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A: Marking and Assessment Criteria

1. All marking shall be specifically and demonstrably linked to the marking criteria for each mark range.Generic assessment criteria are specified in the GAR and form Annex A of this policy. Each Faculty/Department shall adapt these criteria to relate to their subject areas and for different levels of study, and make the specific criteria available to students and staff.

B: Final/Unseen exams

2. Examination scripts shall be marked initially by Module Leaders, who shall annotate scripts with their comments and proposed marks. The comments shall serve two purposes: to assist second markers (see below) and to assist Module Leaders if students seek feedback on their performance (as examination scripts/marks must not be returned or shown to students).

3. A sample of scripts for each module shall be scrutinised by a second internal examiner to check that the assessment criteria have been applied consistently (and, where applicable, that the marking scheme has been followed), and that the outcomes of the assessment are fair and reliable. The sample shall include at least two scripts from the mid-range of each marking band, and all unseen examination scripts with marks of 38 and 39.

4. Normally, the marks for scripts that have been double marked shall be those awarded by first markers, i.e. Module Leaders. However, where second markers consistently disagree with Module Leaders’ marks for the chosen sample, all scripts shall be double-marked by the second examiner, and the marks to be awarded agreed jointly by the two examiners. Where differences cannot be resolved by the two examiners, the opinion of a third internal examiner shall be sought and a final mark agreed.
5 All examination scripts shall be marked anonymously, i.e. scripts shall be identified only by student ID numbers and desk numbers: the identity of students shall not become known to the examiners until the marks are entered onto the mark spreadsheet.

C: Coursework

6 All items of coursework that contribute more than 20% of the overall module mark shall be subject to double marking by selective sampling, as in 3 and 4 above. First markers shall complete a Coursework Submission and Feedback Form, which shall serve two purposes: to allow second markers to assure the consistency of marking and the standards for the sampled items; and to provide feedback to students.

D: Final Year Projects and Dissertation Modules

7 All Final Year projects and dissertations shall be double/second marked. The examiners shall not write comments on project or dissertation reports. The first internal examiner shall complete a Coursework Submission and Feedback Form; the second internal examiner shall complete a Coursework Double Marking Form, (available on-line in the Staff Handbook), i.e. project and dissertation reports shall be subject to what is referred to as 'double blind marking', where the two examiners shall not have sight of one another’s marks/comments, so that the marks awarded by the first marker shall not influence the second marker’s judgment. The two examiners shall then meet to agree the final mark to be awarded for the project/dissertation report. Where differences cannot be resolved, the work shall be marked independently (i.e. without knowing the other two examiners’ marks) by a third internal examiner, with the final mark being determined jointly by the three examiners. Oral presentations of final year projects and dissertations shall be marked in accordance with 9 below.

8 Where final year projects/dissertations are assessed by a panel of examiners, these may include external examiners. Each component of assessment (e.g. project/dissertation report; oral presentation) shall be marked independently by each examiner, with the final mark for each component being agreed jointly by the examiners. See also Section E below. The independent mark sheets of all examiners shall be made available to the programme’s formal external examiner.

E: Oral Presentations and Examinations

9 Oral presentations, whether individual or group, that are a separate component of assessment and contribute a specified percentage weighting for a module shall be double-marked. Often this shall be undertaken simultaneously by at least two examiners in regard to agreed criteria: the examiners shall then jointly agree the overall mark to be awarded for the presentation. Module outlines shall specify the assessment criteria.
10 Oral examinations with a weighting of 20% or more of the total assessment for a module shall be conducted by at least two examiners acting together. They shall assess students independently in regard to agreed criteria before jointly agreeing the overall mark for the oral examination. Module outlines shall specify the assessment criteria.

**F: Moderation of marks**

11 **Overall** module marks of 29, 39, 49, 59 or 69 (including from a compiled attempt), shall be moderated in accordance with the Internal Moderation Guidelines in Annex B. Any mark adjustments shall be based on the academic judgment of the examiners following review of a student’s work by at least two examiners. **There shall be no automatic raising or lowering of marks of 29, 39, 49, 59 or 69**

12 The review and moderation of all marks for a particular module is the responsibility of Module Leaders and Heads of Department/Deans, and shall be undertaken in accordance with the Internal Moderation Guidelines in Annex B.

