



Lincoln Bishop University

Document Administration

Document Title:	Code of Practice for the Assessment of Students	
Document Category:	Code of Practice	
Version Number:	6.0	
Status:	APPROVED	
Reason for Development:	This Code sets out the procedures to be followed for the process of Assessment of Students and assigns responsibility for carrying out various tasks.	
Scope:	This Code applies to staff and students	
Author/Developer:	Academic Faculties	
Owner:	Executive Dean: Teaching, Learning & Student Success	
Assessment: (where relevant)	<u>Assessment Type:</u> Equality Assessment Legal Information Governance Academic Governance	<u>Assessment Status:</u> COMPLETE NOT REQUIRED NOT REQUIRED NOT REQUIRED
Consultation: (where relevant)	<u>Consultation Type:</u> Staff Trade Unions via HR Students via Students' Union Any External Statutory Bodies	<u>Consultation Status:</u> NOT REQUIRED COMPLETE NOT REQUIRED
Authorising Board:	Senate	
Date First Authorised:	08 December 2015	
Reviewed & Effective From:	11 March 2026 – <i>Effective from 1 September 2026</i>	
Next Review Due*:	February 2029 – <i>unless required earlier</i>	
Document Location:	University Website	
Document Control:	All printed versions of this document are classified as uncontrolled. A controlled version is available from the University Website.	
Alternative Format:	If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact policy@lincolnbishop.ac.uk	

***Please Note:** This document remains valid until formally revoked or replaced by the University.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

VERSION CONTROL TABLE

<u>Version Number</u>	<u>Date Authorised</u>	<u>Summary of Key Changes</u>
4.0	22 July 2019	Minor changes to update terminology and clarify the moderation process
5.0	18 October 2023	Constructive alignment with the Regulations for Awards. Removal of procedural information now included as an annex
6.0	11 March 2026	Rebranding, nomenclature and external references updated. Marking and Moderation Guidance amalgamated within the Code.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This Code of Practice sets out the terms under which students of Lincoln Bishop University undertake assessment of their programme(s) of study.
- 1.2. It should be read with reference to the following University Regulations, Codes of Practice and Guidance:
 - 1.2.1. Academic Regulations Governing Taught Qualifications
 - 1.2.2. Regulations for Research Degrees
 - 1.2.3. Code of Practice for Academic Misconduct
 - 1.2.4. Code of Practice for Collaborative Provision
 - 1.2.5. Code of Practice for the Conduct of Boards of Examiners
 - 1.2.6. Code of Practice for External Examining
 - 1.2.7. Code of Practice for Students with Access Needs
 - 1.2.8. Code of Practice for the Validation of Programmes
 - 1.2.9. Code of Practice for Work-based Learning
- 1.3. The Code of Practice for the Assessment of Students is designed to ensure academic standards are consistent with the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and, where relevant, meet the requirements of professional, statutory or regulatory bodies (PSRBs). It also ensures that judgements made regarding students' work are reliable, consistent and free from bias, and that they accord with clear criteria.
- 1.4. The Code seeks to establish close links between summative assessment (which contributes directly to the grade for a module) and the University's strategy on Learning, Teaching and Assessment. Assessment should be regarded as an integral part of the learning opportunities offered to students and should also provide students with clear guidance on the progress that they have made and on the areas in which further development of their knowledge and skills is desirable.
- 1.5. In Higher Education, assessment describes any processes that appraise knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills. There are many different forms of assessment, serving a variety of purposes, which include:
 - 1.5.1. evaluating a student's knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills,
 - 1.5.2. providing a mark or grade that enables a student's performance to be established, and may also be used to make progress decisions,
 - 1.5.3. promoting student learning by providing the student with feedback, to help improve a student's performance,

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 1.5.4. enabling the public (including employers) and Higher Education providers to know that an individual has attained an appropriate level of achievement that reflects the academic standards set by the awarding institution, the FHEQ and PSRBs where relevant.

