

University centre Middlesbrough Assessment and Feedback Policy

Owner	HE Office
Version Number	1.6
Effective Date	January 2026
Date to Be Reviewed	July 2027

Contents

1.	Purpose	4
2.	Scope	4
3.	Key Definitions.....	4
4.	Core Concepts.....	5
5.	Structure	6
6.	Policy and Development Process	6
7.	Principles	6
7.1.	Assessment Design	6
7.2.	Assessment Standards	8
7.3.	Late Assessment Submission Regulations	10
7.4.	Assessment Feedback.....	11
8.	Appendix 1: Assessment Approval	12
9.	Appendix 2: Generic Grade Boundaries and Assessment Criteria for Assessed Work	12
10.	Appendix 3: Marking and Moderation Processes.....	15
10.1.	Definitions	15
10.2.	Moderation	16
10.3.	Internal Sampling Process	16
10.4.	Double Marking and Concealed Double Marking.....	17
10.5.	Agreement of Marks Following Double Marking.....	17
10.6.	Sample of Work for External Examiner	18
10.7.	Assessments Less Suitable for Internal Sampling/External Examining ...	18
10.8.	Anonymous Marking	19

10.9.	Multiple Occurrences of Modules.....	19
11.	Appendix 4: Retention of Assessed Work.....	19
12.	Appendix 5: Assessment Report Template.....	20
13.	Appendix 6: Internal Sampling Report	20
14.	Appendix 7: Record of Internal Sampling	20
15.	Appendix 8: Record of Double Marking	20
16.	Appendix 9: Record of Checking Process	20
17.	Appendix 10: Module Documentation Table	21

1. Purpose

This policy provides a framework for effective, appropriate and fair assessment practice that promotes learning. The purposes of assessment and feedback are to:

- promote deep learning and to engage students;
- assess the extent to which students have achieved learning outcomes;
- assure standards by demonstrating achievement consistent with other Higher Education Institutions [HEIs];
- help students to reflect upon feedback to evaluate and enhance personal performance and development;
- provide a basis for decisions regarding progression and award.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all students undertaking taught components and programmes on Higher Education programmes at University Centre Middlesbrough (UCM). Following internal moderation and external examiner review of student work, all awards are subject to ratification by relevant awarding bodies.

3. Key Definitions

Terminology	Definition
Assessment	The process of evidencing and evaluating the extent to which a learner has met the assessment learning outcomes.
Formative Assessment & Feedback	Formative assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning. It does not contribute to the final mark given for the module. Instead, formative assessment contributes to learning through providing feedback. Formative feedback should indicate what is good about a piece of work and why; it should also indicate how the work could be improved. Effective formative feedback will affect what the student and the teacher do next and improve the learner's future summative performance.
Summative Assessment	Summative assessment demonstrates the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria used to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme, and which contributes to the final mark given for the module. Summative assessment is used to quantify/reward

	achievement and to provide data for selection (to the next stage in education or to employment). For all these reasons the validity and reliability of summative assessment are of the greatest importance.
Component of Assessment	A constituent part or aspect of a module's overall assessment strategy. Each component will be awarded an individual mark that will be recorded separately but aggregated to form an overall module mark. Components of assessment may be comprised of multiple elements [see below].
Element of Assessment	A constituent part of a component of assessment, for example individual aspects of a portfolio of work. Where a module employs the use of multiple elements within a component, each element will be awarded an individual mark, and these will be aggregated into a single mark for the component.
Feedback	Information given to students about the quality of their performance in an assessment.
Unratified Feedback	Unratified feedback is feedback given to a student before the mark has been agreed (ratified) by the relevant module board.

4. Core Concepts

This policy is founded on the philosophy that assessment is **for** learning and not just **of** learning. It also recognises that timely and effective feedback to students and constructive use of assessment are integral to the learning process and have a considerable influence upon what and how students learn. In addition, this policy is underpinned by the following concepts:

validity – a valid assessment is one that assesses the stated learning outcomes of the relevant module, is set at the right academic level and is consistent with subject benchmarks and/or Professional Statutory & Regulatory Body [PSRB] requirements, as appropriate. Validity of assessment is predominantly addressed in 8.1: Assessment Design.

reliability – a reliable assessment is one in which the mark awarded would not vary significantly with different markers. The starting point for reliability is the development and communication of clear and understandable assessment criteria to students and markers followed by the application of rigorous marking and moderation processes by appropriately qualified staff.

efficiency – this relates to ensuring that assessment workloads for students and staff are manageable and timed appropriately to support learning and minimise non-completion.

transparency – this relates to ensuring that assessment processes and systems are clear and understandable for students, staff and external examiners.

diversity – this relates to the use of an appropriate range of assessment strategies that meet the requirements of the discipline and the learning needs of students.

