new assignment must be set for reassessment at level 4, this should be made available to students at the point when the original marked assessment is returned
 - iii. the deadline for reassessment submission will remain the end of year summer reassessment period, but students can be encouraged to submit reassessed work earlier and/or plan a schedule for completing and submitting work for reassessment in order to manage workloads appropriately
 - iv. work submitted for reassessment will not, however, be marked until after the July reassessment submission deadline.

14 Dissertation and Project Modules

- 14.1 Most undergraduate Honours degree courses, including Integrated Masters courses, have a 30 credit or larger level 6 Dissertation or Project module. Some specific rules regarding the submission of the final assessments (normally the report) apply to these modules/assessments.
- 14.2 Final assessments for all level 6 Dissertations and Project modules have a standard deadline for submission, as specified in the University calendar. Where courses have students on professional placements at this time, course leaders may seek permission from the Academic Registrar and Director of Quality and Educational Development to vary the submission date.
- 14.3 Final assessments for all level 6 Dissertations and Project modules will be submitted electronically from 2018/19 via Turnitin® wherever possible. Academic Departments may, if they wish, also require students to submit a hard copy.
- 14.4 Students with mitigating circumstances have the facility to request an extension to the submission deadline for their Dissertation or Project final assessment. The formal procedure for requesting an extension can be found on the Registry Services webpages <https://www.worcester.ac.uk/registryservices/649.htm>.
- 14.5 The University has developed Good practice principles for management of Dissertation and Project modules which makes explicit expectations for the responsibilities of supervisors and students. This can be found in Appendix 2.

15 Ownership and Archiving of Students' Assessed Work

- 15.1 Students hold the intellectual property inherent in all work produced for assessments, but the material produced by students for assessment (essays,

projects, examination scripts, dissertations, artworks, computer disks, etc) is the property of the University, and may be retained pending confirmation of marks awarded by Examination Boards, possible appeals and quality audits. With the exception of examination scripts, the University will generally make assessed work available for collection and/or endeavour to return to students assessed work whenever a student explicitly requests this. Arrangements for returning assessed work to students are the responsibility of individual tutors.

- 15.2 Course leaders should maintain an archive of sample marked student work that is representative of the range of assessment tasks and grades awarded, for the purposes of quality audit, staff induction and development, and monitoring and benchmarking of standards. The sample should be periodically updated at least every three years.
- 15.3 Assessed coursework that has not been collected by the student will be retained by the University for six months after the relevant Examination Board, after which time it will be confidentially disposed of. Arrangements for the disposal of such work is the responsibility of the School.

Related Policies, Documents or Webpages

[Taught Courses Regulatory Framework](#) [accessed on 9.4.2020]

[Generic Grade Descriptors \(Levels 4 - 7\)](#) [accessed on 10.9.2020]

[Grade Descriptors - Level 8](#) [accessed on 9.4.2020]

Mitigating circumstances via [Registry Services webpages](#) [accessed on 9.4.2020]

[Assessment Criteria Working for All: Guiding Staff to Support Students](#) [accessed on 10.9.2020]

Approval/Review Table

Item	Notes
Version Number	v1.4
Date of Approval	04/07/2018
Approved by	Academic Board
Effective from	Immediate
Policy Officer	Director of Quality and Educational Development
Department	Directorate of Quality and Educational Development
Review date	Annual – June 2021
Last reviewed	August 2020
Equality Impact Assessment (EIA)	Not undertaken at August 2020
Accessibility Checked	24.8.2020

Appendix 1

Guidance on designing module and course assessment strategies

1 Taking a course overview

The assessment for an individual module or unit must be aligned with the learning outcomes. However, it is also essential that an overview is taken of the design, schedule and loading of assessment across modules at each level and for the course as a whole. Assessment should be seen as an integral part of learning, and thus particular consideration must be given to how students develop skills in relation to the various forms of assessment required by a course – in terms of learning opportunities, formative assessment and feedback, and progression. The following should be considered:

