
University of Greenwich Assessment and Feedback Policy

June 2014

CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	2
2.0	PRINCIPLES	2
3.0	ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK: THE CONTRIBUTION TO STUDENT LEARNING	4
4.0	ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES	6
5.0	FEEDBACK	11
6.0	PSRB REQUIREMENTS	12
7.0	MANAGING HIGHER EDUCATION WITH OTHERS.....	12
8.0	OTHER REQUIREMENTS.....	12
	Appendix 1 - Definitions of Terms	13
	Appendix 2 – Exemplars of Types of Assessment.....	15
	Appendix 3 – Exemplar Undergraduate Marking and Feedback Guidelines	20
	Appendix 4 – Comprehensive Undergraduate Assessment Grid.....	25
	Appendix 5 – Generic Level 7 Postgraduate Marking Criteria – Essay and Examination	33
	Appendix 6 – Feedback: Some Issues to Bear in Mind	35

University of Greenwich Assessment and Feedback Policy

June 2014

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The University Assessment and Feedback Policy (AFP) embodies the University's commitment to the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#). In particular, it reflects the guidelines in [Parts A](#) and [B](#), and more specifically, the indicators outlined in [Chapter B6](#) of the Code, 'Assessment of students and the recognition of prior learning' (2013).

The AFP is committed to assessment strategies which support the University's aim within the [University Strategic Plan 2012-17](#) of "maximising the individual potential of students" through "fostering a culture of high aspiration, high expectation and high standards that maximises retention and achievement", "...using a range of approaches and technologies that develop collaborative, work-integrated and inquiry-based learning".

2.0 PRINCIPLES

The AFP is based on a number of principles to which all Faculties and academic units in the University must adhere:

- All **information** relating to assessment must be made available to staff, students, placement/practice providers and other relevant stakeholders in a clear, appropriate and accessible format.
- Assessment must be designed so as to **promote effective learning**, with students being provided with assessment criteria for individual assessment tasks, as well as an explanation of how the tasks relate to learning outcomes and how marks will be allocated.
- Assessment procedures must ensure that assessment is **fair, valid and reliable**, through being designed in relation to explicit criteria, being inclusive and scheduled appropriately so that workloads are equitable and feedback can be acted upon.
- All assessment must be **subject to scrutiny** and be made be available to External Examiners as required by the University's [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#), with students receiving a single agreed mark following such scrutiny.

2.1 FRAMEWORK

The AFP also sits within a wider framework of regulations, guidelines, strategies and policies established by the University. These include, *inter alia*:

- [Academic Regulations for Research Awards](#)
- [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#)
- [Examination and Assessment Regulations for Students with Disabilities, Dyslexia and Long Term Conditions](#)
- [Fitness to Practise Regulations](#)
- [Formal Complaints Regulations and Guidelines](#)
- [Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy](#)
- [Marking and Classification Conventions](#)
- [Personal Tutoring Policy](#)
- [Principal Conditions of Registration](#)
- [Quality Assurance Handbook](#)
- [Regulations Governing the Conduct of Examinations](#)
- [Regulations Governing Suspected Plagiarism & Examination Offences](#)
- [Regulations Governing Student Claims of Extenuating Circumstances](#)
- [Student Disciplinary Regulations and Procedures](#)

The key relationships between the AFP and other frameworks within the University are as follows:

- The University's [Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy \(LTAS\)](#) defines the objectives for the University for learning, teaching and assessment practice for the period 2012-2017, and the AFP describes the policy implementation of some of its guiding principles;
- The University's [Quality Assurance Handbook \(QAH\)](#) governs the procedures for designing, approving, and reviewing programmes. The AFP plays a key role in outlining how assessment strategies appropriate to all programmes should be operationalized;
- The University's [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#) provide the rules for the judgment of standards in awards. The AFP outlines how these rules should be implemented so that academic standards are maintained and effective learning encouraged.

