

Assessment and Feedback Policy

Responsibility for Policy:	Registrar and Chief Operating Officer
Relevant to:	LJMU Staff and Students. Relevant to Academic Partnerships? Y/ N
Approved by:	Academic Board 8 th June 2022
Responsibility for Document Review:	Dean, Teaching and Learning Academy
Date introduced:	September 2022 (merger of multiple policies into a single Assessment and Feedback Policy)
Date(s) modified:	July 2022
Next Review Date:	July 2026

RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

N/A

RELATED POLICIES & DOCUMENTS

Academic Framework Regulations

Assessment and Feedback Policy

Principles of Assessment and Feedback

Equitability: LJMU assessment and feedback should provide all students with a fair and equitable opportunity to meet assessment criteria.

Transparency: All LJMU assessments should be written and communicated in such a way to be transparent to all the students to help them understand what is required, how they will be assessed and provided with feedback.

Anticipatory: Assignments should be accessible in the sense of enabling all students, irrespective of physical disability/learning differences, to meet assessment criteria. Students must be supported in their understanding, development and submission of assessment items.

Flexibility: Alternative assessment provides a framework to meet the diverse needs of our students.

Accountability: All assessment design, feedback and marking must conform to LJMU curriculum standards and procedures as defined in the Academic Framework Regulations.

Collaborative: Where possible, students should be enabled and encouraged to contribute to assessment design, the development of marking criteria or choice of feedback methods.

Policy statement

For all LJMU students: This policy applies to all students on LJMU taught programmes including those delivered by partners.

Preparation and design of summative assessments

Learning outcomes: Assessment tasks must be aligned to relevant learning outcomes to ensure that students who pass the module, the level and the programme have met the intended learning outcomes. Assessment should not over (or under) assess any learning outcomes.

Internal approval: Summative assessments are validated as part of the 'Module Proforma' and amended only with the approval of the designated School and Faculty authorities.

External Examiner's approval: External examiners are required to approve the form and content of all summative assessments at all levels. External approval is required prior to the publication of assessment information to students. Any changes to assessment requirements must be approved by the external examiner.

Clear assessment criteria: All assessments must have defined criteria, published in advance. Students must be assessed against these criteria and feedback should specifically relate to them. Information about criteria should be clear and explicit. Students should be able to understand and use the feedback they are given by explicitly relating it back to the criteria for the assessment task.

All programmes must have a feedback strategy: The purpose of feedback (diagnostic, formative and summative) and how and when it will be provided should be made clear at the start of the module. This relates to all assessment types including examinations. This needs to be transparent in the module information and explained in programme review

Academic misconduct guidance: Assessment guidance should explain the consequence of, and penalties associated with, academic misconduct.

Alternative assessments: Any alternative assessment should be of an equivalent level and standard to the original assessment. It must assess the same learning outcomes as the original assessment. The University expects that an appropriate alternative to the standard assessment is available for students who are unable to undertake the standard assessment due to a long-term illness, disability, or personal circumstances. Any alternative assessment provided as a reasonable adjustment for a student with a long-term medical condition or disability must be appropriate for that student's condition.

Student assessment and feedback deadlines must be published: Programme and module information must specify a feedback deadline alongside assessment submission deadlines. Clustering of assessment deadlines should be avoided where possible.

Use of technology for completion of assessment tasks: Students must receive support through written, video or workshop instructions to ensure they can access and use any technology required for the purposes of assessment.

Identify a second marker/moderator: A second marker or moderator (as required) should be identified before the module is delivered. Ideally this would be a colleague who also teaches on the module or a member of the programme team.

During the assessment period

Alternative assessment exceptional circumstances: If there are operational reasons that prevent the original, validated, assessment occurring as scheduled, or there have been material irregularities with an assessment, an alternative assessment may be given to all students on the module. The decision to offer a replacement alternative assessment to an entire cohort needs approval from the faculty assistant registrar. The University will provide advice and guidance should a situation arise that requires the introduction of alternative assessments on a wider scale.