- a) the balance, integration and scheduling of formative and summative assessments
- b) an appropriate diversity of assessment modes and tasks are integral to good assessment practice (but note too much diversity or unplanned diversity can be counter-productive; for this purpose the approval of courses will require an assessment map)
- c) the assessments taken together should ensure that all of the course learning outcomes are tested
- d) students following different pathways or specialist routes through courses should not be able to avoid certain assessment modes/tasks if these are essential for testing course level learning outcomes
- e) the balance of assessment over the course of a semester/academic year should be carefully planned – and for this purpose, the approval of courses will require an assessment calendar/schedule
- f) at level 4 especially, students should benefit from early (within the first 4-6 weeks) formative feedback on assessment
- g) arrangements should be in place for verification of assessments to ensure equivalence in terms of demand (both academically and in terms of student effort) across modules; this should include consideration of assessment requirements for mandatory modules as distinct from optional modules
- h) the overall word count required for a level/year of a course should be reviewed, to ensure it is reasonable, with generally a maximum of 10,000 words being required at Levels 4 and 5, and 16,000 in the final year of an Honours degree.

2 Taking the module view

In designing the assessment details for a module or course unit, account should be taken of the following:

- a) the total student effort hours represented by the credit weighting of the module, and the proportions of this total available for formal taught sessions, independent study and assessment (for example, low contact and high independent study may require more staged assessment)
- b) although students' motivation, background, skills and abilities will make any assessment task more difficult and time-consuming for some than others, as a rough guide a 2,000 word essay might represent a minimum of 30 hours of

- student effort time for the 'average' student (taking into account research, planning, drafting, editing and proofreading)
- c) reliance on a single assessment for a module (eg a single examination or one piece of course work) will mean that a student's fate in the module depends on that single item of assessment; in such cases the teaching and learning strategy for the module should be designed so that students can benefit from formative feedback before the single summative assessment
 - d) alternatively, and particularly for larger modules, it may be more appropriate for 2 or 3 items of assessment (both/all of which contribute to the overall module grade), and that these are scheduled such that the student can receive feedback on the first assessment before they complete the second assessment
 - e) there are many innovative approaches to assessment that do not fit either of the above alternatives; innovation is encouraged, and teams/individuals who wish to do something different are encouraged to explore this with advice from AQU and Registry Services as appropriate
 - f) careful consideration must be given to the alignment of the assessment task(s) with the learning outcomes and any rules for passing the module:
 - where passing the module is based on aggregated results from two or more assessments, it may be appropriate to test the learning outcomes through more than one assignment – to permit a student to redeem an initial failure by an improved performance in a second task
 - where the learning outcomes for a module are tested through two or more different assessment tasks each testing different learning outcomes, then it may be appropriate to specify that students must achieve a minimum pass grade in each assessment – however, this means that there are additional points at which a student may fail the module
 - g) in the light of the above, consideration might be given to assessment strategies that:
 - are staged to permit students to benefit from feedback to re-work/develop further aspects of an assignment
 - permit students to engage in multiple learning assignments and submit for summative assessment their best eg two out of three pieces of work
 - require students to submit a portfolio of work with a commentary on how the learning outcomes have been met (NB this does not all have to be marked at the end)
 - h) the weighting of an individual assessment item should normally reflect its value as contribution to the total amount of assessment for the module as indicated in the assessment table and guidance below
 - i) normally no single summative assessment task should contribute less than 25% to the overall mark
 - j) normally there should be no more than two summative assignments for 15 credit modules, and a maximum of four assignments for a 30 credit module.

3 Assessment load: guidance on equivalence and weighting

- 3.1 The assessment table below is intended to provide guidance for course teams and Schools, in constructing and approving assessment strategies for modules. It should be interpreted flexibly, taking account of the general principles outlined above.