13 All moderation **MUST** take place before the published final deadline for mark entry input. It is the responsibility of Module Leaders to ensure that students’ marks are inserted on the Student Records System **by the final deadline published in the Academic Calendar**.

**G: Module Leader’s Report:**

14 Module Leaders shall be required to complete a Module Leader’s Report **(Annex C)**, for submission to the Module Examination Board. The Report shall include all changes to students’ marks following the review in Section F above; and give reasons, where appropriate, for any unusual distribution of marks, either at the component level (e.g. unseen exam or coursework performance) or in the overall marks.

**H: Moderation by External Examiners**

15 The Examination and Assessment Regulations stipulate that External Examiners are entitled to see any examination scripts, dissertations, project reports and other assessed coursework in order to reach judgments on standards and consistency of internal marking at Levels I and H.

16 In addition to the above, samples of student work from the top, middle and lower ranges of the mark spectrum normally shall be made available to External Examiners for approximately 5% of the module class size (although this shall likely be higher for small classes), for all modules except those studied in the Preparatory Year. Faculties shall
agree with their External Examiner(s) the method for, and precise extent of, the sampling of student work.

Approved on behalf of the Senate: 2 January 2012 and supersedes Policy of 3 October 2010
ANNEX A

Marking and Assessment Criteria

Marking Criteria

Students are awarded marks for each piece of work according to a defined set of criteria. The marking criteria relate to the standard of work that students will need to produce to earn marks in the different grade bands. Students will be given the marking criteria that are specific to their academic department.

Assessment Criteria

The University has a set of generic assessment criteria which each faculty/department should adapt.

The mark descriptors are appropriate to a foundation (preparatory) year but they also give a general indication of how distinctions between the award of marks may be made in later years. Each classification description requires satisfaction of the criteria of the grade below.

First Class (70% and above, A)

An excellent or outstanding submission demonstrating extraordinary quality and exceptional competence. The submission fulfils the brief completely, or exceeds it.

This excellence is demonstrated by:

- Excellent foundation knowledge, rigorous and essentially error-free.
- Appropriate interpretation and application of theoretical principles, concepts, frameworks, and techniques.
- Evidence of commitment to and self-discipline in engagement with the literature, showing wide reading and extended study to broaden the knowledge base.
- Competent acquisition and collation of data, the development of clear, sound, coherent and authoritative arguments and judgments from the data.
- Articulation and communication of material effectively, accurately and reliably in a fresh, clear way.
- Evidence of the development of a critically evaluative and analytical approach.
- Innovation, creativity, originality and imagination of insight.

Upper Second, 2(i), (60-69%, B)

Good to very good – a competent/highly competent submission of commendable quality. Fulfils the brief in all but minor detail.
This *competence* is demonstrated by:

- A sound foundational factual knowledge, with no major errors.
- An assured grasp of conceptual frameworks, and an ability to relate theory to specific contexts.
- A significant level of effort to engage with the subject material and the task, showing good study skills and self-motivation.
- Above-average effectiveness in gathering data and developing arguments.
- Effective presentation and communication of the argument.
- Some demonstration of independent thought showing a critical and analytical approach.
- Above-average originality and creativity.

**Lower Second, 2(ii), (50-59%, C)**

Fair to adequate. The submission largely fulfils the brief but with some flaws or omissions which prevent it being assessed as competent.

This *adequacy* is demonstrated by:

- A firm factual knowledge base with some deficiencies in comprehension. Acceptable or correctable errors, flaws and omissions.
- A firm conceptual knowledge – a good grasp of relevant principles and concepts and their application.
- Evidence within a limited scope of some independent study, some taking of responsibility for own learning.
- A detectable capacity to gather data and to develop a logically constructed and clear argument.
- A rather standard approach to the presentation and communication of the material which represents an accurate reflection of the subject matter studied but which lacks independence of thought.
- Limited or modest originality and creativity of thought and presentation.

**Third Class (40-49%, D)**

Sufficient to pass with Honours, but no more – some significant inadequacies exist. The submission is primarily derivative or descriptive in its approach to the brief, rather than demonstrating critical evaluation or analysis.