2. APPROVAL OF SCHEMES OF ASSESSMENT

- 2.1. When preparing programmes of study for validation or revalidation, a scheme of assessment is required that is in accordance with the Code of Practice for the Validation of Programmes. Staff should consider a range of assessment methods to promote effective learning and the development and demonstration of specific knowledge, understanding and skills. Information regarding Schemes of Assessment is contained within Appendix 1.

3. PUBLICATION OF SCHEMES OF ASSESSMENT

- 3.1. The details of the Scheme of Assessment in the programme specification must be made available to all students. The assessment scheme must correspond exactly and in all respects to the validated programme documentation. Reference should be made to the Regulations for the Award where appropriate.
- 3.2. Schemes of Assessment in the programme specification should include a description of the different types of assessment that are in use and provide an explanation of their primary purpose in measuring academic achievement or transferable skills.

4. SETTING ASSIGNMENTS AND EXAMINATION PAPERS

- 4.1. All assessment tasks should be reviewed each academic year, and across the whole academic year if delivery of modules is repeated. It is expected that for most types of assessment, the specific assessment tasks will be varied for each module delivery occurrence unless assessment tasks are specific to each individual's learning context (e.g. final year project topic, reflective task based on work-based learning).
- 4.2. When setting assignments, academic teams should consider the potential, or request, use of AI by students to generate content in devising assessments. All efforts should be made to include live Q&A elements to assessments for practice assessments to check student knowledge and understanding.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 4.3. For all modules that contribute to the degree classification, the retrieval assessments will normally be a reworked version of the original submission, responding to feedback, unless the module specification confirms that the task will be different.
- 4.4. The details of every assessed assignment (including re-assessment) must be set out in a separate assignment brief. The brief must be issued to students in the approved format at the start of the module.
- 4.5. The external examiner system should be used for providing advice and feedback on the setting of assessment briefs that contribute to a final degree classification for taught degree awards. The deadline for the preparation of assessments will allow sufficient time for this external review to take place. An exception may be made for small-scale exercises and tests even though these may contribute to a final classification. The external examiner should, however, be briefed about the function of such forms of assessment in the overall scheme and may ask for further details including examples of such exercises/tests and/or related student work.
- 4.6. Programme teams should, as far as possible, minimise the 'bunching' of submission dates to help spread students' workload. Care is particularly important where two or more subjects contribute to a programme or where students are undertaking workplace learning or part time study. Reasonable adjustments are made for students who need special assessment arrangements (see Code of Practice for Students with Access Needs).

5. TIME-CONSTRAINED ASSIGNMENTS

- 5.1. Time-constrained assessments (TCA) require students to attend an assessment at a specific time and for a specific duration (e.g. examinations, class-tests, presentations, skills-focused practical demonstrations, performances). Extensions are not permitted for TCA. Should a student be unable to attend a TCA, they can apply for extenuating circumstances.
- 5.2. Examinations must be held during the designated exam weeks, normally at the end of each semester. Details must be provided of any special equipment which may be needed for the examination and any material which may be consulted.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 5.3. The Programme Leader is responsible for advising the Faculty Administration Manager at the start of each semester of any examinations that will take place during the following assessment period. The Faculty Administration Manager will prepare an examination timetable and make arrangements for the invigilation of the examinations. Students must be advised of the exact time, date and location of the examination, typically four weeks in advance, by the Faculty Administration Manager.
- 5.4. Following consultation with the External Examiner, the examination papers must be lodged with the Faculty Administration Manager for secure keeping at least four weeks before the examination.
- 5.5. After the examination is completed, scripts will be returned by the invigilator to the Faculty Administration Manager. Programme tutors will collect and sign for the scripts prior to marking.
- 5.6. In setting assessment tasks, care should be taken to avoid replication (e.g. essay titles, examination questions) which would allow students to answer on the basis of research conducted for previously submitted assessed work.

6. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE SUBMISSION OF SUMMATIVE COURSEWORK

- 6.1. It is the responsibility of students to follow the instructions for the submission of their work for assessment. Coursework may be submitted up to five working days in advance through the University's electronic systems (except where a longer period has been stated). Guidance on the formatting of assessed work will be provided in the Academic Integrity Guide and/or assignment brief, where relevant.
- 6.2. In submitting work for assessment or reassessment, students agree to the following statement:

"I declare that the work submitted for assessment contains no section copied in whole or in part from any other source, including work I have submitted previously at this or another university, unless it is explicitly identified by means of quotation marks and accompanied by detailed references in the approved format. I understand that unidentified and unreferenced copied, AI generated material or purchased assignments constitute plagiarism which is considered academic misconduct and could result in investigation by an Academic Misconduct Panel. I declare that the work is entirely my own."

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 6.3. Work submitted electronically will be screened to check against other material on the web, other submitted work and for the inappropriate use of AI. It will also be stored electronically and may be shared with other institutions for the purposes of plagiarism.
- 6.4. Assignments are submitted electronically, and students should refer to the 'Turnitin Help Guides' which are available on Blackboard.

7. EXTENSIONS AND LATE SUBMISSION

- 7.1. Students may apply for an extension to their submission deadline in accordance with the Academic Regulations.
- 7.2. Students will be contacted by the Faculty Administration Office to confirm the approval of an extension request and the revised date of submission. If the work is submitted by the approved new extended deadline, it will be marked without penalty. The documentation relating to all such claims will be retained and made available to the Board of Examiners if required.
- 7.3. An extension may be given if submission via originality detection software is disrupted by technical issues.
- 7.4. Where assessed work is submitted after the published deadline, the late submission shall lead automatically to the imposition of a penalty in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

8. EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES

- 8.1. The Code of Practice for Extenuating Circumstances set out the procedure for students to follow where unforeseen events prevent them completing assessments within the time allowed or impact adversely on the quality of the assessment submitted.

9. ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE RETRIEVAL OF FAILURE AND COMPLETION OF DEFERRED MODULES

- 9.1. Dates for the submission of retrieval or deferred assessments and for any formal examinations will be set by the University and the outcomes will be considered by a Retrieval Board.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 9.2. There may be an opportunity for final year students to be offered in-programme retrieval following Semester 1 Module Boards. Any other possibilities for in-programme retrieval will normally be specific to particular programmes of study. The relevant Regulations for the Award will specify any such opportunities related to particular programmes.

10. ARRANGEMENTS FOR MARKING AND RETURNING ASSIGNMENTS

- 10.1. Assignments must be marked within the advertised timeframe and in accordance with the published criteria. It is the responsibility of the module leader to ensure that these criteria are available to all internal markers.
- 10.2. Appropriate feedback should be provided electronically on the standard proforma adopted for the programme. The feedback should be linked to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria. It should be designed to promote the student's learning by giving a clear indication of areas of strength as well as advice on how further improvement might be secured. If any targets have been previously identified to the student, and form part of the submission, then feedback should be aligned to those targets as appropriate.
- 10.3. Marked assignments should be available to students by the date indicated on the assignment brief, which should not normally be more than 20 working days
- 10.4. By exception, a longer period may sometimes be appropriate, e.g. if technical issues have occurred when assignments have been submitted via originality detection software (see paragraph 6.3). If it is not possible to adhere to the published timetable, students must be informed of the delay, and a new date should be set.
- 10.5. Provisional marks are made available to students and are confirmed by the Module Board of Examiners. All work is made available for scrutiny by external examiners and for further reviews, and will be retained by the University for a period of six years in accordance with OfS guidance for the retention of assessed work. Students must also be informed that any practical assignments such as physical artefacts will be made available for consideration by the external examiner.
- 10.6. The University does not normally hold meetings of Boards of Examiners at the end of the first semester and marks for both semesters are confirmed at the end of each academic session.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

11. EXAMINATION SCRIPTS

- 11.1. Examination scripts will be returned to students after their results are announced. Samples will be copied and kept for External Examiners and review purposes. Feedback will also be provided with the grade.