- 3.2 The guidance is **indicative** and should not be regarded as prescriptive in relation to either word/time limits or weightings. It is provided only as a reference point in order to have some benchmark or framework within which module assessment design can take place. It relates to summative assessment, and it is expected that all modules provide opportunities for formative assessment in some form. It should not be assumed that the assessment for a 30 credit module is inevitably double that of a 15 credit module. It should also be recognised that assessment is often connected with learning the genre of a subject and therefore students may, for example, be asked to complete written tasks as part of the learning process.
- 3.3 The table is based on the principle of equivalence, where a 2-3,000 word essay or report is regarded as equivalent to a 2 hour formal examination, or a 4,000 word reflective learning journal, or a set of laboratory reports representing practical work over a semester. **Please remember this is guidance only, and should not be interpreted mechanistically**; it is not recommended that assignments are set with word length indicators other than rounded numbers of 1,000, 1,500, 2,000, 2,500 etc ie it is not expected that the table below is followed precisely in terms of word counts etc.
- 3.4 It is expected that shorter word limits will be used in the early stages of a course, and selective use of longer word limits for later stages.

Indicative guidance on module summative assessment loadings

Assessment type	Indicative weighting 15 credit modules	Indicative weighting 30 credit modules
Examinations		
3 hour formal examination	n/a	75/100%
2 hour formal examination	75/100%	40/50%
1 hour formal examination or test	40/50%	25/30%
Essays/Reports		
2,000 - 3,000 words essay/report	75/100%	60/70%
1,500 - 2,000 words written assignment	50/60%	40/50%
1,000 - 1,500 words written assignment	40/50%	25/30%
Reflective journals/logs		
4,000 words/12 week reflective journal/learning log	100%	50%
2,000 words/6 week reflective journal/learning log	50%	25/30%
Laboratory/practical reports		
12 week equivalent Laboratory/practical report file	100%	50%
6 week equivalent Laboratory/practical report file		25/30%

Oral presentations		
15-20 minute individual oral/poster presentation and written summary/account/research	100%	50%
10-15 minute individual oral/poster presentation	40/50%	25/30%
Group presentations		
Group presentation + report or poster	50%	30%

Appendix 2

Good Practice Principles for the management of Project and Dissertation modules

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- 1 Dissertation and Project modules should normally include a small number of taught sessions (minimum of four) for the whole cohort to cover practical matters associated with the Dissertation or Project, including refreshers on research methods, ethical approval, supervision, time management, responsibilities etc.
- 2 Arrangements for the management and supervision of undergraduate final year Dissertation or Project modules must:
 - provide guidance and constructive feedback to enable students to develop feasible and manageable projects against the learning outcomes for the module
 - foster in students independence in the analysis and/or application of knowledge, and a willingness to take responsibility for their own learning
 - ensure student progress is effectively monitored.
- 3 Management and supervisory arrangements should be transparent and made available in written form via a module, Project, or Dissertation handbook to all staff and students. This could be in the form of a learning agreement, and in all cases should include:
 - nature, number and frequency of supervisory meetings
 - who has primary responsibility for initiating meetings
 - arrangements for approving the project/dissertation topic/title
 - requirements for securing ethical approval
 - arrangements for feedback on draft text.
- 4 There should be clear and published procedures for the choice/allocation of project/dissertation topics and staff supervisors.
- 5 Students should be allocated to supervisors who have a generally appropriate academic background and/or research interests.
- 6 There should be explicit mechanisms for addressing any problems or concerns raised by students which cannot be resolved within the framework of the supervisory relationship, for example, referral to the module leader or the course leader.
- 7 There should be a clear policy adhered to by all members of a course team engaged in supervision of undergraduate final year Projects or Dissertations regarding frequency of regular meetings, in the order of, for example, 30 minutes every six weeks (or more frequently if a student is completing over one semester).

- 8 There should be clarity across the course team and for all parties about the relative responsibility of the student and the supervisor for initiating supervisory meetings, follow-up, and recording of meetings.
- 9 All text based work must be word processed and submitted electronically in accordance with University policy.

