

Marking Policy

Contents

1. General Principles	3
1.1 General Principles	3
1.2 Exceptions	3
1.3 Multiple assessment marks combining into one mark	3
1.4 GTAs and marking	3
2. Single Marking.....	4
3. Moderation by retrospective sampling.....	4
3.1 Procedure.....	4
3.2 Resolution of serious concerns raised by a moderator.....	4
3.3 Selecting the sample for moderation – UG Modules.....	5
3.4 Selecting the sample for moderation – PGT Modules	5
4. Check Marking	6
4.1 Procedure.....	6
4.2 Resolution of serious concerns raised by a check marker	6
5. Double Marking.....	6
5.1 Procedure.....	6
Appendix: Marking Methods Overview	8

1. General Principles

1.1 General Principles

- There is no differentiation between modules of different credit amounts.
- There is no differentiation between coursework and exams (apart from the exception below).
- Departments must adopt **one** of the marking methods for **all** their modules (UG **and** PGT) and maintain this approach for the entire academic year.
- The use of the marking form is voluntary, but strongly recommended.

Contribution of assignment to overall module mark	Marking Method		
	Method 1	Method 2	Method 3
0-10%	single marking	single marking	single marking
11-49%	moderation by retrospective sampling	moderation by retrospective sampling	check marking
50-89%	check marking		
90-100%	double marking	double marking	double marking

1.2 Exceptions

- 1.2.1 All UG Y1 exams are single marked unless the overall module mark is 42 or less, in which case there must be full double marking of the exam component.
- 1.2.2. For specialist languages with only one teacher, the Sub-Board Chair should make appropriate arrangements that allow for internal scrutiny while reflecting resource constraints, normally through moderation by retrospective sampling.

1.3 Multiple assessment marks combining into one mark

If several assessment marks combine into one coursework mark of more than 10%, the individual assignments must be moderated by retrospective sampling (if Model 1 or Model 2 are chosen) or check marked (if Model 3 is chosen).

1.4 GTAs and marking

Departments/Sub-Boards may wish to require the retrospective sampling of a larger number of assignments, or double-marking rather than retrospective sampling or check-marking, depending on the involvement of GTAs in marking.

Module convenors are responsible for ensuring that GTAs who mark on their modules are familiar with the School's marking policies, the School's generic assessment criteria, the School's marking guidelines for students with specific learning differences, and any specific requirements relating to the module.

Support for academic teaching teams is also available from Learning & Teaching Development. Please contact Mehmet Izbudak (mi29@soas.ac.uk), Academic Teaching Developer, for further information.

2. Single Marking

Single marking means that assignments are marked by **only one** marker, who is solely responsible for recording comments/feedback and a mark for entry onto the database. Comments/feedback must be provided for all assignments, using TurnItIn.

As the generation of marks involves no second opinion, single-marking is only appropriate for assignments that contribute a small percentage to the overall module mark.

The Visiting Examiner will see a sample of all assignments.

3. Moderation by retrospective sampling

Moderation by retrospective sampling is intended to **confirm** that the first marking is appropriate, fair and consistent, and applies the relevant marking criteria. The moderator does not see each assignment, and therefore **cannot alter individual marks**. Information on how the sample is to be selected is set out in the table below.

3.1 Procedure

1. Once the first marker has completed marking, i.e. recorded their comments/feedback and their suggested mark, they alert the moderator that these are available on TurnItIn.
2. The moderator reviews the sample of assignments and determines whether the quality of the comments/feedback is appropriate, and whether the mark can stand.
3. The moderator does not add comments/feedback or another mark.
4. The moderator must not alter the marks of an individual assessment they have reviewed.
5. If there are concerns over the quality of the first marking, these should be discussed with the first marker and highlighted to the module convenor. If no agreement can be reached on how to address the issues, the Sub-Board Chair should then determine whether full double marking is necessary to resolve the issue and assure quality.
6. A record must be kept of the initial marks, of which assignments were seen by the moderator, and of whether the moderator agreed the first marks or whether a challenge was made, and how this was addressed. If marking forms are not used, the relevant Sub- Board Chair is responsible for ensuring that this information is recorded and can be made available for Visiting Examiners or in case of appeal.
7. The Visiting Examiner will see a sample of all assignments; if practicable, this should not be the same sample that was provided to the moderator.
8. If retrospective sampling cannot be carried out because the module is too small to yield meaningful samples (i.e. it is not possible to meet the minimum number of assignments that must be passed to the moderator as set out below), markers should default to check- marking.

3.2 Resolution of serious concerns raised by a moderator

If the concerns raised by the moderator are found to be serious enough, the Sub-Board Chair can order full double marking, either of all submissions made for the relevant assignment, or – if concerns are focussed on one particular grade band (e.g. all Firsts) – of those submissions that fall within that band.

NB: If there are not enough assignments to meet the criteria for sampling, check marking should be carried out instead.

3.3 Selecting the sample for moderation – UG Modules

Class	Marks Range	Sample Size
Fail	0-39	100%
3 rd	40-49	<u>to be selected as relevant*</u> : 25% of the assignments that fall into these three categories, with a minimum of 10 assignments being seen
2.ii	50-59	
2.i	60-69	
1 st	70-100	100%
Borderlines	39/49/59/69	100%

3.4 Selecting the sample for moderation – PGT Modules

Class	Marks Range	Sample Size
Fail	0-49	100%
Pass	50-59	<u>to be selected as relevant*</u> : 25% of the assignments that fall into these two categories, with a minimum of 10 assignments being seen
Merit	60-69	
Distinction	70-100	100%
Borderlines	49/59/69	100%

- * The sample that is selected should reflect the marks distribution across these classes (3rd, 2.ii and 2.i at UG level, Pass and Merit at PGT level), taking into account any developments in marks distribution (e.g. noticeably more or fewer submissions in a particular class than in previous years).