This *sufficiency* is demonstrated by:

- A basic or elementary foundational knowledge, showing some significant errors, omissions or irrelevancies.
- Some misunderstanding of key principles and concepts or the appropriate application of those theoretical constructs.
- Limited evidence of study or engagement with the literature or of a commitment or effort in taking responsibility for own learning.
- An elementary ability to use data sources other than in a predictable defined context. An appropriate structure to the material is developed, though the argument may be no more than implicit.
- Limitations in communications skills in presenting a cogent or persuasive line of argument.
- Meeting no more than threshold standards of critical evaluation, judgment and reasoning.
- Lacking insight by the adoption of standard techniques rather than the development of original or creative approaches.

**Fail (Below 40%, F)**

0-39% is a wide range of marks and levels of failure range from non-submission or submission of a wholly-plagiarised piece of work or one that in any other way contravenes the University’s regulations, via irrelevance or unsubstantiated assertions to something that is at least the student’s own work.

The submission is insufficient to pass or to be compensated. The submission does not address the terms of the brief, or fails to provide sufficient bulk to meet the requirements of the brief. To pass, fresh or resubmitted work would be needed.

This *insufficiency* is demonstrated by:

- Unawareness of, unfamiliarity with or very serious limitations in foundational knowledge of the course material. Very serious errors or omissions.
- A lack of understanding or serious misinterpretation of theoretical foundations introduced on the course, or their practical application. Evidence of independent thought is absent, or banal at best.
- No evidence of serious commitment to engage with the course material through study.
- An inability to collect or deploy data or to develop a coherent argument. The submission is a random series of points, lacking a clear structure.
- Poor presentation or communications skills.
- No attempt at analysis – the work is descriptive or a regurgitation of course material.
- Work that makes no attempt at originality.
Annex B

Internal Moderation Guidelines

Introduction

1. There are two aspects to the internal moderation of student’s marks:
   - the moderation of overall module marks of 29, 39, 49, 59 and 69, which is the responsibility of Module Leaders - see Section F of the University’s Double Marking and Moderation Policy;
   - a review of the mark distribution for a module overall and its component assessments, which is the responsibility of Heads of Department/Deans and shall be carried out prior to Module Examination Boards.

Rationale

2. A student’s overall mark for a module is determined from the marks for individual components of assessment, each of which is weighted differently. It is therefore possible that an individual student may be awarded an overall mark for a module that is borderline between two grade bands. Such borderline overall marks may be critical to a student’s overall performance. It is therefore essential that these critical marks are reviewed before being finalised. Also, depending on the weighting of a particular assessment, it is possible that certain components of assessment for an individual student have only been marked by one examiner. The Double Marking and Moderation Policy and these guidelines therefore ensure that ALL marks that may be critical to a student’s overall performance in a module have been approved by at least two examiners. The moderation of individual students’ marks where the overall mark is borderline is to ensure that an individual students’ performance overall in a module is judged to be in the appropriate category (e.g. fail but may be condoneable; first class; etc).

3. The moderation of all students’ marks of each module is to ensure that the individual components of assessment, and therefore the overall module marks, are appropriate, both in terms of the level and standard required by the students and the standard of the marking. This can most obviously be assured through a review of all students’ marks for all components of a module, as produced in module board reports.

4. Further details of the above are provided below.

Process

Borderline marks for individual students
5. Where a student has an overall module mark of 29, 39, 49, 59 or 69 (including from a compiled attempt), the component of assessment with the highest weighting (typically the unseen examination in the majority of modules) shall be reviewed by at least two examiners, to determine whether a student’s original mark shall be confirmed or whether a lower or higher mark shall be awarded for the assessment in question. Any agreed change to the mark for the assessment may or may not result in a change to the overall module mark, as it would depend on the weight of the component of assessment concerned.

6. Where the two internal examiners cannot agree a mark, they should consult a third internal examiner or, in exceptional cases, the External Examiner.

7. In all cases, justification shall be given for any decision to change a student’s mark(s) following such review. Records of changes shall be kept with the students’ work and recorded in the Module Leader’s Report (see below). Any mark adjustment shall be based on the academic judgment of at least two examiners following review of a student’s work. There shall be no automatic raising or lowering of marks of 29, 39, 49, 59 or 69.

