MetFilm School
Marking, Moderation and Feedback Procedure

Responsible Person	Head of Quality and Governance
Approving Body	Academic Board
Date of Approval	July 2023
Date of Effect	September 2023
Updated	Every 4 years
Next Review Date	September 2027
Queries	quality@metfilmschool.ac.uk

Contents

1 Scope and Application of Procedure

Introduction – purpose of the procedure

1. This procedure has been mapped against relevant sector guidance, including the OfS conditions of registration, specifically the B conditions, and other documents outlining sector expectations and good practice including the QAA Quality Code. The procedure is also aligned with the University of West London Quality Handbook section on Assessment and Feedback

2. This procedure describes how MetFilm School manages the giving of feedback to students; how assessment submissions are managed and how marking and moderation processes are made robust and fair.

Other relevant documents

3. This procedure concentrates explicitly on procedures that should be followed when marking pieces of assessment; mitigation, extensions, academic offences and appeals against academic outcomes are covered by other policies and procedures. Other relevant policies and documents include:

- o [Learning Teaching and Assessment Policy](#)
- o [UWL Academic Regulations](#)
- o [UWL Extenuating Circumstances regulations](#)
- o [UWL Academic Misconduct Regulations](#)
- o [Student Handbook](#)

4. This procedure should also be read in conjunction with relevant course documentation including Module Study Guides and Module Specifications.

Scope of Policy

5. MetFilm School has a commitment to diverse and inclusive assessment. Our Common Academic Framework (CAF) and Learning Teaching and Assessment Policy ensure there is variety in assessment to support all students to succeed.

6. This policy applies to all forms of summative assessment; exceptions are made for different types of assessment where appropriate. This particularly applies to policies on anonymous marking and double marking; in some forms of assessment (for example assessment of practical work or of presentations) anonymous marking and/or double marking will clearly be impractical or unnecessary.

2 Marking Student Submissions

Submission Formats

7. Submission formats will be agreed in the Module Study Guide (MSG) and made available ahead of time to students. It is the responsibility of students to ensure they have read and familiarised themselves with the guidance in the Assessment Brief in the MSG and to ensure they submit the work in the correct format and by the appropriate deadline.

8. Different formats are allowable, but only in the following circumstances. Arrangements can be made for individual students in exceptional circumstances or where an Individual Support Plan (ISP) or other support agreement makes provision for the submission of an alternative assessment. Any alternative submission arrangements have to be approved ahead of time by the Programme Leader (or nominee) and the Head of Quality and Governance or nominee.

9. The programme team should make all reasonable efforts to ensure before the submissions window that there are no obvious technical barriers to submission as a result of the format or submission hardware or software.

Good Practice in Marking and Avoiding Bias

10. All reasonable efforts should be made to limit unconscious bias in marking and moderation. Anonymity in marking is desirable but the School recognises that it may not always be possible or reasonably practicable, particularly where artefacts are being submitted by groups of students.

11. Efforts will be made in every marking process to limit unconscious bias in other ways where anonymous marking is not possible. Approaches to this will be agreed by Programme Leaders. It is good practice to ensure that first marking is undertaken by a marker who has not been involved in the teaching of the student whose work is being marked.

12. Cross campus marking may be applied to modules where there are small groups of students, or limited staff numbers on individual MetFilm School campuses.

13. Marking must be done against learning outcomes and assessment criteria derived from learning outcomes, and with reference to grade descriptors. Programme Teams must ensure that rubrics are published to students ahead of time.

14. Typical practice for module marking is that grades should indicate clearly where a piece of coursework sits within the grade descriptor, i.e. markers should avoid marks at the grade boundaries.

Marking Turnaround

15. Marking and second marking of summative assessment submissions will be completed and feedback returned to students within **20 working days** across all 20 credit modules, regardless of the level of study.[1]

16. Feedback on work submitted for 40 credit modules may be returned within **25 working days.**

17. Submissions made following an approved extension request will normally be marked within **25 working days from the cohort submission deadline** but all efforts should be made to ensure that students have any relevant feedback in good time to apply it to their future submissions on other modules.

18. Marking turnaround for students with approved mitigations will normally be 15 working days from the new submission deadline set for submission or 25 working days for 40 credit modules. Due regard should be given to assessment board dates when setting mitigation deadlines for students to ensure student progression and awarding are not unduly affected.

19. Where feedback cannot be returned in line with the above timelines, students **must** be informed by their programme team of the alternative feedback return date ahead of time. Any variance from published deadlines or return dates have to be approved by the Dean.

20. In all cases, marks and feedback will be released through the VLE to students once marking and internal moderation are complete. The mark released through

---

[1] Note that sub-contract programmes must adhere to the 15 working day turnaround for assessment as set out in UWL's policies and procedures

the VLE is indicative and marks will only be formalised once they have been externally moderated, approved by a UWL assessment board and published on the Student Record by MetFilm School.

21. Formative feedback is a key part of the feedback process and should meet best practice in assessment, but need not follow the requirements set out in this procedure.

Late Submission and Capping of Student Work

22. A penalty for late submission will be automatically applied to any work submitted after the deadline, unless the student has applied for an extension or mitigation prior to the submission deadline.

23. In line with the UWL Academic Regulations, work that is submitted **up to 10 calendar days late will be capped at the pass mark** for the element of assessment.

