

CARDIFF
UNIVERSITY

PRIFYSGOL
CAERDYDD

MARKING POLICY

The ways in which assessments are marked and graded is one of the fundamental ways in which we define and exemplify academic standards. It is central to the operation of an assessment system that is valid, reliable, and transparent. The purpose of this document is to set out the basis by which equity and transparency in marking will be maintained across the University. Following the guidance will ensure that the confidence already evident in the standards of the University's awards and in the probity of marking will be maintained. It will also enhance the links between marking, academic feedback, and other assessment-related policies and processes.

CONTENTS

Assessment Criteria and Marking Schemes	4
Reliability and Consistency of Marking.....	7
Assessments and Anonymity	11
Assessors	13
Word Limits	14
The Management of Assessment Outcomes	14

1. Assessment Criteria and Marking Schemes

Assessment criteria help define the standards evident at different mark points and guide students on the learning journey on which they have embarked. They provide a valuable tool for staff to help grade assessments and provide academic feedback. They help inform students of some of the qualities that need to be evident in assignments and help them identify what they must do to improve. Staff and students must work together to ensure they have a shared common understanding of the criteria that apply to different tasks, learning outcomes, and levels of academic study. Where appropriate, criteria will be supplemented by marking schemes that provide a more precise framework for the allocation of marks. Marking schemes help assessors to mark assignments by indicating how marks will be awarded for different components of a question or number of questions. They often accompany indicative answers, but should provide for flexibility where students give different answers equate to the same standard of achievement relevant to the learning outcomes.

1.1) Principle

Clear assessment criteria and/or marking schemes shall be adopted in assessments within taught programmes. These shall:

- be shared with staff and students to ensure a common understanding of academic standards is maintained;
- be linked with and focussed upon learning outcomes;
- be inclusive and capable of meeting different student needs;
- be appropriate to the demands of particular tasks at different academic levels;
- act as a reference point to support academic staff in utilising their professional judgement with confidence;
- be drawn on to provide students with academic feedback on assessments, and;
- as appropriate, be aligned with professional, discipline-specific, and sector-wide reference points.

1.2) Guidance

1.2.1) Setting out assessment criteria

Assessment Criteria set out the knowledge, understanding and skills that students will seek to demonstrate in different assessment tasks. Generic Assessment Criteria have been adopted by the University and have been designed as a reference point to support Schools and their students to develop a better shared understanding of assessment requirements and academic standards. They have been designed to be used flexibly, alongside specific marking schemes and the criteria used by Schools. They can be used for a range of different assessment methods and processes and

help support assessment activities across all taught programmes at Cardiff University.

Schools should make clear whether accuracy of spelling, grammar and punctuation is being assessed even when minor errors do not affect clarity of meaning. Specific guidance on Assessing students with disability-related writing difficulties is also available.

1.2.2) Understanding and using assessment criteria

Staff need to ensure that students are involved in and participate in discussions and dialogue to help engender a shared understanding of assessment criteria. This will enable students to better understand the assessment process and will give them the knowledge, understanding and skills they need to demonstrate in assessment tasks. In turn, this will help students to identify how they can use feedback to improve their learning.

Marking teams should adopt mechanisms through which the shared understanding of standards can be maintained and strengthened. Activities that enable this include shared marking parties, post-Examining Board review and calibration of different markers, and staff development activities that draw upon external discipline specific expertise.

It is good practice to reflect regularly on the ways in which assessment criteria are used to support marking. Schools should seek to maintain an archive of marked anonymised assessments and should use this to help all staff maintain a common understanding of criteria and standards. The archive should be used to help communicate and share academic standards with new staff.

1.2.3) Assessment criteria, learning outcomes, and academic feedback

Academic feedback provided to students on individual tasks should relate to the criteria relevant to that assessment. This will help students identify what they need to do to improve their performance. The criteria adopted in an individual assessment should relate to the learning outcomes that are being assessed in that task, which will be drawn from the learning outcomes for that module. The alignment between assessment criteria and learning outcomes must be clear and transparent. This does not mean that staff should limit feedback to comments against the assessment criteria. Feedback should illustrate the overall strengths and weaknesses of a piece of work and should consider any unintended outcomes evident in the assessment.