THE STUDENT'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1 Reading and putting into practice the guidance in the handbook (noting in particular information on record-keeping and assessment).
- 2 Observing health and safety, data protection and ethical protocols, including completion of documents related to ethics approval.
- 3 Planning and managing the time commitment required of the module/Project/Dissertation.
- 4 Initiating and agreeing a written plan of work and a timetable of meetings with their supervisor.
- 5 Keeping a Project diary or log-book as a means of monitoring progress and recording the outcomes of meetings.
- 6 Discussing progress with their supervisor and responding to guidance and constructive criticism, and understanding that the supervisor should not be expected to predict the grade for the Dissertation or Project.

THE SUPERVISOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1 Advising on the student's work plan and agreeing a schedule of meetings (which can be virtual or face-to-face), and responsibilities in initiating and recording the outcome of meetings.
- 2 Ensuring that students are aware of the role of the supervisor and the anticipated extent of support in terms of providing direction, time allocated to meetings, reading and commentating on drafts, etc.
- 3 Monitoring student progress and providing timely, honest and constructive feedback, and following up non-attendance at scheduled meetings, if necessary, using the University referral mechanisms.
- 4 Seeking to ensure that the work is being conducted within agreed protocols (including those relating to ethics and to health and safety).
- 5 Keeping a brief record of meetings and student progress, which can be stored on SOLE.
- 6 Complying with policy on providing feedback on draft text, which is normally that a supervisor will read and comment on one draft of specific sections of the Dissertation /Project provided it is submitted for comment within a reasonable time ahead of the submission deadline or by the published deadline for

commenting on drafts, or deadlines if submitted in part/s.

- 7 Being familiar with the formal assessment procedures and criteria.
- 8 Avoiding giving the student premature or potentially misleading information on marks or grades.

DISSERTATION or PROJECT HANDBOOKS

The handbook (which is normally provided electronically via Blackboard) should provide the key source of information for students and staff. Module leaders may find useful the suggested list of contents below (but this is not intended to be prescriptive or comprehensive).

Contents:

- Module aims and learning outcomes.
- Assessment requirements, criteria and procedures.
- Schedule for any taught sessions.
- Topic choice (or allocation) and approval.
- Advisory/supervisory arrangements.
- Securing ethical approval and ethics protocols, including data protection where appropriate.
- Staff and student responsibilities.
- Notes on progress meetings.
- Plan of work, timetable and submission dates(s).
- The characteristics of a good project.
- Structure, format and length.
- Referencing, academic integrity and avoidance of plagiarism.
- Alternative forms of presentation.
- Health and safety: risk assessment.
- Arrangements for extensions and mitigating circumstances.

Appendix 3

Guidance on using numeric marks for assessment of student work

Rationale for the use of marking in grades rather than percentages

The generic undergraduate or postgraduate grade descriptors apply to all summatively assessed work. They are set out according to the grade system used at University of Worcester, and mapped on to the conventional categories or sub-divisions of the honours degree in UK Higher Education, or other classification systems as appropriate. It should be noted that the grade system is represented by letters rather than numbers and that no numbers are mentioned in the grade descriptors or used in the system. This is intentional and was adopted for two reasons.