2.2 APPLICATION

The AFP defines the University protocols for the conduct of assessment. It provides the fundamental principles and requirements on assessment for Faculties to adhere to, but currently devolves the details of their implementation to Faculties to determine, through their Academic Quality and Standards Committees.

From 2015-16, a University-wide *Operational Implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Policy* document will be produced, which will outline the specific implementation of this Policy more fully. Each Faculty will customise this with subject-specific or PSRB-related detail to produce a Faculty version of the document that accords with its academic and professional requirements.

Faculty-based *Operational Implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Policy* documents, whilst abiding by the fundamental principles outlined here, will cover, *inter alia*: the arrangements for the hand-in and return of coursework; the arrangements for the quality control of programme and course handbooks; arrangements for the internal scrutiny of the design of assessments (e.g. the review of examination questions); arrangements for the control of assessment loading across courses and programmes, and design principles for assessment to encourage good academic practice and integrity in student work.

Oversight and responsibility for the AFP rests with the University Academic Quality and Standards Committee (AQSC). In line with the QAA indicators, this policy must be reviewed by the AQSC every three years (or more frequently where changes are made to the UK Quality Code), to ensure it remains fit for purpose. Faculty *Operational Implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Policy* documents will be overseen and agreed by each Faculty's Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

2.3 INFORMATION COMMITMENTS

All information relating to assessment provided to staff, students, placement/practice providers and other relevant stakeholders shall be made available in a clear, appropriate and accessible format.

The broad grading schemes that underpin assessment will be those published with the University [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#).

The University requires Faculties to ensure that the attention of students and staff is drawn to the University's [Regulations Governing the Conduct of Examinations](#), the [Regulations Governing Suspected Plagiarism & Examination Offences](#) and, where appropriate, the [Fitness to Practise Regulations](#).

The AFP requires all coursework deadlines, including the dates of submission and return of marked work, to be made clear to students at the start of each course. Students must be referred to the University's [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#) and [Regulations Governing Student Claims of Extenuating Circumstances](#) for the regulations governing late submission.

This Policy also commits Faculties to produce the following, on an annual basis, as an Appendix to the *Operational Implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Policy*:

- The names of course leaders and External Examiners for each course;
- The methods of scrutiny of the assessment for each course (in other words, the arrangements for internal and external moderation of assessed work);
- The dates of SAPs and PABs.

This Appendix will outline the level of oversight of assessed work, with the corresponding marking and moderation and/or double-marking processes to be used for each course. Each course will need to comply with the Faculty guidelines for scrutiny and any exceptions must be fully documented and agreed at FAQSC.

Each course must have a Course Handbook, for which a University template will be provided from 2015-16 onwards. Core information provided to students for each course in the Course Handbook must include learning outcomes; assessment structure, timetable for the submission of assignments; marking criteria; moderation or other forms of scrutiny; external examining arrangements, and arrangements for feedback. Some of this information will already be given in the formal [Course Specification \(see QAH Appendix D1\)](#), which should be included in the Handbook, but this will need to be supplemented by the detailed arrangements for particular occurrences of the course.

3.0 ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK: THE CONTRIBUTION TO STUDENT LEARNING

Assessment must be designed in such a way as to promote effective learning. All courses are required to provide opportunities for all the intended learning outcomes for the course to be achieved and assessed. Across the courses, the range and types of assessment must measure student achievement of course- and programme-level learning outcomes.

In November 2009, Academic Council endorsed the principles from the Re-engineering Assessment Practices in Higher Education Project ([REAP 2007](#)) as a means of realising some of the specific aims of the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy 2006 – 11. The [REAP principles](#) are designed to engage and empower students through the development of self-regulation: the first four are about using assessment tasks to promote the active engagement of students in learning, the next seven are about feedback and empowering students through the development of independent learning.

This commitment has now been carried forward into the [Learning, Teaching and Assessment Strategy \(LTAS\) 2012 – 17](#). The University Assessment and Feedback Policy (AFP) forms a part of one of the objectives of the LTAS, as a component of Goal 1: The transformation of curricula and curriculum enrichment.