12. CONFIDENTIALITY

- 12.1. Module marks obtained by individual students are regarded as confidential.
- 12.2. Final assessment results will be published centrally following the confirmation of grades at the Boards of Examiners. For work submitted electronically, provisional marks will be published via Blackboard.
- 12.3. Members of staff of the University must not communicate assessment results directly to students in person, over the telephone, email or by any other means, unless under exceptional circumstances.

13. MARKING AND MODERATION

- 13.1. Marking must be undertaken in accordance with the detailed published criteria outlined in the assignment brief.
- 13.2. All mark schemes (rubrics) in the University have emerged from a common marksheet for coursework assignments and are included in the assignment brief. Most assignments use a university 'generic' set of criteria. This is broken into 4 equally weighted criteria: Knowledge and Understanding; Development of an Argument; Use of Sources; Communication and Expression. Markers should make it clear to students where their performance aligns with these. The tailoring of marking criteria for a particular assignment may be necessary as this ensures that all learning outcomes are assessed, especially when practical skills need to be demonstrated.
- 13.3. The University policy is that all assignments are marked anonymously wherever possible and in accordance with the Code of Practice for Anonymous Marking. Instructions on how to title assignments are available on the VLE.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 13.4. Programme Leaders must take adequate steps to satisfy themselves that assignments and examination questions are relevant and appropriate, and that the outcomes of assessment, which should be available to all internal and external examiners (and, where appropriate, to placement mentors), are consistent and reliable. Newly appointed staff with limited experience of Higher Education should be appropriately supported through the assessment process and outcomes should be moderated by an experienced marker.
- 13.5. We do not seek to make practice totally consistent across the University, but there should be consistency within teams. Each team is required to consider the annotation of work. Inconsistencies and inaccuracies in grammar, spelling and punctuation should be highlighted for part of the assignment, with a note in the margin to indicate when the marker has ceased to note recurring inaccuracies.
- 13.6. Students with identified access needs related to SpLD are expected to access the designated additional support prior to submission to ensure equity in marking process.
- 13.7. Double or second marking enables a second perspective and commentary on assessments. Unlike moderation, this process may involve individual grades being modified. The following guidelines set out the minimum requirements for second marking:
- 13.7.1. any single assignment at Levels 4, 5 or 6 contributing more than 30 credits will be subject to open second marking.
 - 13.7.2. any single assignment at Level 7 contributing more than 30 credits will be subject to blind second marking.
 - 13.7.3. once second marking has been completed, the marks should be compared with the first marker and the arrangements for moderation apply if there is no agreement, within 3% of the first marker.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

Table 1 – Second Marking and Moderation Samples

Level of Study	Module Credit Value	Moderation	Open Second Marking	Blind Second Marking	Moderation Sample
L4	all	Yes			10% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and most borderlines)
L5	30 credits or fewer	Yes			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
L5	More than 30 credits		Yes		All assignments
L6	30 credits or fewer	Yes			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
L6	More than 30 credits		Yes		All assignments
L7	30 credits or fewer	Yes			20% (at least 6 pieces including a sample of all classifications and borderline marks)
L7	More than 30 credits			Yes	All assignments

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

14. CALIBRATION

- 14.1. Where appropriate, taking into account the number of markers and the number of students being assessed, module leaders should ensure that a calibration activity (which may be referred to as 'standardisation') is undertaken prior to marking the full cohort of submissions. Calibration activities are designed to build confidence in the consistency of marking and feedback across the marking team. Calibration involves independent marking of a number of submissions with a follow-up meeting to discuss and review collaboratively the outcome of each marked piece. Actions which the team would like to take as a result will be annotated on the moderation sheet. This activity is particularly valuable where markers can collectively review the grade, feedback and annotations of assessment tasks prior to marking the full cohort for consistency.
- 14.2. If a calibration activity has not taken place, this should be noted on the moderation sheet with the reason (e.g. single marker, small cohort of students).