Students with long-term medical conditions or disabilities: Students who have disclosed to the University (or Partner College) a long-term medical condition or disability should have a needs assessment. This will identify the type of support required and signal a reasonable adjustment. The Individual Student Learning Plan (or its equivalent in a Partner College) may specify a range of suitable measures, such as additional time in examinations or flexible deadlines. There is an obligation on the module leader to make appropriate reasonable adjustments for the assessments on their modules. Students with an Individual Student Learning Plan should be assessed in accordance with that where practicable. The school disability coordinator or the central disability support team (or its equivalent in a Partner College) can offer advice regarding suitable alternatives. These may differ from those suggested on the Individual Student Learning Plan if they remain appropriate to the student's condition.

Reasons for not offering an alternative assessment: There are very few circumstances when it would not be possible to offer an alternative assessment. Professionally accredited or regulated programmes may have prescribed assessment types. In these cases, the programme leader should contact the PSRB to establish whether an alternative is permitted. In addition, alternatives can be rejected if they are deemed impractical or unnecessarily expensive. This would need to be agreed with the faculty registrar.

Mark coursework anonymously where possible: All summative assessed coursework assessments that contribute more than 20% to the final module mark, where feasible, should be marked through an anonymised process.

Mark examinations anonymously where possible: All formal, institutionally scheduled examinations should be anonymously marked. This covers open book, seen paper, or unseen paper examination.

Anonymised marking exemptions: Exemptions from Anonymised coursework policy are as follows:

- Assessments in which students cannot remain anonymous because they are observed, e.g., presentations, performances, laboratory work, clinical practice.
- Assessments in which the production of the work has been closely supervised by the marker, e.g., art and design work, dissertation, thesis.
- Assessments where the code of practice for a professionally accredited course would be contravened if marking were anonymised.
- Programme teams who wish to provide individual, personalised feedback on summative assessment may ask for an exception to the policy. Staff on these programmes should consult with student representatives invalidating these exceptions.

Students can request access to comments: Please note that General Data Protection Regulation (2018) permits students to access any comments or internal correspondence about their work, whether made by internal or external examiners on any coursework. **With respect to examination scripts, GDPR does not afford students the right of access**, but the university is obliged to make staff annotations available **in a meaningful and intelligible form**.

Feedback must be within 15-days: Feedback should be available 15 working days after the assessment deadline. Working days exclude Saturday and Sunday, bank holidays and any other day when the University is closed. Personal annual leave is deemed a working day. Note that feedback on final year final semester examinations can be exempt from this requirement, except where a part-time student is taking such an examination and is continuing to study in the next academic year.

Students must receive in person or online face to face feedback on their first piece of assessed work: Programme and module teams must provide an early opportunity in each year of study for students to receive face-to-face feedback on their first piece of assessed work. This does not have to be in a one-to-one meeting. Feedback could be given in a group setting such as a tutorial, but the opportunity must be provided for students to discuss feedback on their work.

Moderation of summative assessments and workflow

Moderation at all levels: Marking and moderation procedures at all levels should include sighted double marking of at least 10% of students' attempts at summative assessments (or 10 pieces, whichever is the greater) (See exceptions for non-standard items).

Moderation of dissertations: All dissertations and their equivalents which have a value of at least 40 credits to all be double marked, not just a 10% sample. This means most L6 undergraduate, and all postgraduate dissertations will be double marked.

External examiner role: The external examiner will be provided with samples in a timely manner to allow them to engage with the external moderation process. Samples of assessed work will include evidence of second marking and must align with the minimum thresholds outlined below (moderation sample) and be of sufficient size to enable the examiner to form a view as to whether student performance is judged against the appropriate standards. External examiners must ensure that assessments are conducted within the approved Academic

Framework Regulations, comment on the effectiveness of the assessment and are expected to attend Boards of Examiners.

Workflow:

The first marker/s marks all submitted summative assessments in accordance with the agreed criteria/marketing scheme.

Moderation sample: This is usually 10% of the validated summative assessment item (scripts) (or 10 pieces, whichever is the greater) for each module. The 10% sample should include the entire range of marks. Large cohorts with multiple markers may necessitate review of several scripts from each marker that will result in more than 10% of scripts being moderated. The group marking sample must include 10% from all markers.

Standard moderation (non-team marking)

- A second marker marks the moderation sample using the same criteria/marketing scheme as the first marker. The marks of the first marker will stand, except in the following circumstances:
 - Where a second marker identifies in the sample the inconsistent application of the assessment criteria by the first marker, the work of the whole cohort should be remarked.
 - If there are issues of marks being consistently different (+/- 5 percentage points) between the first and second marker, the two markers should agree the marks and then an identical scaling should be applied to the entire cohort's work. The merit order must not be changed by the scaling process. Disagreements that cannot be resolved by the two markers may require further samples to be taken and/or arbitration by the module/programme leader if the interpretation of the grading criteria cannot be resolved.