Ongoing dialogue with students around assessment criteria will help ensure that students become assessment literate, and that they understand the learning skills that are more important at higher levels, the progressive demands that will be placed on them, what they need to do improve their performance, and consider how they can use and feed forward comments received on previous assessments.

1.2.4) Categorical marking

In discursive disciplines, it is good practice to identify the specific points within each decile at which marks will be awarded (e.g. 62, 65, and 68). Using categorical marking better recognises the level of precision that can realistically exist within many assessment tasks.

Where categorical marking is used, it should be used by all markers and should operate at standard points (i.e. 2, 5, and 8). Categorical marking helps simplify and guide the allocation of marks in many assessment tasks. Where used, marks other than the defined points should not be awarded for individual pieces of work. The final assessment and/or module mark may be at a different point however, where categorical marks are combined to arrive at an overall average mark for that task and/or module. Categorical mark points must cover the full mark range.

1.2.5) Marking schemes

Where appropriate, and depending on the nature of the task, assessment criteria should be supplemented by marking schemes (e.g. in assessments in which marks will be awarded for different components of a question or number of questions). It is good practice for indicative answers to be developed for assessments for which marking schemes exist, particularly where multiple markers are used, to help guide markers.

1.2.6) Accessibility

Every student must have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement against the learning outcomes. Assessment tasks, together with criteria and marking schemes, should therefore be designed with accessibility in mind. Because of certain circumstances, some may need to complete a different task, or the same task under different conditions, in order to demonstrate achievement of the same learning outcomes. The University normally arranges such adjustments to assessments through the Specific Provision Regulations section 9.

When an alternative assessment task is provided as a reasonable adjustment for a disabled student, the learning outcomes should not be altered, and Schools should ensure that the alternative task is an appropriate way to test them. However, the assessment criteria may need to be modified to maintain alignment with the learning outcomes in the context of the particular task.

Schools should ensure that students are aware of their approach to marking work from students with disabilities affecting written language expression. Specific guidance on assessing students with disability-related writing difficulties is available. Reasonable adjustments of these kinds should ensure that disabled students have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their

achievement without compromising academic standards or affecting prescribed standards of professional bodies.

1.2.7) Marking, academic standards, and academic judgement

Staff need to ensure that students are aware of the fundamental role that academic judgement plays in determining assessment outcomes. While staff must use marking schemes and/or assessment criteria to support their judgement, students should be informed that many assessment tasks will require assessors to exercise their academic and/or professional judgement. Students should be made aware that appeal applications that question the academic judgement of assessors are not admissible.

1.2.8) Communicating standards with external examiners

Programme teams must ensure that assessment criteria, marking schemes, and approaches to making reasonable adjustments for disabled students are shared with external examiners, and where appropriate relevant professional and statutory bodies. Marking teams should engage in an ongoing dialogue with external examiners to ensure that there is a shared understanding of the academic standards.

2. Reliability and Consistency of Marking

Moderation is the generic term used to define the range of processes undertaken by which staff can be assured that an assessment outcome is valid and reliable. Internal moderation, together with that undertaken with external examiners, are key parts of the ways in which standards are protected and probity guaranteed within higher education. Methods of moderation include the review of a sample of scripts, second marking, marking team meetings, and the scrutiny and review of marks undertaken by Examining Boards. Ensuring that moderation processes are appropriate will require schools to consider the risks of variation (or perceived error) in marks and to consider the importance of individual assessments to students. Where both of these are high, schools will need to ensure that appropriate safeguards are in place to support reliability and probity of marking. Where the risks of error and significance of assessment tasks is lower, the degree of moderation can be lower. In determining their approach, schools will need to ensure their processes meet the expectations set out below and that they satisfy external examiners and professional and statutory bodies.