1. The introduction to the grade descriptors clearly set out that the distinctions between grade bands in the descriptors are qualitative not quantitative. The theoretical frameworks underpinning them rest on students moving through a number of conceptual levels, in their approach to learning and understanding of the nature of knowledge, to achieve improved grades. In fact the grade system is built on these theories in order to explicitly reward higher order thinking about learning and knowledge. It is therefore not possible to get a C grade by doing a larger quantity of D band work, nor do two pieces of work at C band add up to give a result at a higher band. Therefore it would carry erroneous implications to use quantitative numeric labels [which imply psychometric qualities such as the ability to add them up or that the gap between each number is equal] to reflect qualitative data [where grades cannot just be summed and the distinction between a D- and an E might be considered greater than the distinction between a D and a D-].
2. The grade descriptors are also built on the acknowledgement that grading student work is not an exact science. It is a matter for professional academic judgment. 'The complex nature of work at this academic level cannot be reduced to a clear-cut series of mutually exclusive categories and grade descriptors cannot be interpreted as such. The category descriptions indicate the general characteristics of different types of work which lead to their assignment to particular categories.' [GUGD, p. 2] There is a reasonable argument, therefore, that it is not realistic to indicate that such fine grained decisions as those between awarding 67 or 68 percent are objectively defensible but that broad descriptive bands of B+, B and B- are as specific as it is appropriate to operate.

The implication of these points is that, in most circumstances it is inappropriate to use numerical grading on student work. The grade descriptors encourage staff to assess learning and development processes as well as the more traditional focus on outputs and artifacts.

Approaches to marking multiple choice tests and examinations and similar

Colleagues may find it appropriate and helpful as part of their assessment diet, to use assessment approaches which have traditionally used numeric grading, such as multiple question exams, multiple choice tests and computer based tests. The use of

numerical grades in these cases is largely to arrive at an overall grade based on numerous small answers. Staff may also wish to allocate percentages to each individual sub-question to indicate their relative importance or value. The question then is whether the use of numerical grading can be avoided for these assessment types or, if not, how these numbers should be related to the generic grade descriptors. The following examples may be helpful to illustrate different approaches:

1. Make a qualitative judgment on the overall work rather than the individual pieces – in Ecology a traditional exam is set with a number of individual questions. However, rather than awarding individual percentage points for each question and then adding them together, a qualitative judgment is made against the learning outcomes and criteria on the overall set of responses and an appropriate alphabetic grade awarded.
2. Structure the test to work through the grade descriptors – Biggs & Tang (2007) suggest the possibility of setting a multiple question test which builds through the levels of grade descriptors. So, for example, some data is provided and the first group of questions ask for a factual or descriptive responses [grade D], the next group of questions require some analysis and grouping of the data [grade band C], the next questions asks for synthesis and evaluation of the data [grade B] and the final question(s) ask the student to relate this evaluation to external themes and make recommendations for policy and practice [grade band A]. Again an overall decision can be taken on the grade based on how well the student performs at the different levels. A similar approach could be adopted by combining multiple choice questions to identify knowledge in grade bands C & D with more evaluative open questions which allow students to demonstrate performance at grade bands B & A.
3. Establish numerical equivalents to the alphabetic grades - it is important to note that this should be done on a case-by-case basis and appropriate guidance to students included in the module outline as there is no assumption in the generic grade descriptors that they represent any particular numeric or percentage figure. For example, there are cases where a professional body requires students to achieve eg 70% on a factual examination. It is clear that this requirement for factual knowledge only equates to our broad D grade descriptor. Therefore 70% is set as equivalent to a pass for a piece of work, and the assessment operates on a purely pass/fail basis.
4. In the case of examinations or tests where assessment is based on a percentage scale and the pass mark is deemed to be 40%, the University has introduced a standardised methodology/conversion table for those assessment items that must be marked numerically. Departures from the standard may be acceptable but must be specifically approved and must be communicated to students in the module outline or equivalent.

% Mark awarded	Item grade
79.5 – 100	A+
74.5 – 79.49	A
69.5 – 74.49	A-
66.5 – 69.49	B+
63.5 – 66.49	B

59.5 – 63.49	B-
56.5 – 59.49	C+
53.5 – 56.49	C
49.5 – 53.49	C-
46.5 – 49.49	D+
43.5 – 46.49	D
39.5 – 43.49	D-
34.5 – 39.49	E
24.5 – 34.49	F
14.5 – 24.49	G
0 – 14.49	H

Where tests or examinations are deemed to require some element of numerical marking, then the whole examination/test should be marked in percentage terms out of 100%, and the conversion to grade should be made using the table above.