5. Structure

This policy utilises the following sections: Assessment Design, Assessment Standards, and Assessment Feedback. Each of the sections has principles, with supporting statements.

6. Policy and Development Process

This policy has been developed in consultation with representatives from all academic and relevant central departments as well as feedback from students

This policy has also been developed with due regard to the Office for Students conditions of registration in particular Condition B4 (assessment and Awards) as well as relevant sections of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Quality Code. It has also drawn upon best practice in the sector.

Finally, this policy reflects the standards and expectations as set out by University Centre Middlesbrough's awarding partners.

7. Principles

7.1. Assessment Design

7.1.1 Assessments are clearly matched to learning outcomes and set at the appropriate academic level:

- a) Each learning outcome will be subject to summative assessment. This will be mapped and checked at the approval event
- b) Assessment tasks will be appropriate to the academic level of the module. This will be checked at the approval event.

7.1.2 Programme assessment strategies include a range of summative methods that encourage learning and counter possible bias associated with individual assessment methods:

- a) Each programme assessment strategy is developed taking account of the way in which assessment/tasks integrate with each other, both within and across modules, pathways, and programmes
- b) Assessment tasks are designed on the basis that they are appropriate to assess the type of learning outcomes
- c) Where appropriate, assessment tasks are work-related to ensure that graduates exit with appropriate employability skills
- d) Where group working forms part of an assessment strategy, consideration is given to whether marks should be awarded to individuals or to the group. The method used to manage this is clearly explained in the assessment strategy and communicated in all assessment briefs.

7.1.3 Assessment practices are inclusive, ensuring all students have equal opportunity to demonstrate achievement:

- a) Students are given equal opportunity to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes and competence standards as appropriate
- b) Where students have a confirmed special educational need, Where possible, reasonable adjustments to assessments are made where it can be demonstrated that a student would be disadvantaged by being expected to complete the planned assessment task.

7.1.4 Programme assessment strategies include a range of formative methods/processes that encourage learning:

- a) Each programme incorporates a range of formative processes including oral, written, and where feasible, peer assessment and feedback
- b) Due regard is given to the inclusion of an early formative piece of work to promote skills development in Level 4 or the transition phase between levels i.e. early in Level 5 and 6
- c) Where appropriate, some assessment tasks are designed to encourage students to apply formative feedback (from staff or peers) to improve their performance in the next assessment
- d) Where less familiar types of assessment are used, timely opportunities are given for students to practice/receive constructive feedback.

7.1.5 Assessment strategies and tasks promote good academic practice:

- a) Assessments are designed with due regard to preventing academic misconduct
- b) Students are informed about academic misconduct and its consequences using standard information
- c) Appropriate support for the development of good academic practice is provided for students.

7.1.6 Assessment workloads are realistic and not over-burdensome for students and staff and are timed to support learning:

- a) Assessment deadlines are spread across an appropriate time period to avoid assessment bunching and minimise non-completion
- b) The volume of assessment does not exceed that required to assess the learning outcomes.
- c) The use of elements within components of assessment (compound assessment) does not result in over-assessment within a module or programme.

7.1.7 Assessment strategies are regularly reviewed and, where appropriate, revised:

- a) Module leaders reflect annually on the appropriateness of/enhance assessment strategies in light of student feedback, performance, and external examiner comments
- b) Module statistics are reviewed at Module Boards and where issues related to student performance are identified, action plans are implemented
- c) Detailed analysis of student performance data is undertaken as part of annual programme monitoring and periodic programme review, and assessment strategies are adjusted where necessary.