15. MODERATION

- 15.1. Moderation is the process whereby the standard of assessment task, the application of assessment criteria, the range of marks awarded, and the quality and appropriateness of the feedback are considered and commented upon. Moderation does not change the mark of individual students and typically should be undertaken by someone who has not delivered the module. The following guidelines and summary table set out the minimum requirement for moderation:
- 15.1.1. On undergraduate programmes, assessments which do not contribute to the final degree classification will be subject to moderation involving a sample of 10%, at least six pieces including a sample of all classifications and most borderline marks.
- 15.1.2. Assessments in stages which contribute to the final degree classification of an undergraduate programme, or Level 7 modules of 30 credits or fewer, will normally be subject to a moderation exercise of a sample of all award classifications.
- 15.1.3. The assessment of a sample of student performances and presentations will be moderated in the same proportions as written assignments. In addition, appropriate evidence, including the use of video recordings, will be used as part of the moderation and external examining processes.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

- 15.1.4. Providing the second marker is within 3 marks of the original marker for each piece of work, no changes will be made to the original marks. In the event of an agreement not being reached, a scaling up of up to +5 or -5 across the whole set of marks may be recommended in accordance with the guidance outlined in Appendix 4.
- 15.1.5. The outcome of all school placements will be moderated.
- 15.1.6. The external examiner will receive the sample which has been internally moderated and will see evidence of moderation.
- 15.1.7. The moderation process must be captured on the standard moderation sheet template.

16. UNIVERSITY VERIFICATION

- 16.1. University verification is a quality assurance process that confirms the internal moderation undertaken by partner organisations is sufficient to maintain robust academic standards. It is not a form of second marking, nor does it replicate internal moderation, which remains the responsibility of the partner. Please see the University Verification process document for full details.

17. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

- 17.1. All newly appointed staff and visiting tutors must be provided with information and training on the University's assessment practices by their Line Manager. Sampling of the marking standards of new staff must, therefore, be undertaken regularly.
- 17.2. Academic staff must be supported by Programme Leaders and Heads of Programmes to participate in appropriate staff development activities relating to both existing, new and innovative assessment and marking practices.
- 17.3. All sections of this Code apply to programmes delivered by collaborative partners, whether the marking is done by University staff or staff at the collaborative partner (as specified in the relevant Memorandum of Cooperation).

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

18. APPENDIX 1 – SCHEMES OF ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING SCHEMES OF ASSESSMENT

Schemes of Assessment

1. The Scheme of Assessment must specify the elements of assessment that students are required to complete in each module and the weighting that is accorded to each element.
2. The Scheme of Assessment must clearly state the volume of assessed work that a student is required to undertake (e.g. by stating the length of written assignments and the duration of presentations or examinations). Care should be taken to ensure that the overall assessment load is appropriate, especially in joint schemes which involve the study of more than one subject, and that there is a consistent relationship within the programme between the volume of assessment required and the credit value and level of the module.
3. There should be reasonable consistency between different programmes as regards the volumes of work required when comparing work related to similar types of assessments. Programme teams shall normally conform to University level guidance on this subject. Validation and Revalidation panels should seek clarification regarding the reasons for any significant deviation from such guidelines before giving their approval to the scheme of assessment.
4. The nature of the assessment must be clearly suited to establishing the extent to which the learning outcomes for each module have been met. The overall scheme of assessment must include a rationale showing how the scheme is matched to the learning outcomes for the programme.
5. The Scheme of Assessment must take account of the provisions of the relevant subject benchmark statements (if any) or benchmark statements for closely related subjects and, where appropriate, the requirements for accreditation by professional bodies.
6. The Scheme of Assessment must be compatible in all respects with the Regulations for that Award.

Monitoring of Schemes of Assessment

7. Programme teams should keep under review the effectiveness and appropriateness of the scheme of assessment. In particular, they should seek to determine how far it is proving successful in establishing the extent to which students have met the learning outcomes and in discriminating between different levels of performance. Teams should consider the evidence provided by the record of student performance as well as feedback from staff, students and the external examiner. The outcome of this consideration should normally be included as part of the Annual Monitoring Process and, where appropriate,

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

in the Programme Team's response to the External Examiner's report. Where the need for revision is indicated, the necessary action should be pursued promptly through the established procedures for approving changes to validated programmes. Such changes would normally be introduced for new cohorts only.