It will however be appropriate in many cases to mark an examination or an assessment item with multiple parts in grades and then calculate an overall grade for the assessment item to enter into the student record.

Determining an item grade from component parts

The following table can be used to calculate an overall grade for a multiple part assessment, e.g. an examination paper with a small number of equally or differentially weighted questions.

Item grade	Grade Points	Overall points
A+	19	19 - 20
A	18	18 - 18.9
A-	17	17 - 17.9
B+	16	16 - 16.9
B	15	15 - 15.9
B-	14	14 - 14.9
C+	13	13 - 13.9
C	12	12 - 12.9
C-	11	11 - 11.9
D+	10	10 - 10.9
D	9	9 - 9.9
D-	8	8 - 8.9
E	7	7 - 7.9
F	5	5 - 6.9
G	2	2 - 4.9
H	0	0

The individual assessment questions should have the grade points calculated, and then the total for the assessment item should be rounded to one decimal point when appropriate (eg a total of 5.55 becomes 5.6). A worked example is set out below.

The following example uses the table to determine the overall grade for an examination paper made up of 4 equally weighted (25%) questions, for a student who has achieved the following:

Qu 1 = C+

Qu 2 = B-

Qu 3 = E

Q4 4 = B+

C+ for Qu 1 will be awarded 25% of 13 grade pts = 3.25

B- for Qu 2 will be awarded 25% of 14 grade pts = 3.5

E for Qu 3 will be awarded 25% of 7 grade pts = 1.75

B+ for Qu 4 will be awarded 25% of 16 grade pts = 4.0

The assessment total is $(3.25 + 3.5 + 1.75 + 4.0) = 12.5$

12.5 (as indicated in the right hand column) equates to C for the examination overall.

Appendix 4

Guidance on course closures, major changes and implications for student progression

Guidance

- 1 This guidance establishes principles for dealing with the situation where students are required to re-take modules but the module is no longer running, so that students, partner institutions and course/staff teams are clear about the action to be taken, and decisions can be made on an equitable and transparent basis. It should be remembered that within the regulations, students may be required to re-take modules because they have failed two assessment opportunities, because they have failed to submit assessments or not met the attendance requirements of the module, or alternatively because they have submitted a successful claim of mitigating circumstances, or possibly because they have intercalated.
- 2 Principles
 - 1 The principles of the academic regulations with respect to failure and reassessment opportunities must be applied fairly and equitably
 - 2 The consequences of failure and the means by which a student can retrieve failure must be taken by the relevant examination board and recorded in the minutes
 - 3 Where a student is required through application of the regulations, to re-take a module which is not running in the next academic year, the following decisions are open to an examination board:
 - a. To determine that the student should follow a specified alternative equivalent module (this should be the expected normal outcome)
 - b. To determine that the student should follow a personalised programme of supported, directed study, based on the module learning outcomes and leading to appropriate assessments
 - c. To offer the student the opportunity to transfer to a new or alternative equivalent course (particularly where the student may have failed a number of modules)
 - d. To exceptionally offer the student one further final reassessment opportunity.
- 3 The Subject Assessment Board should make recommendations to the Board of Examiners in relation to each module failed. Since these are not normally subject to discussion, in the event that the recommendations are to vary the application of the regulations as at 2.2, this should be reported to, and confirmed by, the Board of Examiners. This means that the Board of Examiners can, if necessary, review the recommendation in the light of the full profile of student results. In the event that decisions made by the Subject Assessment and Examination Boards require amendment as a result of a late decision not to run a specific module, a revised decision must be made via Chair's action, if necessary involving the external examiner, and reported to the next meeting of the Board(s).

- 4 The Chair and officers of the Board of Examiners should be mindful of issues of transparency and equity (for students in relation to equality of opportunity and cost) in reaching decisions.
- 5 The Head of Registry Services should specifically report on this matter in the report to ASQEC on examination board minutes.