7.2. Assessment Standards

7.2.1 Assessment processes are transparent and clearly communicated to relevant stakeholders:

- a) Clear information regarding assessment regulations and processes is provided to students and other stakeholders to promote assessment and regulatory literacy
- b) External examiners are provided with access to information about assessment processes

- c) For each module, timely information is given which clearly states the purposes and methods of module assessment, assessment criteria, and how and when students receive feedback
- d) Consideration is given to how students may be more involved in the assessment process for each module/programme – e.g. self, peer, group activities, exercises to help students use assessment criteria, and peer marking.

7.2.2 Clear and appropriate assessment criteria are provided for all assessment tasks:

- a) Each module assessment task has specific assessment criteria based on the module learning outcomes
- b) Where appropriate, assessment criteria are developed with regard to the generic marking criteria in addition to the relevant learning outcomes
- c) In all assessment tasks, UCM adheres to a level-based Encourage, Support and Enforce policy which is explained in the table below. The policy refers to exceeding the word count limits. Coursework which falls below the word limit may be penalised if information is missing/criteria not met.

Word Count Limit			
Level	Principle	Comment	Penalty
4	<i>Encourage</i>	Students must aim to remain within the word count limit. If students exceed the limit: Tutors flag the issue in student feedback and, in feedback tutorials, offer guidance regarding meeting count limits.	No Penalty.

5	Support	Students must remain within the word count limit but can exceed the limit by up to 10% without penalty. If students exceed the word count limit by >10%, a penalty applies. Tutors flag the issue in student feedback and, in feedback tutorials, offer guidance regarding meeting count limits.	Assessors will not read beyond, and therefore will not assess, any text beyond the upper word count limit +10%.
6/7	Enforce	Students must remain within the word count limit. If students exceed the upper word count limit, a penalty applies.	Assessors will not read beyond, and therefore will not assess, any text beyond the upper word count limit.

7.2.3 Marking and moderation practices promote consistency, reliability and objectivity:

- a) Marking and internal and external moderation processes are carried out in accordance with the processes identified in Appendix 3
- b) External examiners report any concerns regarding standards of assessment and also areas of good practice
- c) UCM ensures that all concerns reported by external examiners are responded to appropriately/take any necessary actions and disseminate good practice
- d) All assessed work is retained by UCM for five years..

7.2.4 Assessment of students is carried out by appropriately prepared and supported staff who are competent to undertake this role:

- a) Assessments are set and marked by appropriately qualified staff.

7.3. Late Assessment Submission Regulations

All summative assessment submissions are subject to the below regulations depending on the relevant awarding body:

- a) All submissions occurring prior to the submission deadline are considered for the full range of marks available.

- b) The Open University - late submission is accepted up to and including 6 days *after* the deadline, however, the mark will be capped as follows in line with OU regulations: a 10% deduction from the overall marked score for each day late. The reduction is applied to the 40% pass mark (undergraduate) and 50% pass Mark (post-graduate) but no further. Any submissions occurring 7 or more days *after* the deadline are refused and a mark of 0% is entered into the student record.
- c) Pearson - any submissions after the deadline are capped at a pass mark for the assessment.

7.4. Assessment Feedback

Students are provided with timely feedback which promotes learning, encourages critical reflection, and facilitates development.

- a) All programmes have a feedback strategy including both formative and summative feedback
- b) Individual formal feedback is provided electronically to students on all summative assessed work
- c) Opportunities are made available for students to discuss their feedback with a module tutor as appropriate.
- d) Unratified feedback is provided for all first sit summative assessments normally within 20 working days of the submission date.
- e) Students are informed about the position regarding the reading of draft work for that module or programme prior to submission.
- f) Students who require additional learning support for conditions such as dyslexia may receive feedback on aspects of their work impacted upon by their condition, depending on their preference. Programme leaders and module tutors discuss this with students who apply for reasonable adjustments (detailed in the [UCM HE Extenuating Circumstances Policy](#)). Aspects of submissions which are directly linked to additional learning needs are not taken into consideration when assigning grades to submissions.