2.1) Principle

Assessments shall be managed in ways that ensure equity, consistency, and transparency.

2.2) Guidance

Schools shall put in place and operate processes and procedures that ensure reliability, consistency, and accuracy of marking. These shall be made known to students. The processes used may include sampling, second marking, and/or other internal and external moderation methods.

In determining the processes that will be used, Schools should consider the risk of errors occurring in marking and the importance of an assessment to students. The higher the risk of error and the greater the significance of an assessment task to students, the more rigorous the degree of scrutiny needs to be. Factors that impact on the risk of error include the number of markers and their level of experience, the nature of the assessment, the availability of indicative answers, the clarity of marking schemes, and the degree of objectivity associated with the assessment. The importance to the student should be judged on the possible impact might have on degree outcomes, the assessment, and/or progression decisions, the weight given to the task, and the credit rating of the module. The risk of error and the significance to students of all tasks that contribute to final awards should be considered by schools to determine what, if any, moderation will take place. It is not expected that the outcomes from very small assessments in which there is a clear 'right' answer will require moderation.

Moderation should take place after the first marking of an assessment element has been completed and not at the completion of that module. This will allow judgements to be made as to whether the standard of marking of that assessment is appropriate for that task. Schools need to balance moderation practices with the need to conduct marking efficiently and provide students with timely and detailed feedback. Schools must be able to justify the moderation processes and procedures they adopt, and to provide details of these through reviews undertaken via the University's quality processes.

Details that should be within School processes include:

- The procedures used to ensure accurate calculation and transcription of marks;
- Which pieces of work will be subject to specific moderation processes;
- What proportion of the cohort's work will be subject to moderation;
- Definitions of groups of assessors whose marking may be subject to greater scrutiny;
- The decision making processes used when marks differ between assessors, and;
- The ways in which moderation outcomes are reported to Examining Boards.

2.2.1) Verification and scrutiny of marks

It is crucially important that Schools ensure that the marks awarded are correct, that marks are tallied correctly, and that the final marks are recorded against the correct student's record. Schools must ensure that the processes used safeguard against error and ensure the accurate transcription of marks. These processes must be applied to all assessments.

2.2.2) Sampling

In many written assessment tasks, a review of a sample of scripts will provide sufficient security to enable a judgement to be made on the appropriateness of the initial marks. Schools should scrutinize and review a sample of scripts graded at different points in tasks that require academic staff to interpret and judge answers. The sample needs to be determined by considering the size of the cohort and the benefits to learning that will be gained by providing prompt and detailed feedback. Hence, it is likely that the proportion of work sampled in larger classes will likely be smaller. At a minimum, it is recommended that all scripts marked below the pass mark are moderated and that a sample of, at least, the square root of the number of students undertaking the assignment is reviewed.

2.2.3) Second marking

Second marking of all assignments within an individual assessment task should take place only where the risk of variability in marking (or perception of risk) is high, and when the assessment could have a significant impact on a student's progression and/or final award. Examples of assessments where it is advisable for second marking to be employed are listed below. This list is **not** exhaustive.

- Dissertations and extended projects;
- Work marked by non-academic staff (as confidence in individuals who are inexperienced markers increases, the degree of moderation can be reduced);
- Where practicable, work undertaken on a placement outside of the University;
- Where an alternative assessment task has been substituted as a reasonable adjustment for a disabled student;
- Work in which anonymity cannot be maintained, and;
- Assessment tasks undertaken at another institution (e.g. within a collaborative programme).

Where second marking does take place, schools need to determine whether the second marker will have access to the marks and/or comments generated by the first marker. Having access to this information will help develop a better shared understanding of academic standards, but may risk

the second marker being unduly influenced by these comments. Blind second marking (i.e. where the second marker is unaware of the marks and/or comments a first marker has given) should only be employed in assessments where the risk of marking error has been identified as very high and where the mark can impact significantly on a student's final outcome.

Schools will need to determine whether dissertations and other extended projects will be first marked by the project supervisor or otherwise. Extended pieces of coursework should normally be marked by supervisors only when it would not be possible for other members of staff to make an academic judgement on the specific content covered by the piece of work.

