

# SCTEI Assessment Policy

## 1. *General*

- 1.1 All summative work will be marked on the Common Awards marking cover sheets or an electronic equivalent.

## 2. *Feedback*

- 2.1 Written feedback will be given to each student on every summatively assessed task. This may, on occasion, be supplemented by additional oral feedback.
- 2.2 Feedback will also be given on all formative assessment tasks. This may be written or oral, and may be addressed to individuals or to a group of students. It may include peer feedback, but there will always be an element of tutor feedback.
- 2.3 Feedback will always be given within a month of the submission deadline, except in exceptional circumstances (such as the illness of the tutor). Where such circumstances exist they will if possible be communicated to the student. This feedback may be given prior to any second marking and therefore may not be final; marks are in any case provisional until they have been agreed by a Board of Examiners.
- 2.4 In instances where a formative assessment task is designed as preparation for a specific summative assessment, feedback will be provided in sufficient time as to allow students to benefit in that summative task

## 3. *Student Identification*

- 3.1 All meetings of boards of examiners will consider students anonymously.
- 3.2 Major projects<sup>1</sup> or dissertations will be assessed anonymously, as far as is possible (it may be necessary for the supervisor to act as first marker because of their subject expertise). Other work need not be assessed anonymously.

## 4. *Moderation of marking for summative assignments*

### 4.1 Definitions:

Double-marking and moderation are two distinct mechanisms which may be used as part of the process of quality assurance of assessment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined as the level 6 modules TMM3341 Independent Learning Project (Long) and TMM3352 Extended Project in Theology, Ministry and Mission.

Double-marking is applied to all scripts in a run. Moderation applies to a sample of scripts. Each serves a different purpose and imposes different actions upon examiners.

'Second marking' refers to the action of the second marker who may be double-marking (all scripts in a run) **or** moderating (a sample of scripts).

#### 4.2 Moderation within SCTEI

- a) Moderation differs from double-marking in that it seeks exclusively to identify systematic defects in the first-marking process. Moderation focuses on the marks awarded to the full set of assessed work for a task, module or programme in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is therefore separate from the question of how differences in marks between two or more markers are resolved, and is not about making changes to an individual student's marks. For this reason moderation may be carried out on a sample of assessed work.
- b) The programme leader shall allocate a proportion of the work submitted for each summative assessment to be moderated (sample of scripts). Some of this will take place within each centre, some across the TEI. This shall consist of a minimum of six scripts for each assessment and a minimum of 10% of the scripts marked by each first marker for that assessment task, or 35% from any first marker undertaking summative assessment for the first time (with a minimum of 12 scripts). The sample shall be selected equally from the top, middle and bottom of the marking range.
- c) The role of the moderator is to ensure that the scale, range and standards of first-marking are appropriate, with any recommendations for change based upon the identification of systematic issues with the first marking, and resolutions being applied systematically to the whole run of scripts. If moderation reveals a pattern of excessively generous or punitive marking, omission or over-emphasis of some element of answers, large fluctuations in marks, or use of an excessively narrow range of marks, then this should be rectified by an appropriate systematic review of the marks. This may involve double-marking all work (see below), but could also be a review of lesser scope, for instance of the marks for one question on an exam paper or within a particular mark range. It is expected that all scripts displaying the same general issue(s) will be double-marked by the second marker. Unless the second marker has seen all such scripts, the first marker's mark should not be altered.

#### 4.3 Double Marking within SCTEI

- a) Double-marking is to be applied to all dissertations and major projects and shall be 'blind' or unseen (i.e. the first marker's marks and the rationale for them are not communicated to the second marker until after they have completed their marking).

- b) It is applied to other summative work if moderation reveals a pattern of inconsistent or over-harsh or over-generous marking by any first marker, and it has been identified that double-marking is the appropriate step to review the full run of marks for those assignments/ scripts marked by the first marker. (A review of a lesser scope may be appropriate. See 4.2 above)
- c) Increasing or reducing the marks awarded to all the candidates concerned will be done in systematic fashion whose rationale and procedure are recorded with the work affected, agreed with the external examiner(s) concerned and communicated to the board of examiners.
- d) Individual marks awarded by the first marker cannot be changed unless the second marker has also marked all scripts in a run, as not all students would have been considered equally.
- e) There is no requirement that double-marking for assignments other than major projects and dissertations must be carried out blind or unseen (where the first marker's marks and the rationale for them are not communicated to the second marker until after they have completed their marking).

#### 4.4 Changing marks

The first marker may ask the second marker to review any assignments on which she/he would like a second opinion.