8. Appendix 1: Assessment Approval

The key steps involved in assessment approval are as follows:

- a) Summative assessment design and type, including the allocation of marks, is the collective responsibility of the team and must be led by a subject expert. Drawing on additional expertise as required, assessments are subject to a process of peer review to include:
 - the clarity of the task(s);
 - the level and difficulty of the task(s);
 - relevance to and coverage of the learning outcomes being assessed;
 - appropriateness/suitability to type and mode of student;
 - overlap with other assessments;
 - clarity and appropriateness of assessment criteria;
 - appropriateness of marking scheme, model answers, etc. to questions posed and as a means of discriminating performance and attainment;
 - topicality of the assessment within the developing subject area;
 - over time, range and variation of assessment topics.
- b) All summative assessment proposals are subject to approval. This should normally apply to both first sit and reassessment proposals.
- c) Once the final format is agreed, all summative assessments are shared with external examiners to comment on the appropriateness and standard of the summative assessment. If extenuating circumstances prevent formal submission of the assessment to the external examiner, they are advised of the situation and their agreement sought on the assessment strategy and key aspects of the assessment.
- d) All assessment information is communicated to students at the beginning of a module.
- e) Unless educationally appropriate, assessments are not re-used from one year to the next and staff ensure that assessments do differ. It is, however, accepted that in some cases it is appropriate to re-use the same assessments from one year to the next e.g. in modules that may be project based or where the assessment focus is on the student's own organisation.

9. Appendix 2: Generic Grade Boundaries and Assessment Criteria for Assessed Work

(Open University Awards)

Level 4 (Certificate)	Level 5 (Diploma)	Level 6 (UG Degree)	Level 7 (PG Degree)
85%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of a very high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of a thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with very effective use of source material and accurate referencing.	85%-100% Exceptional work with presentation of the highest standard. The work contains coherent arguments and ideas. There is a detailed understanding of subject matter and critical analysis of issues/problems. Points are made clearly and concisely, always substantiated by appropriate use of source material. There is evidence of a sound ability to critically interrelate theories with examples from practice where appropriate.	85%-100% Exceptional work. Presentation is logical, error-free and, where appropriate, creative. There is an in-depth understanding of issues/problems and excellent critical/deep engagement with the material and concepts involved. Very skilful interpretation of data. Arguments, ideas and, where appropriate, solutions are presented coherently and fully underpinned by thorough research and reading.	90%-100% Exceptional work. Presentation is logical, error-free and, where appropriate, creative. There is an in-depth understanding of issues/problems and excellent critical/deep engagement with the material and concepts involved. Very skilful interpretation of data. Arguments, ideas and, where appropriate, solutions are presented coherently and fully underpinned by thorough research and reading.
70%-84% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. There is coherence of ideas and demonstration of thorough knowledge and understanding. Arguments are supported by wide reading with appropriate use of source material and accurate referencing.	70%-84% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Evidence of strong knowledge and understanding together with some critical analysis and insight. Source material is used effectively to support arguments, ideas and solutions.	70%-84% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Demonstrates an excellent knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some effective critical and analytical application of relevant research and reading.	80%-89% Outstanding work with presentation of a very high standard. There is comprehensive understanding of key concepts and knowledge and clear evidence of critical analysis and insight. Accurate interpretation of data with arguments, ideas and solutions presented effectively and based on strong research and reading.
55-69% The work is well presented and coherently structured. There is evidence of a sound knowledge and understanding of the issues with theory linked to practice where appropriate. Most material used has been referenced/acknowledged.	55-69% Very good presentation. Sound knowledge and understanding with an emerging ability to critically engage with and apply the concepts involved linking them to practice where appropriate. Good use of source material which supports most points clearly. Content is wholly relevant and is coherently structured.	55-69% The work is very good, logically structured and presented to a high standard. Demonstrates a strong knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some critical and analytical application of relevant research.	70-79% Extremely good work with presentation of a high standard. Demonstrates an excellent knowledge base with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some effective critical and analytical application of relevant research and reading.
40%-54% Presentation is acceptable but attention to structure and style is required. The content is relevant but largely descriptive. There is evidence of a reasonable level of knowledge and understanding but there is limited use of source material to support the arguments, proposals or solutions. Some links are made to practice where appropriate.	40%-54% Adequate presentation. The work is descriptive and/or lacks critical analysis where required but is relevant with limited though sufficient evidence of knowledge and understanding. There is some evidence of reading although arguments/ proposals/solutions often lack coherence and may be unsubstantiated by relevant source material or partially flawed. Links to practice are made where appropriate.	40%-54% Adequate presentation. The work displays basic knowledge and understanding of the topic but is largely descriptive. There is an attempt to bring together different ideas and concepts although this would have been strengthened by the inclusion of further key issues. The structure of the work requires attention to its coherence and logical development of content. The link between theory and practice, where appropriate, is somewhat tenuous and its development would enhance the work considerably.	60%-69% Structure and organisation of work is good and presented to a high standard. Knowledge base displayed is sound with a clear understanding of the issues and application to practice where appropriate. There is some critical and analytical application of relevant research.
30-39%	30-39%	30-39%	50-59%