2.2.4) Supporting moderation

Schools should seek to introduce ways through which markers come together, discuss, and share information on marking and the standards that students have achieved. Team meetings held to review marks provide a relatively efficient way in which moderation can be undertaken, and, at the same time, help cultivate a better shared understanding of academic standards. It is good practice for marking teams to review the mark ranges awarded within different tasks and modules outside of that undertaken by an Examining Board.

2.2.5) Resolving disputes between markers

Schools should define how final marks will be determined in cases where different marks are arrived at by two markers. Where possible, the markers should seek to come together and agree a mark, and in cases where the difference is considered significant, by negotiation between the markers using the relevant assessment criteria, and where appropriate marking schemes. If the markers are unable to reach an agreement, a further internal third marker should be appointed by the Chair of the Examining Board. The third marker should be given access to the two original marks and should determine the mark, documenting their reasons for this. In some assessments, e.g. presentations, vivas etc. it is recognised that it will not normally be possible to appoint a third marker. Where markers disagree, and where it is not possible for a third marker to be appointed, an average of the two initial marks should be taken.

External examiners must not be requested to arbitrate and/or third mark assessments where two internal markers have arrived at substantially different marks. Where third marking does take place, both of the original marks should be made available to external examiners to help illustrate standards.

2.2.6) Reasonable adjustments for disabled students

Schools shall make clear:

- their approach to marking work from students with disabilities affecting written language expression;

- whether and how the work of students with disabilities affecting written language expression is identified ('flagged') to assessors;
- the process used to determine whether an alternative assessment task should be substituted as a reasonable adjustment for a disabled student, and;
- the process used for assuring comparability of marks for alternative assessments, for instance, those agreed as reasonable adjustments for disabled students.

2.2.7) Scaling

In a small number of assessments, scaling may need to be undertaken to enable the distribution of marks to be made broadly comparable across different assessments on the same programme. While this is rare, and more often used in disciplines and assessments in which all students can either be awarded very high or very low marks through initial marking (e.g. in mathematical assessments), students should be informed where this is done and how it will be undertaken should it need to be undertaken.

2.2.8) Combining Assessment Components

In a small number of (often practically focused) modules, individual component assessments can be attached to individual classes. Where this occurs, it is recommended that schools, where possible, combine multiple assessments into a single assessment component. By doing this, schools will be able to enter a single mark for the different assessments, which can be calculated from the best X out of Y individual assessment tasks (where Y is the total number of assessments, and X is the number of assessments a student must complete).

Combining multiple assessments in this way will ensure that students who are absent from an occasional assessment are not penalised unfairly and do not have to complete an Extenuating Circumstances form. It will also encourage students to complete all of the tasks, given the opportunity for their mark to improve should they complete all of individual assessments. Where individual assessments are combined in this way, Schools must ensure that completion of the specified number of assessments will enable students to demonstrate achievement of the relevant learning outcomes, and allow students to meet any relevant professional competencies and/or other professional requirements.

2.2.9) Script legibility

Students may occasionally submit work that is not legible. When this occurs, and the deadline for the assessment has been passed, Schools should seek, where possible, to have the script transcribed. Schools may charge students for this service. Where this is not possible, students should normally be offered the opportunity to rewrite the script to ensure it is legible and can be marked.

2.2.10) Making information available

Students must be made aware of the moderation processes used within their programme. This information should be published in programme handbooks and/or published on Learning Central. External examiners shall be invited to consider and comment on the moderation procedures used in programmes to ensure reliability and consistency of marking.

3. Assessments and anonymity

Anonymous marking takes place where the student's identity is not known to the assessor at the point when marking is undertaken. The University requires that anonymous marking be undertaken in all assessments, where possible. Anonymous marking removes the perception that preconceived notions of individual students can be brought to the marking process and will help reassure students of the probity of marking. In ensuring anonymity, schools will need to review and revise the processes operated to receive assessments, make work available to markers, and return work to students. Schools need to be clear as to when identities will be known to markers, at Examining Boards, and to support the provision of ongoing learner-specific feedback and feedforward.

