Marking Procedures

Approved by:	Effective date:	Next review:
Education and Student Experience Committee	1 August 2024	July 2025

Procedural statement

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

Who needs to know about the procedure?

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

Purpose of the procedure

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

Contacts

The University Quality and Standards Office is responsible for:

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

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

Marking Procedures

Contents

Marking Procedures

1. Introduction

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

1.2. In this document, "assessment" refers to summative assessment only, which carries marks or grades that are used in the determination of a student's progression and award. It does not refer to formative assessment and feedback, as formative activities are not connected to the marking process.

1.3. In this document, "marking" means the attribution of a "mark" (in percentage point, e.g. 75%), or a "grade" (e.g. Distinction, Merit, Pass or Fail).

   (i) The mark achieved for an assessment pre-penalties or caps (also called "mark pre-penalties or caps") must be provided to students in the Turnitin Grade Box (it will then automatically be drawn through to the Blackboard Grade Mark Centre, PebblePad or other Virtual Learning Environment). This mark is provisional and, in the case of Blackboard, an automated generic statement to students highlights this.

   (ii) The application of penalties and/or caps will be done by the administrator when the marks are entered into the Student Record System (this is the "mark post-penalties or caps"). The Student Record System will only store the mark post penalties or caps where relevant. The information about penalties and caps applied will be available to students on SITS My Record.

   (iii) What students see on SITS MyRecord is their "final mark", which is post-penalties, caps and post Boards of Examiners. These marks will be available following the Boards of Examiners.

   (iv) Information is provided to students, on the VLE and in the University web pages to explain where to find which type of mark, but course teams are encouraged to reiterate this information to students to help them avoid confusion.

2. Mode of submission

2.1. The mode of submission for assessment will depend on the nature of the work being assessed.

2.2. Full details of the University's arrangements for Digital Assessment can be found at https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching-enhancement/policies/Digital-Assessment-Formerly-EMA.aspx. These pages should be consulted.

2.3. Where technically possible, all work must be submitted in an electronic format through one of the University's supported systems.

2.4. A paper copy must not be required where electronic submission through the University's supported systems is possible.

2.5. Where the nature of the work being assessed prevents electronic submission through one of the University's supported systems, an alternative mode of submission is permitted.

2.6. Where an electronic submission of assessment is made to the incorrect location, provided the submission has been made by the correct deadline, the submission may be considered valid and marked accordingly, provided the below criteria are met:

(i)   the student notifies the Course Team or Registry Services of the error;

(ii)   the date, time and location of the submission can be established;

(iii) there are no clear indications that the submission was not intended as a final submission for marking;

(iv)   the submission complies with all other requirements for the assessment other than being submitted to the wrong location.

2.7. Where an electronic submission of an assessment is made more than once, only the first submission will be marked and other(s) discarded, unless the student notified the Course Team before the deadline.

2.8. For assessments due to be marked anonymously (following the Anonymous Marking Policy), if an error occurs in the submission, the following applies:

(i)   If the submission is made in the incorrect electronic location (as in 2.6), anonymity will be lifted by administrators only to ensure the assessment is found and marked anonymously by the appropriate marker.

(ii)   If the student has not anonymised their assessment, the submission will be considered legitimate but not marked anonymously.

(iii) Other troubleshooting relating to errors in anonymous marking submissions via Turnitin can be found in the guidance on Troubleshooting anonymous marking on Turnitin.

2.9. If a significant system outage (defined as one formally confirmed by Registry Services occurs *on the day* of a submission deadline, the deadline for submission of the relevant work should be extended *by 1 working day*. Submissions should continue to follow standard processes, modifying marking penalties for late submission in accordance with the deadline extension. Registry Services will notify the rest of the University, via Staffnet and other means, of the outages and revised deadlines. At Registry Services' request, LTE will also post communications to the VLE. Course teams will be responsible for communicating revised deadlines to students. Where a systems outage occurs outside of office hours, the outage will be confirmed retrospectively as soon as possible.

2.10. If a significant system outage occurs within two working days after a submission deadline, marking penalties for late submission on or after the day of the outage should be modified by 1 working day.