The work is poorly structured and presented. Some material may be irrelevant. Content is based largely on taught elements with very little evidence of reading around the topic and little or no reference to practice where appropriate.	Poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a weak knowledge base with some key aspects not addressed and use of irrelevant material. Flawed use of techniques. Limited evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. Little reference to practice where appropriate.	The work is poorly presented and contains numerous errors, inconsistencies and omissions with limited use of source material. The work displays a weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. There is limited evidence of the application of theory to practice where appropriate. It contains many unsupported statements with limited attempts to bring issues together and lacks critical analysis and reflection.	Structure and organisation of work is adequate. Knowledge displayed is adequate but work is predominantly descriptive and relies on given source material. Learning outcomes are achieved. The work contains some discussion and interpretation of relevant perspectives although further development of the arguments presented would be beneficial. Adequate range of source material utilised. Minor errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.
15% - 29% The work is very poorly structured and presented. Much material is irrelevant. Content is based almost entirely on taught elements with very little evidence of any purposeful reading around the topic. No effective reference to practice where appropriate. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.	15% - 29% Very poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a very weak knowledge base with many key omissions and much material irrelevant. Use of inappropriate or incorrect techniques. Very little evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. No links to practice where appropriate. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.	15% - 29% The work is very poorly presented and contains numerous serious errors, inconsistencies and omissions with little use of source material. The work displays a very weak knowledge base and a lack of sufficient understanding of the topic. There is very little evidence of the application of theory to practice where appropriate. It contains many unsupported statements with very little attempt to bring issues together and there is a complete lack of critical analysis and reflection. To obtain a mark of 20% the work must show evidence of a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and with the subject matter.	40% - 49% (Fail) Structure and organisation of work is unsatisfactory. Knowledge displayed is factually accurate, however lacks critical analysis. Limited attainment of learning outcomes. Arguments/proposals/solutions lack coherence and are unsubstantiated. Limited/dated range of source material utilised. Limited application of theory to practice (where relevant). Errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.
0% - 14% The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect or omitted. No evidence of critical thought. No effective use of supporting material. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	0% - 14% The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect or omitted. No evidence of critical thought. No effective use of supporting material. No links to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	0% - 14% The work is extremely poorly structured and presented. It demonstrates no real knowledge or understanding of key concepts and principles. Much material is irrelevant, incorrect, inconsistent or omitted. No evidence of critical analysis and reflection. No effective use of supporting material. No application of theory to practice where appropriate. Not a genuine attempt to engage with the assessment requirements and/or subject matter.	0% - 39% (Fail) Poorly structured, incoherent and wholly descriptive work. Evidence of a weak knowledge base with some key aspects not addressed and use of irrelevant material. Limited evidence of appropriate reading and no evidence of critical thought. Little reference to practice where appropriate.

Pearson awards

The grading of BTEC Higher National qualifications is at the unit and the qualification level. Each successfully completed unit will be graded as a Pass, Merit or Distinction.

- A Pass is awarded for the achievement of all outcomes against the specified assessment criteria.
- Merit and Distinction grades are awarded for higher level achievement.

Assessment decisions for Pearson BTEC Higher Nationals are based on the specific assessment criteria given in each unit and set at each level of attainment in that unit and at the qualification level. The criteria for each unit have been defined according to a framework to ensure that standards are consistent in the qualification and across the suite as a whole. The way in which individual units are written provides a balance of assessment of understanding, practical skills and behavioural attributes appropriate to the purpose of the qualifications.

The assessment criteria for a unit are based on a hierarchy. For example, if a merit criterion requires the student to show 'analysis' and the related pass criterion requires the student to 'explain', then to gain a merit the student will need to cover both 'explain' and 'analyse'. The unit assessment grid shows the relationships among the criteria so that assessors can apply all the criteria to the student's evidence at the same time.