3.1) Principle

Assessments shall, where possible, be marked anonymously.

3.2) Guidance

Students must be informed of any assessments that cannot be marked anonymously in advance of that task. Examples of assessments in which it may not be possible to maintain anonymity include oral examinations, clinical practice, and performances. Schools should seek to ensure that dissertations and/or extended projects are marked anonymously where the work is not initially marked by the supervisor.

In assessments where staff will provide individual comments that build on previous feedback and/or elective feedback, student identities will have to be made available to staff when marking. Where these strategies are adopted, students must be made aware of the reasons why markers will know their names, and the benefits to their learning that these feedback strategies can provide.

Where marking by number applies, student identities can be revealed after marking and internal moderation has taken. Student names and numbers should be made known when marks are recorded to help ensure that they are recorded accurately and can be verified. Examining Boards do not need to be held anonymously as Boards cannot change the marks awarded to an

individual student. In exceptional circumstances (e.g. where needed in respect of student disabilities) the Head of School may approve the disclosure of a student's identity before an internal mark has been determined and shall report such circumstances to the Examining Board.

The policy on assessing work from students with disability related writing difficulties has been designed to support anonymous marking as far as possible. Where such a student has requested it, scripts from University examinations are flagged with a sticker. Under the policy, Schools are asked to consider whether coursework should also be flagged and, if so, to develop mechanisms which are consistent with anonymous marking.

Schools should seek to develop and enhance processes to manage assessment that ensure assessment results are recorded accurately. In undertaking this, Schools should seek to minimise the number of times that marks are recorded and/or transferred between different systems.

4. Assessors

The skills required to mark student work and manage assessment cannot be acquired solely by having a deep understanding of the subject matter. Developing a shared understanding of the academic standards within a programme requires experience, an appreciation of marking culture, and a wider understanding of pedagogy and the principles that support assessment. Schools need to ensure that all involved in assessment are properly prepared and supported when undertaking this role.

4.1) Principle

All assessors shall be competent to undertake their role, and educated and supported appropriately.

4.2) Guidance

The reliability and consistency of marking is in part dependent upon the skill of assessors. Schools shall adopt strategies that enable all staff to gain an understanding of marking practices and academic standards. It is important that assessors understand the principles of assessment and can provide assessment for, and of, student learning is valid, reliable, and explicit.

Assessors must have considered diversity issues when planning and designing assessments in order to ensure the equitable treatment of students. Where assessment tasks cannot be anonymously marked, programme teams should consider how procedures and training might assist all staff in minimising any risk that unconscious bias might affect marking.

School staff development programmes should include a variety of activities to enable reliable and consistent assessment of student work. Staff should be encouraged to reflect on marking practices, share experiences, and

identify continuing professional development needs. Schools should also seek to ensure that space and time are made available for marking teams to engage in continuing professional development activities and promote the shared dialogue that helps develop a better common understanding of relevant pedagogy and standards. Schools should encourage research students involved in the assessment of students to supplement the mandatory school-based training through attendance at relevant sessions provided through the University's Doctoral Academy training programme.

Schools should adopt strategies through which a shared understanding of criteria is developed and maintained across all staff who mark student work. Schools should also ensure that staff new to marking are supported appropriately when they first mark. Approaches that schools should adopt might include:

- Mentoring of new staff;
- Meetings to review marking undertaken by a team;
- Using an anonymised sample of previous students' work for practice marking;
- Bespoke staff development events;
- Calibration exercises to review the mark range used by different staff.

5. Word limits

Taking a consistent approach to the assessment of work that exceeds word limits will help ensure equity and enable students to better develop a range of important skills. This should be done by applying assessment criteria that set out the need for students to conform to a task's instructions.

5.1) Principle

Assessment processes and procedures shall be applied fairly and consistently. Students shall not gain unfair advantage or be unfairly disadvantaged by inconsistencies in the application of procedures relating to Assessment.