24. The School recognises that there may be extenuating circumstances that result in late submission of work. Lifting of caps will be considered by the School Mitigation Panel, in line with the UWL Exceptional Circumstances Regulations. Decisions on lifting caps for late submission can be made without the need to convene a Panel, but must be approved by Head of Quality and Governance or appropriately senior nominee. Evidence to support the circumstances must be submitted.

Word Limits and their application

25. Per UWL quality guidance on marking and feedback, there is a clear pedagogic rationale for having word/time limits in place on assessed work. They
    a. encourage succinct and clear presentation of work by students
    b. reinforce required professional and academic practice
    c. provide a clear guide to students on the amount of time that they may wish to spend on undertaking an assessment.

26. Enforcement of word/time limits is intended to support students' understanding of these principles. Programme teams should decide whether word/time limits are to be enforced and for which assessments.

27. Assessment briefs in module study guides should make it clear to students which assessments will have the word/time limit enforced.

Calibration

28. Module teams should undertake calibration activities prior to the beginning of the summative marking processes, to ensure a shared understanding of terms and standards.

29. It is good practice to develop indicative answers or model answers and provide these to all markers.

30. A record of calibration should be kept. A proforma for this is available from the Quality team.

3 Second Marking, Moderation and Alternative Assessments

Definitions

31. The processes of second marking and moderation are to ensure consistency in marking practice.

32. **Second marking** is defined as the marking of all pieces of submitted work for a particular assessment by an examiner other than the person originally designated to mark the work presented for assessment. For details of the types of second marking that might be used, staff should refer to the Assessment and Feedback section of the UWL Quality Handbook.

33. **Internal Moderation** is defined as a process of sample marking of submitted work for a particular assessment by an internal examiner other than the person originally designated to mark the work presented for assessment.

34. **External Moderation** is defined as the review of second marked work or the moderation sample (as relevant) by a suitably qualified external examiner.

Second Marking and Moderation

35. A sample of all student assessed work **that contributes to the final award** must be internally moderated. In practice this normally means that work at level 4 is not moderated. In all cases Programme Leaders can make arrangements for moderation or second marking at L4 if an initial review of the marks for the modules before publication to the VLE indicates issues with the first marking process.

36. Moderators cannot make changes to individual student marks, but can recommend a remark of **all submissions** for the assignment by a second marker.

37. All final projects at level 6 and level 7 should be fully second marked, normally through blind second marking.

38. For each module, a decision should be made before marking takes place as to the scale of second marking or moderation required and the approach that the team will take. Where a need for second marking is identified in the moderation process, a record of this will be kept. This record will be provided to the external examiner for review.

39. Inconsistencies and variations between markers may occur. However, the mark awarded by the **first marker(s)** should normally be recorded as the final mark, unless the discrepancy between marks is greater than 5%. See point 41 below.

40. Where work is second marked, the two markers should try to agree a proposed mark to go forward to the relevant UWL assessment board.

41. Where there are differences that cannot be agreed through initial discussion between first and second markers, and the discrepancy of marks is above 5% and/or there is disagreement across classification boundaries, the use of an alternative marker will be employed.

42. A record of the second marking or moderation **must** be retained. A proforma for this is available from the Quality Team.

43. Sample sizes for moderation will be agreed by Programme teams but will normally be **10% of submitted assessments**. Where there are particularly small student numbers on programmes, the 10% sample can be 10% of all assessments submitted for the relevant module across campuses.

44. The moderation sample must include any work where first and second markers have had difficulty agreeing a grade or where a third marker has been employed.

45. In line with the UWL assessment and feedback handbook, samples for moderation should also include:

    a. The assessment(s) marked highest overall
    b. At least two passed assessments from each classification band
    c. Any problematic assessments, see above
    d. Any borderline marks (i.e. marks falling within 2% of a grade boundary)
    e. All fails

46. The internal second marking or moderation sample will normally be the same sample that is then shared with external examiners for external moderation.

Reassessment and Alternative Assessments

47. In line with the UWL Academic Regulations, alternative assessments are allowable where the circumstances require it.

48. Assessment briefs must be approved by the Dean or suitably senior nominee and copies of the Briefs must be shared with the Quality Team.

49. Briefs must ensure all required learning outcomes can be met and must be designed to enable students to do their best work.

50. Alternative Assessments are allowable for students with ISPs and in circumstances where a resit is required which cannot reasonably be run in the same way for the student required to resit.

51. Any alternatives required as adjustments for students with ISPs should be planned and agreed with the Disability and Wellbeing Service.

52. Where possible, any alternatives should be designed well ahead of the running of the module.

53. Alternative assessments should meet best practice requirements for assessment, as outlined in the Assessment and Feedback Section of the UWL Quality Handbook. Consideration needs to be given to when the assessments are set, equivalence and parity with the original assessment type and format as well as word count equivalents, and avoiding over-assessment as far as possible. The School should ensure that there are no technical issues with recording the assessment as a result of changes (e.g. where the number of assessment elements varies between the original and alternative assessment briefs.)

54. Students undertaking reassessment and those being assessed through alternatives are entitled to proper feedback and timely return of feedback in line with this procedure.

55. Students are responsible for ensuring they have followed all guidance in the assessment briefs in their MSG and any additional notes on the programme submission page on the VLE or any submission information circulated by Programme teams.

Appendix 1 – Assessment Process responsibility flowchart [INCOMPLETE]

Before Module Runs
- Course Team: Assignment Briefs and Rubrics update in MSGs
- Course Team and Head of Data and Planning: VLE pages set up
- Course Team: Assignment links on VLE set up

Submission Date
- Course Team:

Exceptional Circumstances