Marks for individual assignments may be altered **either** where the first marker asked for a second opinion on that assignment **or** when double marking (all scripts in a run) of that marker's work has been complete. In these cases, when first and second markers disagree:

a discrepancy of no more than 5% in the mark for the module as a whole and which does not span a classification border is to be resolved by taking the average of the two marks;

a discrepancy of 5% or more in the mark for the module as a whole or spanning a classification border is to be resolved by discussion between the markers to reach an agreed mark if possible;

if agreement cannot be achieved (or if one of the markers is unavailable) the work shall be referred to the programme leader or his/her nominee who will seek to reach agreement with the marker(s);

if agreement still cannot be reached, the work shall be referred to the external examiner.

The second marker shall give explicit rationale for his/her grade when this is 5% or more different from that of the first marker, or

- the discrepancy spans a classification border, or
- where his/her rationale for the grade would be significantly different from that of the first marker.

Where the discrepancy between first and second marks is 5% or more or spanning a classification border, a note of the process followed to reach an agreed grade and the rationale for this grade shall be recorded.

All feedback and grades assigned are available to the external examiner. The student need not be given any grade except the agreed one, and need not be given second marker's comments except when the first marker's grade was changed.

## 5. *Retention of assignments*

In line with Durham University policy we will retain student work:

- 1) until a year after the student has graduated;
- 2) **and** on online plagiarism systems for up to five years from the submission of the assignment;
- 3) **and** for quality assurance purposes samples of work may be retained until the next time the module is taught

## 6. *Assessment of group working*

6.1 When group work skills are assessed summatively,

- a) provision will be made for assessing the group work component in the event that a student has to **resit** the assessment (e.g. by identifying the relevant learning outcomes that would have been met by the group work component, and providing an appropriate assessment task that would enable the student to meet that learning outcome);
- b) the standard University and SCTEI assessment regulations apply, with the exception of the collusion regulations;
- c) **feedback** will be made available to all group members, not a group representative;
- d) where a group member has a disability, any necessary **reasonable adjustment** will be made to ensure that the member can participate in the work.

6.2 Group work **assessment outlines** will clearly identify to students:

- a) how marks will be allocated (for example whether marks will be awarded for the process, such as how well the team collaborated);
- b) how students will submit their work (single submission on behalf of the group, or should each individual submit);

- c) if each member of a group obtains the same mark, or if individual contributions will be assessed (and if so, how these individual contributions will be derived).

(These will be determined with reference to Common Awards assessment criteria and assessment guidance for group projects..)

6.3. Students will be informed of:

- a) how groups will be formed (self-selecting or pre-assigned) and strategies that will be applied if students drop out of groups. If groups are to be self-selecting it should be clear what the minimum/maximum size of the group should be and the procedures for the management of groups that fall outside of these boundaries;
- b) how groups will be managed. For instance:
  - i. will the groups be student led, or will a tutor be assigned? If it is the latter, what is their role? For instance, students must be informed if a tutor is observing group meetings to assign a process mark to each group participant;
  - ii. the opportunities available for group communication, including the availability of pre-timetabled sessions, access to technology or software (such as module blogs) or if students will be required to make their own arrangements;
  - iii. what groups should do if they have a member who is not contributing, e.g. because of absence due to long-term sickness, or for those not participating to an expected standard.

## 7. *Assessment of oral communication skills*

7.1. When **formal presentation skills are to be summatively assessed**:

- a) The standard University assessment regulations will be consulted.
- b) The oral presentation assessment task outline will clearly identify to students:
  - i. The marking criteria in advance of the presentation date;
  - ii. The proportion of marks which will be allocated to subject content, versus presentation skills;
  - iii. The presentation timing requirements and how, if at all, these impact on marking criteria.
- c) Evidence of the presentation will be retained so it can be made available to external examiners. Examples of evidence include: recordings of presentations; copies of students' slides; the minimum expectation is the retention of notes from the markers, the mark proforma and feedback to students.
- d) Where a student has a disability which will impact on their ability to deliver an oral presentation any necessary reasonable adjustment will be made to the assessment task.

- 7.2. If **students' small group teaching contributions are to be summatively assessed** (e.g. the assessment of students' expression of their opinions on a set reading where they are not the primary contributor):
- a) Students will be made aware, in advance of the teaching session, how their contribution will be assessed;
  - b) Students will be given clear feedback, aligned to the assessment criteria, describing how their contribution was assessed;
  - c) The proportion of the module's assessment formulated from students' participation will be aligned to the volume of the evidence collected to assess a student's contribution.
  - d) Each member of a tutorial group will be given an opportunity to participate.