5.2) Guidance

Schools should not apply discrete penalties to overlong assignments. Schools should, where appropriate, make it clear through the learning outcomes and assessment criteria that assignments require students to be concise and adhere to specified word limits. Schools should seek to ensure that all students are made aware of the need to submit work that does not significantly exceed word limits. This information, with appropriate guidance, should be communicated to students regularly. Where students do submit overlong assessments, markers should complete marking that assignment, where possible, and then utilise their academic judgement to determine a mark for the work against the agreed criteria. Where the criteria include the ability to conform to instructions, such as defined word limits, markers may

award work that exceeds the mark length a lower mark. Where multiple markers are involved, they should ensure that the weightings that will be applied to different criteria are agreed in advance of the task and that moderation operates to ensure consistency in the judgements made.

6. The management of assessment outcomes

Adopting consistent and transparent approaches to the release of marks will help ensure that students receive clear information and feedback on their academic performance at appropriate points. By adopting the processes and procedures set out below, Schools will be able to minimise the risk of students being given an incorrect result, help ensure that students do not seek to access results prior to their confirmation by an Examining Board, and ensure that staff can be available to provide guidance and advice where needed.

6.1) Principle

The outcomes from assessments shall be made available to students in a timely and transparent manner.

- 6.1.1) Heads of School shall make arrangements for provisional results from 'in-year' assessments to be released to students via SIMS as they become available.
- 6.1.2) Heads of School shall notify students in advance of the next examination period of the date on which students can expect to receive their end of year or end of stage results, subsequent to their confirmation by an Examining Board.
- 6.1.3) Heads of School shall make arrangements to release confirmed results and outcomes to students through SIMS online on the date on which these are scheduled to be released.
- 6.1.4) Heads of School shall ensure that, on receipt of a formal subject access request, students are given a copy of the marks and comments on their exam scripts within 40 days after the release of results.

6.2) Guidance

6.2.1) Provisional results from in-year assessments

Staff should seek to ensure that the provisional results that students achieve in assessments taken outside of the Examination Periods are returned to students as they become available. Schools should inform students that the marks awarded in all in-year assessments are provisional and may be amended prior to their confirmation by an Examining Board. Schools encourage students to reflect on the marks and feedback provided on individual assessment tasks, and to utilise this to help them identify how they can improve their performance and future learning.

To support student reflection on performance, staff should ensure that they are familiar with and implement the Policy and Guidance on Academic Feedback to Students. Personal tutors should ensure that they use the facility within SIMS that allows them to access the range of provisional marks which have been awarded to their tutees, so that they can support them to identify how they can improve.

6.2.2) The release of results to students

Schools should liaise with staff in Registry and Academic Services to agree dates on which confirmed results will be made available to students. After agreeing this date, Schools should add information to SIMS stating the release date of results for a specific cohort. On this day, the results will be released on SIMS at 9.30 am. At this point a PDF of the interim transcript will be made available and the student's module record on SIMS will become visible. Subsequent to the completion of their programme, students will receive a complete final transcript which will include the marks for all completed modules in their programme.

Schools should seek to ensure that staff are available on the date on which results are released to provide guidance and advice, where needed, to students.

6.2.3) Access to examination scripts and results

Under the Subject Access Request (SAR) procedures of data protection legislation, a student can request access to their personal data and is entitled to receive a copy of this data from the University unless an exemption applies. To make an application for the disclosure of written feedback on an examination script, a student must submit a request to Assurance Services and provide proof of identification. In line with the legislation the University has one calendar month to comply with the request and this is co-ordinated by Assurance Services on behalf of the School.