2.11. If a significant system outage occurs after a submission deadline but on the day of an agreed deadline for a student with an approved extension (through one of the University's support procedures, such as exceptional circumstances), the deadline for submission for that student should be extended by 1 working day.

2.12. If a significant system outage occurs within two working days after the agreed deadline for a student with an approved extension (through one of the University's support procedures, such as exceptional circumstances), marking penalties for late submission on the day of outage should be modified for that student by 1 working day.

3.   Marking Illegible Scripts

3.1.   The University has specific requirements when students submit illegible scripts for assessment.

3.2.   An illegible script, either in its entirety or in part, is one that is not possible for an examiner to decipher in such a way that a fair assessment can be made. [Taught Regulations, 11.4]

3.3.   At least three examiners must ascertain that they have failed to decipher the script before work is treated as illegible. These should comprise the first maker and moderator for the component of assessment and a re-marker appointed by the Head of School or nominee for this purpose.

3.4.   An indication of work deemed to be illegible should be made on the script, such as by underlining it and annotating it "ILLEGIBLE TO MARKERS".

3.5.   No marks or grades shall be given or deducted for work deemed illegible. [Taught Regulations, 11.5]

3.6.   If, as a result of decisions on illegibility, a piece of work does not attract a sufficient mark or grade to pass, the work will be treated in line with the University's reassessment regulations. [Taught Regulations, 11.6]

4.   Marking of work where a student has not followed the instructions of the examiners

4.1.   The University has procedures in place where a student does not follow the instructions in an examination or time constrained assessment activity.

Where too many questions have been answered in a formal examination

4.2.   A student who completed more questions than required will receive the aggregate mark for the best among the answers up to the number required. For example, a student who has answered four questions when three questions should have been answered will receive the aggregate mark for the best three answers.

Where coursework exceeds the prescribed length

4.3.   Where a dissertation or other coursework exceeds the prescribed length by more than 10 per cent (or by any amount where precision is required due to the nature of assessment e.g. writing in a set poetic

form) a penalty reduction in marks of 10 percentage points (of the eligible marks) shall be applied. [Taught Regulations, 11.14]

Where assessment is not undertaken

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

5. Penalties for the late submission of assessed work

5.1. In the case of late submission of work for a component of assessment (including dissertations, extended essays and projects) without an approved exceptional circumstance, the work will be penalized. [Taught Regulations, 11.7]

5.2. Late work penalties do not apply to Examinations and Take-Home Examinations. For Take—Home Examinations, if the work is not submitted within 24 hours, it is considered a non-submission and awarded a mark of zero.

5.3. The standard penalty to be applied by all courses will be 10 percent, for any late submission up to 2 working days (unless a significant system outage occurs, as set out in 2.9 above). The deduction will reduce the mark to no less than the pass mark, where the work would otherwise have passed. Where the work would otherwise have failed no further late penalties will be applied. After 2 working days late a mark of 0 will be recorded and the work will be considered as a non-submission. These regulations will apply, unless: **EITHER**

    (i)   an Additional Course Regulation has been approved by Academic Board;

    OR

    (ii)   the work is marked on a pass/fail basis and it is not possible to give a numerical mark. [Taught Regulations, 11.8]

5.4. The submission deadline is 2pm on the date due. The application of penalty starts after 2:01pm on the day of the published deadline. For example, for late assessments, a penalty of 10 percent will be applied from 2:01pm on the day of the published deadline until 2pm on the second working day. The calculation of "working days" is Monday to Friday.

5.5. The 10 percent penalty will be 10 percent of the full one hundred percent and not 10 per cent of the mark awarded to the student. If, therefore, the student has scored 50%, the student will lose 10 percent and receive 40% where the work is submitted in the late period.