10. Appendix 3: Marking and Moderation Processes

The following marking and moderation processes are identified to promote consistency, reliability, and objectivity. In addition, they ensure that summative assessments have been through a defined and evidenced set of processes which demonstrate consistency of judgment and of standards for all students in any given cohort, irrespective of the number of staff involved in delivery and marking, location of students, method of delivery, etc.

10.1. Definitions

Moderation	This is an overarching term to describe the processes which take place following first marking to verify the judgment of the first marker(s). This could include double marking, concealed double marking, or internal sampling (depending upon the complexity of provision).
First Marking	A process whereby a member of staff awards marks and produces feedback for the work of students.
Double Marking	A process whereby a second person(s) marks the work in addition to the first marker, allocates a mark, and provides comments.
Concealed Double Marking	A process whereby a second person(s), without sight of the first markers comments or feedback, marks the work, allocates a mark, and provides comments.
Internal Sampling	A process whereby a nominated person reviews a sample of work, including the mark allocated and feedback, with the aim of confirming the judgment of the first marker(s).

Anonymous Marking	Marking where the student's identity is unknown to the marker.
Checking	A process following first marking of objective assessments (e.g. MCQs) whereby a second person checks to ensure that marks have been calculated and recorded accurately.

10.2. Moderation

10.2.1 The minimum standard for all taught modules comprises internal sampling for each assessment component, apart from dissertations or equivalent projects involving 30 credits or more. Under certain circumstances, additional verification processes may be required and where double marking of a sample or full cohort of work is required, further internal sampling is not normally necessary.

10.2.2 Where assessments comprise solely of objective tools (e.g. Multiple Choice Questions, objective right and wrong answers) then internal sampling is replaced by a process of checking by a second person to ensure that marks have been calculated and recorded accurately.

10.2.3 All internal sampling/checking activity *must* be complete prior to releasing unratified marks to students.

10.3. Internal Sampling Process

10.3.1 At the commencement of the module, the programme leader identifies a person or persons suitable to undertake internal sampling (referred to hereafter as the internal sampler). This is normally a colleague who also teaches on the module or a member of the programme team. For modules with large numbers of students, it may be appropriate to identify more than one person to undertake this activity.

10.3.2 The internal sampler for all awards of the Open University must have access to the work of all markers for the cohort and normally selects a sample based on the following parameters:

- work awarded a fail;
- work allocated a 70% mark or equivalent grade (or above);
- borderline pass work (3% below to 3% above the pass mark);
- a sample of work across all other bands (normally comprising approximately 10% of the work in those bands) to include some work from each marker;
- any additional work where the first marker requests a second opinion;
- any students in the cohort enrolled to a Single Registerable Module.

10.3.3 The criteria for selection of a sample for all Pearson awards should ensure that all of the following are included:

- Every Assessor
- Every unit
- Work from every assignment
- Every assessment site (for multi- site centres)
- Pass, Merit and Distinction achievement (a student who has not yet achieved or a referred student is also a valid selection).

10.3.4 The internal sampler reviews the work selected and considers whether the assessment criteria have been applied appropriately/consistently, and whether the mark awarded/proposed feedback is appropriate.

10.3.5 Where the internal sampler confirms the marks of the first markers, they complete an assessment report in conjunction with the module leader (see Appendix 5). This is then made available to the external examiner, in addition to a full list of marks and the sample of work.

10.3.6 Where the internal sampler identifies issues relating to consistency in the application of the assessment criteria, this should be reviewed with the module leader and relevant markers. Where concerns are deemed to be significant, the relevant programme leader is informed and a course of action identified to assure standards. This normally entails initiating concealed double marking of either the work of all students or all the work of particular markers. Following this, marks are agreed. The assessment report provides the external examiner with an overview of the process.

10.4. Double Marking and Concealed Double Marking

10.4.1 All dissertations or equivalent projects involving 30 credits or more are routinely concealed double marked. It is acknowledged that for some project equivalents e.g. art and design shows, it is not appropriate to operate concealed double marking. In such circumstances, an alternative approach should be discussed with the Higher Education Office and the necessary approvals put in place before the process is amended.