Management of course closure/suspension/major change by Schools

- 6 College Learning, Teaching and Quality Enhancement Committees should review at their first meeting in each academic year, any courses that have suspended recruitment, are planned for closure or major review, and identify whether there are implications for continuing students.
- 7 Where courses are undergoing major change, the approval process must explicitly address transition arrangements for continuing students.

Appendix 5

Guidance on the moderation of assessed student presentations

1 Student presentations as non-text based assessments present issues for moderation because there is no physical evidence of the assessment (although in some cases students may be required to submit their presentation notes/slides, and/or a written supplementary document). Where presentations constitute only a very limited number of assessments in a given course and/or are only taken by a small number of students it should be possible to record them all. This means that internal and external moderation can take place in the normal way through sampling.

2 It is acknowledged, however, that where presentations are a significant element of a course assessment strategy and/or are taken by a large number of students (possibly with a number of different markers for the same assessment), recording of all student presentations may for practical reasons be difficult. It is, however, important to note that at least a sample of presentations must be recorded for the purposes of external moderation.

3 The following constitute the minimum expectations for internal and external moderation of assessed student presentations:

- 1 Where a number of different markers are involved in assessing student presentations of a given module or a group of modules at a particular level, there should be a standardisation exercise in advance of the assessment. A standardisation exercise involves the blind marking (awarding of grade and provision of feedback) of a small sample of presentations (probably recordings from previous year) followed by discussions to agree standards, grade criteria and form/style of feedback.
- 2 All presentation assessments at levels 5, 6 and 7, and in the case of FD and HN courses, level 4 also, should be internally and externally moderated according to the School/subject/course stated policy (which must align with the University minimum requirements with regards to sampling, noting that in small courses, it will be a requirement for all assessed work to be internally and externally moderated).
- 3 All presentations at levels 5, 6 or 7 that contribute 40% or more to the assessment weighting of a module should be recorded, so that there is a physical record for the purposes of moderation and in the event of an appeal.
- 4 A sample of presentations at levels 5, 6 and 7 that contribute less than 40% to the assessment weighting of a module should be recorded, so that there is a physical record for the purposes of moderation.
- 5 Except in the case of FDs and HNs, assessed work at level 4 does not contribute to the overall classification of the award, and is not subject to external moderation (except in the first year of a new module or course). Course teams would be expected to have in place arrangements for standardisation and internal moderation of presentations at level 4 in line with the above principles.

Appendix 6

Proforma for internal standardisation and moderation of marking



Moderation report

Course:		Module Title & Code:	
		Assessment No/Title:	
		Assessment choices (if applicable):	
Academic Year:		Semester:	
Date of submission:		Date standardisation completed:	
		Date moderation completed:	
Marking and Moderation team		Please describe how moderation was undertaken (please refer to Assessment Policy) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blind double marking - All assessments - Non-blind double marking - Assessment 	
Name	Initials		

Statistical analysis

Number of assignments marked:				Number moderated:			
Breakdown of marks (% if sample is over 20)							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H

Individual students (add more rows if necessary)

Student Name/ Number	Assign- ment choice <i>If applicable</i>	Marker Grade (initial)	Moderator Grade (initial)	Third marker (initial) <i>If applicable</i>	Agreed Grade	How agreed (d) = discussion (m) = mean (t) = third marker

Commentary:

Anything noteworthy for future development:	
Comment on standard of feedback to Students:	
Issues for referral to Course Leader:	

Signature:

Module Leader	
Date	

For External Examiner:

External Examiner's name			
Are the marks Agreed:	YES	NO	Pending Comments
Comments:			

Module leaders should ensure that the following are provided for External Examiners:

- module outline
- assessment brief/copy of examination paper
- marking scheme/solutions/grade descriptors/assessment criteria
- complete list of student cohort and individual marks for assessment
- sample of scripts, as outlined in the UW Assessment Policy.