5.6. For a component of assessment that has been validated to be marked on a pass/fail basis for which it is not possible to give a numerical mark, the late submission of work without an approved exceptional circumstance will be recorded as a fail, unless an Additional Course Regulation setting out an alternative arrangement has been approved by the Academic Board. [Taught Regulations, 11.9]

5.7.   Where the penalty is applied to a reassessment it will be applied to the marked assessment before the cap of the pass mark is applied. [Taught Regulations, 11.10]

5.8.   Where a request is made for an Additional Course Regulation:

   (i)   this will normally be as a result of professional body or employer expectations;

   (ii)   the penalty will be for the mark of 0 to be applied where work has not been submitted by the deadline. [Taught Regulations, 11.11]

5.9.   All work that is penalised because of late submission will be subject to the normal reassessment regulations. [Taught Regulations, 11.12]

5.10.   The application of any penalties to work submitted within the permitted late period will be made after the component of assessment has been first marked, moderated and externally examined to ensure the transparency of the process. [Taught Regulations, 11.13]

5.11.   Wherever possible, students who do not submit by the deadline or the permitted late period should be encouraged to discuss their work with their module leader or PAT to support any reassessment.

6.   Standardisation, Moderation and Double Marking

Principles

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

   (i)   The University is committed to ensuring that all marks and grades awarded for summative assessment are accurate, fair and equitable and are, therefore, reliable.

   (ii)   The University utilises a moderation process to ensure that assessment is reliable, except in those specific instances where it requires assessment(s) to be double marked.

   (iii)   In both moderation and double marking, the student will receive only a single mark and a single piece of feedback.

   (iv)   When marking is anonymous, both the first marker and moderator or the first marker and second marker for double marked assessment mark the assessment anonymously, as set out in the Anonymous Marking Policy.

Definitions

6.2.   The following definitions apply:

   (i)   Double Marking is the process by which two markers assess the work against the assessment criteria, coming to an independent conclusion, before together agreeing a single mark or grade.

(ii)   Moderation is the process by which the mark or grade of the first marker of any summative assessed work is reviewed by a moderator, who must assure themselves, through sampling the first marking, that the assessment criteria have been applied accurately, fairly and equitably.

(iii)   Standardisation is a pre-marking activity between the markers to agree standard application of the marking criteria. It is employed for any assessment that is double marked and/or where there is more than one first marker, to ensure consistency in marking and feedback.

Allocation of markers

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

(i)   a first marker(s) to each component of assessment;

(ii)   a moderator, where the component of assessment is to be moderated;

(iii)   a double marker(s), where the component of assessment is to be double marked.

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

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

Standardisation

6.6.   Where double marking is required or where there will be more than one first marker, standardisation must be completed in advance of marking. Standardisation involves a group of markers independently marking a sample of student work and assigning grades using agreed criteria, to ensure to all markers have a clear and consistent understanding of the grading criteria before commencing marking.

Moderation

6.7.   Moderation is the exercise of academic professional judgement.

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

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

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

(i) comprise the higher of either (a) ten pieces of the submitted pieces of assessed work, or (b) 20 per cent of the submitted pieces of assessed work, up to a maximum of thirty pieces of assessed work;

(ii) include a sample of assessed work from marks or grades spread across the range;

(iii) must include assessed work marked by all first markers, where there is more than one.

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

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

(i) the first marker(s) has allocated an appropriate mark or grade and that that mark or grade reflects the assessment criteria accurately;

(ii) the first marker(s) has provided feedback that reflects the alignment of the piece of work with the assessment criteria;

(iii) there is consistent marking across a component of assessment.

6.13. The moderator will be provided with:

(i) the appropriate sample of assessed work;

(ii) the feedback to students for that sample of work;

(iii) the marks or grades for all pieces of assessed work;

(iv) access to all pieces of assessed work with feedback, if required.

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

6.15. On completion of the moderation process, the moderator will submit the *Moderation Report Form* to the Course Director in order to provide evidence of the completion of the moderation process, prior to the Module Board of Examiners.

6.16. The moderator will not indicate on any piece of assessed work (on Blackboard, Turnitin or other) that the assessed work has been moderated.

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

EITHER

(i) significant inconsistencies in the marking;

AND/OR

(ii) systematic deviations from the marking criteria;

AND/OR

(iii) inappropriate feedback to students.

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

6.19. Where the second moderator:

(i) confirms the marks or grades of the first marker(s), the marks or grades of the first marker will stand and those marks or grades will be submitted to the Module Board of Examiners;

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

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

6.21. Where there are more than two first markers and the deficit established by the moderator relates to the marking of more than one first marker, the procedures set out in 6.17 and 6.18 above should apply in full.