10.4.2 There are a variety of factors which can potentially reduce the reliability of marking, such factors are taken into consideration when deciding whether double marking (concealed or otherwise) is required. The guidance contained in this document directs programme teams as to whether double marking is required. Factors which increase the likelihood that double marking is required include:

- the level of subjectivity required when reaching a judgement;
- whether or not it is a new module;
- the experience and quantity of markers;
- whether or not the assessment technique is new or familiar to the markers;
- the credit value/level of the module;
- large teaching teams and/or multi-site provision;
- whether or not the work constitutes 100% of the module mark;
- whether there are specific Professional, Statutory & Regulatory Body requirements;
- concerns raised previously by external examiners.

The above list is not exhaustive, and it may be a combination of more than one factor which is used to determine the requirement for double marking. For example, a new module, with a familiar assessment type and experienced marking team would not necessitate double marking. However, a new module with an innovative assessment type which constitutes 100% of the module mark may necessitate double marking.

10.4.3 Double marking may include a sample or may be required for all work and where feasible and practicable it should be concealed. Where double marking a sample reveals any significant issues, the remaining work is double marked.

10.5. Agreement of Marks Following Double Marking

10.5.1 Following double marking the first and double markers meet and compare their judgements on the mark awarded and feedback. If there are no significant differences the markers agree the mark and content of feedback to the student. The

first marker then makes any necessary alterations to the feedback and the student only receives one set of feedback, signed by the first marker.

- 10.5.2 The name of both markers, their marks and the agreed mark are recorded for inclusion in the assessment report.
- 10.5.3 If there are significant differences in the marks (e.g. spanning across classifications) the reasons for allocating marks are explored in an attempt to reach agreement on the mark to be awarded. If the two markers are able to resolve their differences, then they agree a set of marks for the work.
- 10.5.4 If the two markers are unable to resolve their differences, the matter must be reported to the programme/curriculum team leader. They then review with the markers the marks allocated and attempt to reach a resolution. Where this cannot be easily achieved an independent person is asked to double mark (concealed) the work (third marker) and following discussion, the programme/curriculum team leader determines a final mark to be given to the student. Any submissions subject to this process should be submitted to the relevant external examiner(s) for review.

10.6. Sample of Work for External Examiner

- 10.6.1 External examiners are given access to course VLE's and all student submissions. Programme leaders can advise a representative 'sample' of 2 submissions per grade boundary upon request.
- 10.6.2 Following reassessment, external examiners may choose to sample work again.
- 10.6.3 External examiners are also provided with relevant module information, assessment information including assessment criteria, results for the full cohort, and the assessment report.

10.7. Assessments Less Suitable for Internal Sampling/External Examining

- 10.7.1 The use of certain types of assessment, e.g. practical examinations or oral presentations present challenges in terms of the internal and external moderation processes. The key questions for the programme team to answer are:
- How will external examiners be provided with evidence on which to base their judgment regarding the maintenance of academic standards?
- How robustly can they defend challenges to the objectivity of the assessment process, should this be required?
- 10.7.2 Assessments which cannot be either internally or externally moderated are normally restricted to a maximum weighting of 30% of the total module overall mark. The external examiner should be provided with a sample of any artefacts produced by the student, where relevant and practicable, in addition to feedback for the usual sample.
- 10.7.3 Where such assessments are weighted at greater than 30% of the module mark, the module leader proposes a strategy for moderation to the appropriate programme/curriculum team leader. This will normally involve:
- Where possible, recordings can be made of the assessment activity and these can be used as part of the internal sampling and external examining process. Students are informed of the requirement to make a recording/the rationale, and their permission sought.

- If recordings cannot be made, double marking for all students should be undertaken.
- Ensuring that relevant artefacts produced by the student are made available to the external examiner for the usual sample of work, in addition to the feedback given to the student.
- Providing the external examiner with an opportunity to attend to observe some of the assessment activities.
- If none of the above strategies are appropriate, the external examiner should be invited to attend the assessment activity.

10.7.4 Where assessment of professional competence of students is undertaken in the workplace this is generally undertaken by practice assessors. Such assessments should be undertaken by suitably prepared assessors via mechanisms agreed at programme approval. The form of moderation should also be agreed at programme approval and involves the relevant academic link tutor and practice assessor.