Team marking moderation (More than two markers)

- A second marker marks the moderation sample using the same criteria/marketing scheme as the first marker. The marks of the first marker will stand, except in the following circumstances:
 - Where a second marker identifies in the sample the inconsistent application of the assessment criteria by the first marker, the work of the whole cohort should be remarked. However, where the work has been marked by a team of markers and moderation identifies inconsistencies in the marking of an individual marker then scaling or remarking should be applied to all the work marked by that individual.
 - If there are issues of marks being consistently different (+/- 5 percentage points) between the first and second marker, the two markers should agree the marks and then an identical scaling should be applied to the entire cohort's work, not just individual summative assessments in a moderation sample. The merit order must not be changed by the scaling process. Disagreements which cannot be resolved by the two markers may require further samples to be taken and/or arbitration by the module/programme leader if the interpretation of the grading criteria cannot be resolved.

Moderation of non-standard assessment items: If an assessment does not involve the production of physical evidence, as with some types of performance or presentation, markers must make clear what processes are in place to ensure consistency of marking and

maintenance of standards. For example, presentations and performances could be recorded and examples shared and discussed at a meeting convened for that purpose. Where double marking has been considered and is not possible, the module handbook should indicate what moderation procedures are used instead.

Oversight of moderation

- The completion of the module mark verification report forms part of the evidence that internal and external moderation has taken place. The mark verification interface is in WebHub and the module leader must confirm that moderation has taken place by completing the module mark verification report in relation to several prompts.
- Oversight of all marking and moderation activity is invested in Boards of Examiners. Prior to a Board of Examiners, the Director is responsible for ensuring that procedures are followed regarding the consideration and approval of the form and content of all summative assessments that count towards the assessment of the programme and its module(s). The Director is also responsible for the completion of the moderation process, for ensuring that marks achieved by students for each summative assessment task are finalised by the deadline and that External Examiners have been involved in the moderation process.

Enhancements

These enhancements go beyond minimal policy requirements to further support students learning from assessment.

Student voice: Students should be enabled to contribute to designing assessments, criteria or feedback methods as part of curriculum development.

Supporting understanding of academic misconduct: Students should be offered the opportunity to submit written work through Turnitin prior to final submission. This can support the developing of academic writing skills, as well as reinforcing messages related to academic integrity.

Assessment design for inclusivity: It is good practice to design assessments to be as inclusive as possible. This will minimise the need for an alternative assessment as a reasonable adjustment. In the absence of that, forward consideration of alternatives to standard assessment will speed up the management of requests for reasonable adjustment.

Definitions

Summative assessment: Summative assessments are conducted for the purposes of awarding credit, the right to progress through a programme of study, or of determining a final award.

Moderation: Moderation is a process to ensure that marking is consistent, fair and aligned with criteria, irrespective of whether the summative assessment is taken at the first or any subsequent opportunity.

Second marker: The purpose of the second marker is to ensure consistency by independently reviewing the marks awarded by the first marker(s) for a sample of work.

Double marking: Where two individuals independently mark the same piece of work

Feedback: Feedback should be aligned to assessment criteria, outline positive attributes and constructive alert the student to where improvements are needed.

Plagiarism prevention and detection software: The Turnitin service allows individual student's work to be uploaded and automatically matched for similarity with content on the web; certain electronic journals; and all assignments uploaded by LJMU and the other institutions using the service.

Personal mitigating circumstances: Students with personal circumstances that affect their ability to complete a scheduled assessment may request an alternative assessment. However, consideration should be given for an extension to a coursework deadline and rescheduling of the assessment to the next available assessment period (deferral)

Anonymity: Anonymity means that the marker does not know the identity of the student whose work they are marking. It ends when the final overall mark/grade is made available via the VLE (Virtual Learning Environments) (Canvas) or transcribed to a marksheet.

Alternative assessment: An alternative assessment will assess the relevant learning outcomes to the same standard and at the same level as the standard assessment. Alternative can relate to the mode of assessment (i.e., providing and adaptation to the standard approach) or method (i.e., assessing using a completely different approach)