6.22. The moderator will not provide feedback to students.

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

Double Marking

6.24. Double Marking is required in the following circumstances:

(i) where a component of assessment is undertaken independently by each student, such as independent study, dissertation or negotiated module;

(ii) where it is impossible to revisit the assessment (such as a live performance or exhibition) and no permanent record, e.g. video recording, can be kept;

(iii)   where it is the requirement of an external regulatory body.

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

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

6.27. The first marker will be responsible for feedback to students. Where a component of assessment is double-marked, the double marker may give feedback, but this should be incorporated into a single set of feedback provided by the first marker to the student. Two sets of feedback must not be given to students.

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

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

7.   External Examiner moderation

Section 7 does not apply to Level 0 or Level 4 unless stipulated by a Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB).

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

(i)   review the marking to determine if it is of an appropriate standard;

(ii)   make a judgement on the overall standards of student performance on the modules to which they are appointed;

(iii)   ensure that written University procedures for marking are observed for the modules to which they are appointed.

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

7.2. Before an assessment is set, the Course Director / Module Leader will ensure that details of all assessments, including essay questions, examination papers, presentation titles and their equivalents for other assessments are shared with the External Examiner and that the External Examiner is given

the opportunity to comment on the appropriateness of the assessment task as a means of assessing the achievement of the module learning outcomes.

7.3. The External Examiner will moderate a sample of assessed work for each component of assessment for each module. The External Examiner is not required to sample reassessed work.

7.4. Where the assessed work is held digitally, the External Examiner will be given access to all assessed work and will select their own sample in line with the guidance issued by the Quality and Standards Office to External Examiners.

7.5. Where the assessed work is not held digitally, the Module Leader will agree a sample with the External Examiner and the outcome may depend on the nature of that assessment. The External Examiner may, in addition, request to see further assessed work, and must not be refused.

7.6. The Module Leader will send a copy of the Moderation Report Form to the External Examiner for information.

7.7. The Module Leader will ensure that the External Examiner is provided with full information where a module is delivered at more than one location, including where a module is franchised, and is provided with a means of identifying which students studied at each location to enable the External Examiner to provide a comment on the standard of the assessed work at each location.

8.   Collaborative provision

8.1. Academic Staff who are employed by a collaborative partner are affiliate examiners and are permitted to undertake marking.

8.2. Where standardisation is required, the CCCU Link Tutor must be involved.

8.3. Where assessed work is moderated, a full member of the Board of Examiners must act either as the first marker or as the moderator;

   (i)   where work is double marked, the first and double marking will normally be undertaken by the collaborative partner. CCCU will moderate a sample of the work. This will normally be undertaken on the same basis and timeframe as the External Examiner's review of a sample.

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

Marking Procedures

9. Feedback to students on marked assessments

9.1. Students are entitled to comprehensive feedback on all forms of assessment, including all forms of examination (onsite, take-home, locally run time constrained assessments, etc.).

9.2. Formal feedback on assessment is a key aspect of assessment for learning. It is important for enabling student development and progression. Feedback on assessment should be given to students as soon as possible to enable students to review progress and to identify areas for improvement in future work.

9.3. All students should receive the mark pre-penalties or caps (see point 1.3 for definitions) and feedback as soon as possible and within the maximum time of 15 working days after the assessment or reassessment submission date, except for the following:

    (i)   Dissertations, extended projects, independent studies (usually work of a word equivalence of 5,000 words or more).

    (ii)   Work submitted for Research Degrees and taught Doctorates.

    (iii)   Where students have an approved temporary learning agreement in place.

    (iv)   Work submitted after the deadline, where the requirement is within 25 working days of the deadline.

9.4. Where 9.3 (i)-(iv) applies, the deadline dates will be set at the discretion of the course team, but must be as soon as possible and timely to inform students' development and must be clearly communicated to students as set out in the procedures for formal feedback outlined in this section.