10.8. Anonymous Marking

UCM operates a process of anonymous marking for all summative examinations.

10.9. Multiple Occurrences of Modules

10.9.1 This relates to where modules are delivered with different start/completion dates to different discrete cohorts and may include multiple deliveries across different sites.

10.9.2 For the purposes of marking, moderation, and external examining processes the default position is that each location/cohort is regarded as being a separate delivery and should be managed accordingly. When multiple provision is regarded as being a single delivery, the samples selected for internal and external scrutiny should include work from all locations/cohorts.

11. Appendix 4: Retention of Assessed Work

All assessed work, including that submitted electronically is normally retained for five years after the end date of a programme.

In the event that a student seeks an academic appeal or is otherwise in pursuit of redress through litigation or complaint that would exceed the normal five-year retention period, then the work of such a student is retained.

In all other cases (except as below), student work may be destroyed at the close of this period. All work should be destroyed as confidential waste.

It is not the policy of UCM to normally return work to students, although programme teams may do so at their discretion. Students are advised to keep a copy of conventional assignments if they so wish.

Certain types of work (e.g. original artwork or artefacts) may not be easily copied and students may have a legitimate need to use such work to demonstrate their abilities to potential employers and others. Students may request the return of such work and programme teams make appropriate arrangements.

However, If a student is considering applying for assessment review they should, if possible, apply before requesting the return of any assessed work which may be subject to such review, and which then will not be returned until completion of the review process. Note that if an application for assessment review is accepted, the College will not be able to reconsider work which has already been returned.

The UCM Student Return of Work Request Form is available [here](#).

12. Appendix 5 Assessment Report Template

Available [here](#).

13. Appendix 6: Internal Sampling Report

Available [here](#).

14. Appendix 7: Record of Internal Sampling

Available [here](#).

15. Appendix 8: Record of Double Marking

Available [here](#).

16. Appendix 9: Record of Checking Process

Available [here](#).

17. Appendix 10: Module Documentation Table

Document	Responsible	Due
Module report (only required in specific circumstances, check the template for details)	Module leader	2 nd sit progression/award board (unless all students have passed prior to 1 st board, in which case: 1 st sit board)
Assessment report (1 document per assessment)	Module leader/internal sampler	1 st sit progression/award board
Internal sampling report (1 document per assessment)	Internal sampler	1 st sit progression/award board
Record of double marking (only for 'project' assessments on modules of 30 credits and above)	Module leader/internal sampler	1 st sit progression/award board
Record of checking (only for assessments marked 'objectively' e.g. a set of multiple choice questions or test)	Internal sampler/assessment checker	1 st sit progression/award board

Revision History		
Version	Date	Detail
1.0	September 2017	
1.1	September 2018	Document edited for clarity and to homogenise presentation. QAA URLs updated. References to HESC changed to AB. Implement URLs to College website HE Essential Information page. Add item c) to section 7.2.2, assignment word count policy. <i>Return of Student Coursework</i> form added to Appendix D.
1.2	October 2019	Appendix G removed. Appendix G1 and G2 added to include Record of Internal Sampling and Double Marking.
1.3	November 2019	Errors Corrected
1.4	July 2022	Late submission of work regulations amended and module documentation table added.
1.5	June 2023	
1.6	October 2023	Level 7 marking criteria added. Information about timescale for internal sampling/checking activity added. Advice included re: including work which double markers can not agree upon being included in EE sample
1.7	October 2026	Section 10.3 updated to include Single Registerable modules Section 10.4 updated to reflect change of responsible party.
1.8	June 2026	The term 'College' replaced with University Centre Middlesbrough (UCM) throughout the document. Section 6 updated to reflect current practice and terminology. Section 7.1.3 b wording updated to reflect changes to consideration of reasonable adjustments. Section 7.2.3 updated to align to UCM policy on retention of student work. Section 7.3 numbering updated. Section 8b updated to reflect practice. Section 9 updated to include Pearson grading criteria. Section 10.3.3 updated to include reference to Pearson sampling process. Section 10.4.1 updated to reflect changes to remits and responsibilities. Section 11 updated to reflect current assessment retention period and to clarify the requirements for students seeking return of work which is subject to a request for review. Logo removed pending update approval Title amended from HE to University Centre Middlesbrough