4. Check Marking

Check marking means that each assignment is **seen by two markers**, but only the first marker provides comments/feedback and a mark. The role of the check marker is to **confirm** that marking is appropriate, fair and consistent, and applies the relevant marking criteria, but unlike with moderation by retrospective sampling, this happens for **all** individual assignments.

4.1 Procedure

1. Once the first marker has completed marking, i.e. recorded their comments/feedback and their suggested mark, they alert the check marker that these are available on TurnItIn.
2. The check marker reviews each assignment and determines whether the quality of the comments/feedback is appropriate, and whether the mark can stand.
3. The check marker does not add comments/feedback or another mark.
4. If there are minor concerns over a small number of individual assignments, a mark for those should be agreed with the first marker.
5. If there are serious concerns over the quality of the first marking, these should be discussed with the first marker and highlighted to the module convenor. If no agreement can be reached on how to address the issues, the Sub-Board Chair should then determine whether full double marking is necessary to resolve the issue and assure quality.
6. A record must be kept of the initial marks, and of whether the check marker agreed the first marks or whether a challenge was made, and how this was addressed. If marking forms are not used, the relevant Sub-Board Chair is responsible for ensuring that this information is recorded and can be made available for Visiting Examiners or in case of an appeal.
7. The Visiting Examiner will see a sample of the assessments.

4.2 Resolution of serious concerns raised by a check marker

If the concerns raised by the check marker are found to be serious enough, the Sub-Board Chair can order full double marking, either of all submissions made for the relevant assignment, or – if concerns are focussed on one particular grade band (e.g. all Firsts) – of those submissions that fall within that band.

5. Double Marking

Double marking means that each assignment is marked by **two markers, both** of whom record comments/feedback and a suggested mark. The two markers then determine an agreed mark for each assignment, which is reported for entry onto the database.

NB: We will be operating a process of open double marking, i.e. the second marker will know the first marker's comments/feedback and mark (as opposed to blind double marking where both markers arrive at the mark completely independently of each other).

5.1 Procedure

1. Once the first marker has completed marking, i.e. recorded their comments/feedback and their suggested mark for each assignment, they alert the second marker that these are available on TurnItIn.

2. The second marker marks each assignment again, also recording comments/feedback and a suggested mark.
3. For double marking, discrepancies between first and second marker of more than five points must be resolved by discussion, and a short written summary of how agreement was reached must be provided. Discrepancies of less than five points will be resolved by averaging.
4. The first marker is responsible for recording the agreed mark and the consolidated comments/feedback on TurnItIn.
5. A record must be kept of both suggested marks and the agreed mark. If marking forms are not used, the relevant Sub-Board is responsible for ensuring that this information is recorded and can be made available for Visiting Examiners or in case of appeal.
6. The Visiting Examiner will see a sample of all assignments.

Document Version

Valid from	Author	Changes	Published
2016/17	Eva Peters, Curriculum & Regulations Officer	Update to previous policy regarding extent of double marking and differentiation between full and half modules and exams and coursework; introduction of check marking.	December 2016
2017/18	Eva Peters, Curriculum & Regulations Officer	Marking thresholds amended (0-10% and 11-49%). Approved by LTQC 26.04.2017.	August 2017
2018/19	Eva Peters, Curriculum & Regulations Officer	Terminology updates in line with restructuring. Reformatting to bring in line with other policy documents. Approved by LTQC 29.05.2018.	July 2018

Appendix: Marking Methods Overview

	single marking	moderation (by retrospective sampling)	check marking	double marking
first marker's responsibilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record comments/feedback and award mark • Inform support staff once marking complete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record comments/feedback and award mark • Select sample for moderation • Inform moderator once first marking complete • Inform support staff once moderation complete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record comments/feedback and award mark • Inform check marker once first marking complete • Inform support staff once check marking complete 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record comments/feedback and award mark • Inform second marker once first marking complete • Agree marks with second marker and consolidate comments/feedback • Inform support staff once double marking complete
second marker's responsibilities	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutinise sample • Individual marks cannot be changed • If no concerns over the quality of the marking: inform first marker once moderation complete • If concerns over the quality of the marking: aim to resolve with first marker, keeping module convenor informed; if no resolution, refer to Sub-Board Chair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrutinise all submissions • If no concerns over the quality of the marking: inform first marker once check marking complete • If minor concerns over a small number of individual assignments: agree mark with first marker • If serious concerns over the quality of the marking: aim to resolve with first marker, keeping module convenor informed; if no resolution, refer to Sub-Board Chair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record comments/feedback and award mark • Agree marks with first marker and consolidate comments/feedback
Key characteristics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All marks rely on one marker's judgement. 2. Least time-intensive method. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intended to verify the validity of the first marking. 2. The moderator sees <u>a sample</u> of submissions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intended to verify the validity of the first marking. 2. The check marker sees <u>all</u> submissions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All submissions are seen by two markers and receive an agreed mark and consolidated comments/feedback. 2. Most time-intensive method.