

The College Policy

Assessment Sub Boards will be entrusted to apply the rules of the College Marking Framework consistently and fairly and Faculty/School Assessment Boards will be responsible for ensuring that the Assessment Sub Boards have conducted their marking processes in accordance with the marking framework and the adopted marking models.

In keeping with the College commitment to ensure that the assessment process is fair, equal and transparent, Assessment Sub Boards will select the most appropriate marking model for each assessment type within a module with the overall aim of improving the turnaround time linked to the marking process and enhancing the delivery of relevant and timely feedback.

Programmes **must** provide students with details of the College Marking Framework and the models that they intend to apply.

The Governance

Faculties should adopt the following Governance procedures for the College Marking Framework:

- The Faculty Assessment Boards when approving the Assessment Sub-board subject specific/discipline-based marking schemes should ensure that the appropriate marking models are attributed to each assessment and that:
- Any individual involved in the marking process will have appropriate experience and expertise. It is the responsibility of an Assessment Sub-board to ensure that new examiners have suitable guidance and support to carry out these duties;
- The marking process is clear and details are made available in advance to external examiners including, for Models three and four, information on how the marking sample is selected and the size of the sample calculated;
- Details of the marking process are made available to students including, for Models three and four, information on how the marking sample is selected and the size of the sample calculated;
- Procedures for dealing with discrepancies between markers are compliant with the College Marking Framework, made available to all examiners and consistently employed;
- The original marks made by the first and second marker are documented and made available to the external examiner and at the Assessment Sub-boards for scrutiny;
- External examiners are given an opportunity to consider and comment on local procedures and their enactment in their final report;
- All final year projects and dissertations must be double marked in accordance with Model Two;
- Summative marks shall not be awarded for attendance at teaching events. Marks for participation should be restricted to small teaching groups or online discussion boards and must be marked in accordance with Model Five and Model Seven;
- All assessments, unless involving practice, performance, or presentation must remain anonymous, where practicable;

- Marking for modules or programmes delivered entirely online should be subject to the same assessment scrutiny as examination scripts and all other form of written assessment submitted for Faculty/Institute/School-based programmes.

That in order to instigate greater flexibility whilst ensuring probity, rigour and transparency across the College the following suite of marking models is adopted:

The Models

Model 1 ~ Blind double Marking

Blind double marking means that separate copies of the assignment are marked independently and anonymously, or the first marker makes no annotations on the work being marked so that the second marker examines all pieces of work as they left the student. Both examiners record their marks and comments separately and a final mark is determined.

The resources needed to undertake this model are considerable and it is often considered impracticable to do, consequently there is no requirement to 'blind double' mark all assessments but an Assessment Sub Board could adopt this approach if they so wished.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers¹

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker with an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor²) as second marker.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Faculty Assessment Board.

Guidance for markers

Where there is a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original markers are required to reconsider. If there is still a discrepancy, a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

¹ Provided by CAB June 2012

² An assessor is a person with particular expertise or knowledge appointed to assist in setting papers, marking and attending practical examinations.

Model 2 ~ Double Marking

Double marking means that all examination scripts, coursework and report/dissertation or other forms of written assessment are marked by at least two Internal Examiners or by one Assessor and one Internal Examiner.

In the case of assessments for quantitative subjects where answers can be scored objectively and there is a precise model solution and marking scheme approved by the examiners for every question, each script must be marked by an Internal Examiner; and every script must be checked independently by an Assessor or Internal Examiner to ensure that all answers have been marked and that the marks and part-marks have been correctly totalled and recorded.

For other subjects, both examiners record their marks and a final mark is determined based on academic judgement.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker with an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or postdoctoral worker or external marker or assessor) as second marker. For quantitative subjects where answers can be scored objectively and there is a precise model solution and marking scheme, the first marker should be an experienced examiner, and the independent check may be carried out by a PhD student or post-doctoral worker. PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

Guidance on marking practice

An experienced examiner determines the final mark following marking by internal examiners. Where there is a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original markers are required to reconsider the work. If there is still a discrepancy a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted a mark is still calculated and is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

Model 3 ~ Double Marking by Retrospective Sampling

Double marking by retrospective sampling means that all examination scripts and other forms of written assessment are marked by an Internal Examiner(s). A second marker then double marks a sample of the work already first marked, the sample being randomly selected from across the range of marks (as below).

If this method is employed the following safe guards must be adhered to:

The sample size must be a MINIMUM of 10% of the entire cohort or FIVE scripts (whichever is greater) and include:

- For modules with less than 20 students enrolled – at least ONE script per classification
- For modules with 20-29 students enrolled – at least TWO scripts per classification
- For modules with 30 or more students enrolled – at least THREE scripts per classification

The second marker must not alter the marks of any assessments in the sample.

However, where there is a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original markers are required to reconsider the work. If there is still a discrepancy a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

If other patterns of inconsistency emerge between the first and second marker (such as both marking very high), then this must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Subboard who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken. This will include identification of the group of scripts that might be affected, following which, the entire group must be remarked. The Chair of the Assessment Sub-board should gain the approval of the relevant external examiner for the remedial action taken.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker with an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or postdoctoral worker or external marker or assessor) as second marker.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted a mark is still calculated and the is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

Model 4 ~ Scrutiny ~ For level 3³, 4 and 5 assessment only

Scrutiny means in this instance that all examination scripts and other forms of written assessment whose primary purpose is summative are marked by an Internal Examiner(s). A second examiner, who will have access to the grades and comments of the first marker(s), will scrutinise a sample of assessments to assure the quality of marking standards.