8. Full consideration of the operation of the scheme of assessment and any changes that have been made to it should be included in the annual monitoring report. This report might be expected to include a consideration of:
 - a) the extent to which there is comparability across the programme between assessment load and credit value, and consistency between the programme and other programmes of the University in this respect;
 - b) the correspondence between learning outcomes and assessment methods; the range of assessment methods that students experience, any issues arising from the adoption of innovative modes of assessment, and how any such issues are managed (e.g. articulating any specific team strategies that have been required, for instance for the management of any group and/or peer assessment of learning if applicable);
 - c) the possibility of assessment overload or underload;
 - d) the extent to which students are able to assimilate and reflect on their learning;
 - e) the distribution of assessment tasks across semesters;
 - f) experience of using assessment methods that take account of individual learning needs.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

19. APPENDIX 2 – GRADE DESCRIPTORS FOR ALL UNDERGRADUATE PROVISION

These descriptors are inter-related: with regard to marks of 40% and above, there is an assumption that in awarding marks in one band, work will have met most of the criteria of the band; with regard to marks of 39% and below, there is an assumption that awarding marks in one band, work will not have met most of the criteria of the next higher band.

A mark below 40% indicates a Fail grade (the shaded boxes).

Mark Range	Criteria
90-100%	• Responds to all of the assessment criteria for the task • Displays exceptional degree of originality • Exceptional analytical, problem-solving and/or creative skills • Minor or no errors, for example only minor typographical issues
80-89%	• Responds to all of the assessment criteria for the task • Work of outstanding quality, evidenced by an ability to engage critically and analytically with source material • Likely to exhibit independent lines of argument • Highly original and/or creative responses • Extremely wide range of relevant sources used where appropriate
70-79%	• Responds to all of the assessment criteria for the task • An extremely well-developed response showing clear knowledge and the ability to interpret and/or apply that knowledge • An authoritative grasp of the subject, significant originality and insight, • Significant evidence of ability to sustain an argument, to think analytically, critically and/or creatively and to synthesise material • Evidence of extensive study, appropriate to task
60-69%	• Responds to most of the assessment criteria for the task • A detailed response demonstrating a thorough grasp of theory, understanding of concepts, principles, methodology and content • Clear evidence of insight and critical judgement in selecting, ordering and analysing content • Demonstrates ability to synthesise material, to construct responses and demonstrate creative skills which reveal insight and may offer some originality • Draws on an appropriate range of properly referenced sources
50-59%	• Responds to most of the assessment criteria for the task • An effective response demonstrating evidence of a

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

	clear grasp of relevant material, principles and key concepts • An ability to construct and organise arguments • Some degree of critical analysis, insight and creativity • Demonstrating some conceptual ability, critical analysis and a degree of insight • Accurate, clearly written/presented
40-49%	• Responds to some of the assessment criteria for the task • A response demonstrating an understanding of basic points and principles sufficient to show that some of learning outcomes/assessment criteria have been achieved at a basic level • Suitably organised work demonstrating a reasonable level of understanding • Covers the basic subject matter and is appropriately presented but is rather too derivative and insufficiently analytical • Demonstrates limited conceptual ability, levels of evaluation and demonstration of creative skills • Demonstrates adherence to the referencing conventions appropriate to the subject and/or task
30-39%	• Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • A weak response, which, while addressing some elements of the task, contains significant gaps and inaccuracies • Indicates an answer that shows only weakly developed elements of understanding and/or other skills appropriate to the task • May contain weaknesses in presentation that constitute a significant obstacle in communicating meaning to the assessor
20-29%	• Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • A poor response, which falls substantially short of achieving the learning outcomes • Demonstrates little knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Little evidence of argument and/or coherent use of material
10-19%	• Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • A very poor response demonstrating few relevant facts • Displays only isolated or no knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Little adherence to the task
0-9%	• Overall insufficient response to the assessment criteria • Displays virtually no knowledge and/or other skills appropriate to the task • Work is inappropriate to assessment task given

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

20. APPENDIX 3 – GENERIC POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT MARK DESCRIPTORS

Modules are marked on a range of 0-100%. Mark descriptors are given in the table below.