Students are not permitted to challenge the academic judgement of the markers and in recognition of this principle, the legislators included a specific exemption to the right of access for examination scripts within data protection legislation. This exemption does not extend to any marks or comments made on the scripts by others which means that if students submit a SAR, the law entitles them to receive a copy of the marks and comments on their exam scripts but not the scripts themselves. However, because the information provided must be meaningful Assurance Services normally provide a photocopy of any page of a script that has either a mark or a comment on it in response to a Subject Access Request. Schools may wish to review practice to limit the potential release of exam scripts and decide to confine written comments to a separate cover sheet. This will allow Assurance Services to respond to Subject Access Requests without having to consider release of substantial proportions of the script. All comments should be in the language of the assessment and must be inclusive and non-discriminatory. Please note that the exemption under data

protection legislation does not prevent the disclosure of the script in circumstances where the supervised access is considered appropriate and this will be at the discretion of the School.

The University's Policy and Guidance on Academic Feedback to Students recommends that students should get feedback on their performance in end of module exams via group feedback. This should be provided on the overall performance of a cohort in examinations and indicate areas where students did well and/or struggled. Additionally, students who have failed modules should be able to meet with academic staff on request to identify ways in which they can improve. This process must be applied consistently across the school and must not be more restrictive than the students' legal rights.

Results and marks shall not be made available to parents or any other third party unless 1 of the following conditions applies:

- Explicit written consent (by email) has been obtained from the student;
- The University is required by law or statutory instrument (as may be in the case of sponsors);
- Where required to prevent or detect crime;
- Where required to release to a third party who is sub-contracted by the University to process the data in a way that meets data protection legislation.

Sponsors may have agreements in place enabling the disclosure of a student's academic performance. This should be outlined in the Terms and Conditions for the Award Holders. . If there is any doubt about disclosures please check with the Assurance Services, at inforequest@cardiff.ac.uk.

6.3) Glossary of terms related to Marking

6.3.1) Anonymous marking

Marking where the identity of students is not known to the assessor(s). Where undertaken, anonymity should be maintained until marking has been complete. Student identities may be revealed subsequently to allow students to be provided with feedback and to ensure that marks are recorded accurately.

6.3.2) Assessor

An individual responsible for setting assessments, marking assessments, and/or the provision of feedback to students. Most assessors will be members of the University's Academic Staff, although postgraduate research students and other external individuals may contribute to some aspects of assessment.

6.3.3) Assessment Criteria

Statements describing the attributes that will be taken into account in marking an assessment task and the performance required to be awarded marks. The criteria selected for an individual task will be based on the intended learning outcomes, these having been chosen to illustrate the knowledge, understanding and skills that students will typically display in that assessment task.

6.3.4) Categorical Marking

Marking to predetermined and defined percentage mark points rather than marking to every point within the full percentage scale.

6.3.5) Second Marking

Marking of student work by 2 different assessors. In some cases, the second marker will have access to the first marker's comments and/or mark (non-blind marking). In other situations, it may be more appropriate for the second marker to be unaware of the first assessor's mark (blind marking).

Whether second marking is undertaken (blind or otherwise), both markers will normally make notes to enable subsequent discussions to take place where there is a significant difference between the two markers' judgements.

6.3.6) Indicative answer

The assessor's explicit view of what an answer to an assessment task should contain. Indicative and/or model answers are more commonly used where the right answer can be defined precisely.

6.3.7) Marking scheme

A detailed framework for assigning marks, where a specific number of marks are given to individual components of each question and/or questions in an assessment task.

6.3.8) Moderation

The processes undertaken through which assessment outcomes are confirmed as valid and reliable and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently.

Forms of moderation typically include:

- Sample review of first marking, either by an internal or external examiner;
- additional marking, for example of border the results, firsts and fails;
- review of marks: where there is a significant difference between several assessment marks, within or between modules, which indicate the marks may need to be reviewed.

6.3.9) Scaling

The mathematical adjustment made to the marks achieved by a cohort of students should the distribution of marks in that assessment be noticeably different to other

tasks. Scaling should not normally need to be undertaken, outside of mathematical assessments in which a markedly different set of marks can result.

6.3.10) Verification

The processes undertaken to check that marks have been calculated and recorded correctly and to ensure that any other relevant factors have been considered properly in determining a student's results.