³ The English Language Centre has level 3 assessments

The scrutinised sample⁴ will be randomly selected to maintain consistency of marking standards. If this method is employed the following safe guards must be adhered to:

The sample size must be a MINIMUM of 10% of the entire cohort or FIVE scripts (whichever is greater) and include:

- For modules with less than 20 students enrolled – at least ONE script per classification
- For modules with 20-29 students enrolled – at least TWO scripts per classification
- For modules with 30 or more students enrolled – at least THREE scripts per classification

The marker scrutinising must not alter the marks of any assessments in the sample.

However, if s/he identifies a discrepancy of ≥ 10 percentage points OR where the difference in marks crosses a classification boundary the original marker (s) are required to reconsider the work. If there is still a discrepancy a third, independent, experienced marker will be asked to help determine the final mark.

If other patterns of inconsistency emerge (systematic errors, very high/low marks) in the marks awarded by the first examiner then this must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-board who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken. This will include identification of the group of scripts/coursework assignments that might be affected, following which, the entire group must be remarked. The Chair of the Assessment Sub-board should gain the approval of the relevant external examiner for the remedial action taken.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as first marker provided that the element of assessment being marked contributes $\leq 15\%$ to the overall assessment of the module. The scrutiniser must be an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor).

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is still calculated and is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted. Where examiners award the lowest mark to different questions a final mark will be determined by a separate, experienced marker.

Model 5 ~ Single Marking

Single marking is where assessments are marked by one examiner. This approach is useful when marking formative assessments and small parts of summative assessments. If this method is employed in summative assessment the following safe guards must be adhered to:

⁴ Scrutinise a sample of assessments to ensure marking standards are appropriate.

No individual piece of work should contribute >15% to the overall assessment on a given module;

Any one examiner should not single mark work contributing to >50% of the overall module;

Single marking should not be the only Model of assessment employed in a module.

Independent checking should take place by an experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) to ensure that systematic errors and/or patterns of inconsistency in the marks awarded does not occur.

If identified this must be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Sub-board who will determine the most appropriate course of action to be taken. This will include identification of the group of scripts/coursework assignments that might be affected, following which, the entire group must be remarked. The Chair of the Assessment Sub-board should gain the approval of the relevant external examiner for the remedial action taken.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed as a single marker provided that the element of assessment being marked contributes $\leq 15\%$ to the overall assessment of the module. An experienced examiner (not a PhD student or post-doctoral worker or external marker or assessor) must maintain an overview of the marks awarded.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment Board.

Rubric Violations

When students fail to answer the correct number of questions (either too few or too many) in different sections of an examination they have violated the rubric requirements of the assessment. In such cases the following should apply:

- the examination script (all answers) is marked as usual by both examiners;
- if insufficient questions have been attempted the mark is still calculated and is determined from the questions answered (a mark of zero is awarded for unanswered questions);
- if more than the required number of questions have been answered the question(s) with the lowest mark (s) will be discounted.
- The module lead or Assessment Sub-board chair should be made aware of the situation.

Model 6 ~ Online/computer based assessments

This model is normally employed for multiple choice question (MCQ) papers. It is a requirement that a clerical check is carried out to ensure that the marks have been accurately collated and assigned to the correct candidate.

In the event of a failure of the IT system during an examination period and when the error cannot be attributed to student error, the following options are to be considered by the Assessment Sub-board:

- That students are offered a replacement examination, either in the same format, or an alternative form of assessment if appropriate (regulation A3, 20 refers);
- That the overall module mark is recalculated using marks from other summative assessments (if available).

When neither of the above options are considered acceptable suspending the award rules (i.e., award credit for the lost work) may in exceptional circumstances be considered.

The views of the external examiner should always be sought in these situations.

Guidance on the use of PhD students and post-doctoral workers

A PhD student or post-doctoral worker, having undergone appropriate training and instruction, can be employed to carry out clerical checks that marks have been collated and assigned to the correct candidates.

PhD students should not be employed in the assessment of level 7 work. An exception might be made for practitioners with extensive experience but only with prior approval from the Chair of the Assessment and Standards Committee.

Model 7 ~ Ephemeral Assessment

Ephemeral assessment is summative assessment where the evidence of the candidate's performance is difficult to retain or cannot be retained.

Assessment Sub-boards will need to ensure:

- That the marking criteria for the assessment has been approved by CASC;
- That the format and conduct of the assessment and the criteria for marking are communicated to the candidates well in advance of the assessment event.

It is also recommended, wherever practicable, that the format of the ephemeral assessment is discussed with the external examiner and consideration is given to ensuring that either: More than one examiner is involved directly in the assessment event, or

A second examiner or the Assessment Sub-board is in a position to review the paperwork arising from the assessment event so that any decision to fail a candidate does not rest solely with one examiner.

Approved Academic Board December 2008

Updated June 2009 College Assessment Board

Updated July 2010 College Assessment Board

Updated November 2010 College Assessment Board

Updated Jan 2011 College Assessment Board for use in 2011/12

Updated June 2012 /June 2013 Updated Dec 2014 CASC

Updated November 2016 CASC; Updated April 2017