A mark below 50% indicates a Fail grade (the shaded boxes).

Mark Range	Criteria
90-100%	• Demonstrates an exceptional ability and insight, indicating the highest level of technical competence. • The work has the potential to influence the forefront of the subject and may be of publishable/exhibitable quality. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at the highest possible standard.
80-89%	• Demonstrates an outstanding ability and insight based on authoritative subject knowledge and a very high level of technical competence. • The work is considered to be close to the forefront of the subject and may be close to publishable/exhibitable quality. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a very high level.
70-79%	• Demonstrates an authoritative, current subject knowledge and a high level of technical competence. • The work is accurate and extensively supported by appropriate evidence. It may show some originality. Clear evidence of capacity to reflect critically and deal with ambiguity in the data. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a high level.
60-69%	• Demonstrates a sound, current subject knowledge. No significant errors in the application of concepts or appropriate techniques. May contain some minor flaws. • The work is well developed and coherent; it may show some originality. Clear evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • Relevant generic skills are demonstrated at a good level.
59-59%	• Demonstrates satisfactory subject knowledge. Some evident weaknesses; possibly shown by conceptual gaps, or limited use of appropriate techniques. • The work is generally sound but tends toward the factual or derivative. Limited evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • Relevant generic skills are generally at a satisfactory level.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

40-49%	• Demonstrates limited core subject knowledge. Some important weaknesses; possibly shown by factual errors, conceptual gaps, or limited use of appropriate techniques. • The work lacks sound development. Little evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
30-39%	• Demonstrates inadequate subject knowledge. • The work lacks coherence and evidence of capacity to reflect critically. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
20-29%	• Demonstrates seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject. • The work contains minimal evidence of awareness of relevant issues or theory. • The quality of the relevant generic skills do not meet the requirements of the task.
10-19%	• The work is almost entirely lacking in evidence of knowledge of the subject. • No evidence of awareness of relevant issues or theory. • The quality of the relevant generic skills does not meet the requirements of the task.
0-9%	• The work presents information that is irrelevant and unconnected to the task. • No evident awareness of appropriate principles, theories, evidence and techniques.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS

21. APPENDIX 4 – THE PROCESS OF MODERATION WHEN AN AGREEMENT CANNOT BE REACHED

If the moderator is not able to agree with the first marker's judgement, the following process should be used. It would be expected in any case where scaling is recommended, that the sample size would be increased to make sure the scaling recommended is appropriate.

- a) If the first marker has been consistently generous or too punitive, up to 5 marks each way, a scaling of up to +5 or -5 across the whole set of marks may be recommended. The sample will be passed to the Programme Leader for verification, and the scaling will be applied by the PL in consultation with the original marker.
- b) If the first marker has been too generous or too punitive at either the higher or lower end of a sample of work, the moderator may recommend a scaling to a particular band of the work, indicating this in a table, up to 5% and applied to all the marks in that band.
- c) The sample will be passed to the Programme Leader for verification, and the scaling will be applied by the PL in consultation with the original marker. In this case, it is important to check the rank order or the original marker is not altered.

67-100	-3 recommended
0-66	No change

- d) Occasionally, a scale may be recommended that rectifies generosity in a particular band and punitive marking in another band. In this case, further scripts will be selected, and the scaling will be carried out carefully to ensure that the rank order is not changed. Marks will need to be plotted on a grid to demonstrate this. The PL will be closely involved in any major scaling of this kind. The resulting grid might look like this:

67-100	-3
61-66	stet
51-60	+3
0-50	+5

- e) When scaling is not possible without altering rank order, there should be a re-mark of the whole set of scripts.
- f) The External Examiner should be informed of any scaling or re-marking that has occurred in categories c) and d) above, with evidence of the process undertaken.