9.5. For examination, students should receive the mark pre-penalties or caps as follows:

    (i)   For take-home examination and other examination completed online, within the maximum time of 15 working days after the assessment submission date

    (ii)   For on-site examination supported by Registry Services or locally organised on-site examination, within the maximum time of 17 working days after the assessment submission date, with the additional 2 working days given to allow for students' scripts to reach the markers.

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

9.7. Formal feedback should include qualitative comments and the mark pre-penalties or caps, as confirmed by moderation or double marking processes.

9.8. Where there are substantive logistical reasons for a revised assessment deadline on an ongoing basis beyond the normal maximum times, application for a revised deadline should be made via the 15 Day Deadline Variation Request Form as set out in the guidelines, which is provided at:

http://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulation-and-policy-zone/regulation-and-policy-zone.aspx#F

9.9. If a significant system outage (defined as one formally confirmed by Registry Services) occurs on the day of a submission deadline, the deadline for the return of feedback for the relevant work should be extended by 1 working day.

Responsibilities of Staff

9.10. The Course Director is responsible for having oversight of the assessment mechanisms/processes for the course which enable all students to receive formal feedback (including the mark) as soon as possible and within the given deadlines.

9.11. Where the Course Director identifies a significant issue in relation to meeting obligations for assessment feedback, this should be brought to the attention of the relevant Head of School or nominee.

9.12. Where the course team believes that the standard feedback deadline should be extended for a course or module for substantive logistical reasons (e.g. nature of course delivery, etc), the Course Director is responsible for applying in writing to the relevant Faculty Education and Portfolio Sub-Committee for a variation of the deadline date.

9.13. Applications should be made on the University template 15 Day Variation Request form and will need to include a clear rationale and duration of the variation in deadline.

Responsibilities of the Faculty Education and Portfolio Sub-Committee

9.14. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Education and Portfolio Sub-Committee to monitor the timeliness of feedback to students on summative assessment.

9.15. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Education and Portfolio Sub-Committee to consider 15 Day Variation Requests for approval.

9.16. Deadline variations will be made for a set period of time as determined by the Faculty Education and Portfolio Sub-Committee through the approval process. After which, if a deadline variation is still required, a new application should be made.

Marking Procedures

Policy Information	Description of Policy Information
Policy Title	Marking Procedures
Department Owner	Quality and Standards Office
Policy Category	Academic - directly affecting research, assessment or teaching within the University.
Policy Owner	Director of Quality and Standards
Policy Administration	quality@canterbury.ac.uk
Related University Policies	Regulation and Credit Framework for the Conferment of Awards
Related University Procedures (*)	Academic Misconduct Procedures Anonymous Marking Policy
Approved by	Education and Student Experience Committee
Date Approved	05/08/2024
Date of Commencement	1 August 2024
Review Date	July 2025
Version	9
History of revisions of the policy	Version 1, approved by Education and Student Experience Committee, 20 September 2017 Version 2, approved by Education and Student Experience Committee, 18 November 2020 Version 3, approved by Education and Student Experience Committee, 6 July 2021 Version 4, clarification of application of late penalties (5.3 – 5.4), Education and Student Experience Committee, 16 December 2021 Version 5, change to the principles for double marking and moderation for collaborative partners and clarification of standardisation requirements. Education and Student Experience Committee, 18 May 2022. Version 6, change to 5.1 to clarify application of late work penalties to failing grades. Education and Student Experience Committee & Academic Board, 18 January 2023. Version 7, annual updates for clarification and to incorporate revised rules on Late Penalties and Anonymous Marking. Education and Student Experience Committee, 29 June 2023.

Marking Procedures

Policy Information	Description of Policy Information
	Version 8, revision to 7.3 to remove reference to External Examiner moderating reassessment sample; revision to 5.11 to clarify that there is no requirement to mark submitted after permitted late period; alignment with new branding. Education and Student Experience Committee, 20 November 2023. Version 9, revision to remove link to Timely Feedback Policy, which is now embedded in this document; removal of requirement for reassessment of moderation; removal of clause 5.11 regarding marking not required for work submitted after the late period. Education and Student Experience Committee, 05/08/2024.
Website Address	https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/quality-and-standards-office/regulations-policies-and-procedures/regulation-and-credit-framework.aspx