8. At the most, it is anticipated that the above review and moderation would result in the marks for any one item of assessment being changed by no more than 1 or 2 marks, with the overall mark not changing by more than 1 mark, if at all.

Marks for all students

9. Prior to Module Examination Boards, Module Leaders are required to meet with their Head of Department (which may be at a Departmental Meeting) to review the mark distribution for the module overall and its component assessments. As a consequence of this review, it may be decided to revise the marks for all or some students for one or more components of assessment. Such moderation shall be left to the academic judgment of the Head of Department and may be deemed necessary, for example, from an unusually high/or low number of F or A grades, either for a component of assessment or for the module overall. Any change must be justified and recorded in the Module Leader’s Report. Some examples and possible remedies are given below. This process of reviewing mark distributions would be supported by Departments developing their own guidelines for acceptable ranges for module averages for each type of assessment.

Examples and possible remedies

- The unseen examination marks for the module have a relatively low average (e.g. less than 40%) and a relatively high failure rate (e.g. 60% or more), and the External Examiner had commented that the draft examination paper was somewhat harsh.

  **Possible Remedy:** multiply the marks for the unseen examination by 1.2 (i.e., in effect lowering the pass mark for the examination to 33).
• The coursework average for the module is 20% or more higher than the average for the unseen examination marks and the Head of Department considers that the coursework may not have been sufficiently challenging.

    **Possible Remedy:** multiply the coursework marks by 0.8 (i.e., in effect increasing the pass mark for the coursework to 50).

• The majority of students have an overall coursework grade of A or B, suggesting that either the coursework may have been relatively unchallenging and/or the marking may have been relatively too lenient.

    **Possible Remedy:** multiply the coursework marks for those with A and B by 0.85.

• The overall average mark for the module is high, e.g. 70% or above.

    **Possible Remedy:** multiply all assessment marks for those with C and above by 0.85.

**Implementation**

10. Each Module Leader shall contact the Faculty Senior Assistant Registrar, with details of the module code/title and the name/ID number of those students whose marks are to be changed, to request that the Student Records System (SRS) is re-opened. The Faculty Senior Assistant Registrar shall confirm that the SRS is open for the entry of those specific marks identified by the Module Leader.

11. **It is the responsibility of Module Leaders** to ensure that any changes to marks, either for overall modules or components of modules or for individual students, are made and entered correctly on the SRS by the final mark input deadline published in the Academic Calendar. They should check the correct entry with their Teaching Assistants, in accordance with the University’s mark input checking procedures.

**Module Leader’s Report**

12. The Module Leader’s Report (see Section G of the Double Marking and Moderation Policy) shall indicate the reasons for all changes to students’ marks following internal moderation.
The British University in Egypt

Faculty of .................................................. Department ..........................................................

**Module Assessment Report**

Module Code: ......................... Module Title: ..........................................................

..........................................................

No. of Credits: ....................... Module Leader: ..........................................................

..........................................................

No. of Students: ............... Compulsory or Optional (delete one) Date: ..........................................................

**Students** (give details of student attendance and behaviour, details of any disruption, etc).

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

................................................................................................................................................

..............................................................................................................................................

**Assessment** (give the % weighting, including any components of Coursework; the no. of exam questions, types of question, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Module</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unseen exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab/Practical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moderation  (Indicate the results of moderation before the final mark deadline, e.g. coursework reduced by 10% for all students; X students raised from 39% to 40%; Y students lowered from 39% to 38%. Give brief details in all cases).

Double marking  (Indicate the % of each component of assessment that was double-marked).

Name of Second Examiner:  

Results of Assessment  (distribution of grades for each component and overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Module</th>
<th>% distribution of class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unseen exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component of coursework</th>
<th>% distribution of coursework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| Class Test |  |  |
| L abs/Practical |  |  |
| Research Paper |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |

**Comment on Distributions** (e.g. explanation/reasons for any unusual distributions, high failure or pass rates, class averages, etc.)

.................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................

**Observations on student performance** (e.g. what students did well/badly)

................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................

**Lessons Learned** (e.g. recommendations for changes/improvements, if any)

................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................................................................................................

**Signature**

Module Leader: ..................................................  Date: ..................................................