The LTAS commits the University to assessment and feedback designs that maximise learning through formative and summative assessments which are varied, developmental and well spaced across programmes. Both formative and summative assessments should be incorporated into all courses within a programme.

The AFP therefore requires programme teams to ensure that assessments include a range of types of assessment to promote effective learning and assess a range of learning outcomes. Assessment types should be varied to allow students to demonstrate a range of academic skills and attributes, including group work, oral presentation, report writing and academic writing. This is especially relevant in relation to the Greenwich Graduate Attributes and the need for students to develop a range of skills that enhances their employability.

The range of assessment types should be designed to ensure inclusivity and acknowledge different learning styles, but without unduly multiplying the different types of assessment activity. The potential range of forms of assessment is described in [Appendix 2](#) of this Policy; however, a balance needs to be struck between a range of assessment tasks and the need for students to know how to address these. Too much variety and too little opportunity to practice the task can be as problematical as too little. The guiding principle has to be what best assesses the learning outcomes, rather than the provision of variety for its own sake.

The general principle governing the design of assessment regimes on courses and programmes should therefore be that of economy of movement: seeking to minimize the assessment loading required to make a judgement about the achievement of learning outcomes and the development of specific skills. This might mean, for example, looking at the possibility of using synoptic assessment tasks that encompass a significant number of learning outcomes, and possibly skills, in a single exercise, or that encompass learning outcomes across a number of different courses.

Assessment tasks should also follow a pattern that ensures that assessment is developmental and impacts positively on future learning. They should reflect the increasing complexity and demands of successive stages in the programme.

[Appendix 4](#) provides the means to construct a detailed marking grid, by selecting criteria and identifying levels of achievement. Feedback to students should be provided on the same basis, allowing them to see clearly where they been successful and where improvement is needed.

More specifically:

Assessment tasks should promote effective learning through:

- An explicit relationship between individual assessment activities and specific learning outcomes, which can be clearly articulated to students;
- The use of a variety of assessment activities, through which students can demonstrate the achievement of a range of academic and/or professional skills and one or more of the attributes of the Greenwich Graduate;
- A developmental progression that builds on previous learning and promotes subsequent learning on the course or programme, reflecting the increasing complexity and demands made by successive stages in the programme;
- Fostering, through the way in which they are designed, active and inquiry-based learning and developing increasing independence and in-depth learning in the student;
- Being regularly reviewed, updated, where necessary, and renewed, to ensure the active engagement of students and promote good academic practice and integrity;
- Feedback that is timely, positive in orientation and constructive, in a way that guides the student in how to proceed in the future and develops the skills of self-evaluation

For more details on feedback, see below.

Assessment tasks should be fair, valid and reliable through:

- Being evaluated solely on the basis of the achievement of students against criteria and standards specifically aligned with learning outcomes;
- Being designed to promote inclusivity and in such a way as not to disadvantage, either overtly or by omission, any student or groups of students;
- Covering a range of assessment practices that acknowledge and cater for different learning styles;
- Being scheduled in such a way as to allow both staff and students to plan and manage their workloads successfully;
- Clear communication to students of the purposes, timing, weighting, methods of marking and scrutiny for all summative assessments, at the start of every course;

-
- Procedures that ensure that all staff teaching on a course share a common understanding of the purpose of assessment tasks set and associated marking criteria, with appropriate scrutiny and oversight of the marking processes.

For more detail on ensuring that assessment practices are fair, valid and reliable, see Sections 4.0 – 4.6 below.

Feedback should:

- Clarify how good performance is recognised, through clear description of the goals of assessment, the criteria used to evaluate it and differential standards of achievement;
- Foster the development of reflection and self-assessment in learning;
- Encourage dialogue about learning (peer and tutor-student);
- Act as a motivation to learn, developing self-esteem and a clear appraisal of the potential for improvement;
- Provide opportunities for feedback to be acted on, enabling students to develop;
- Provide information that tutors can use to help shape their teaching and the further guidance they offer to students.

For more detail on the provision of feedback, see [Appendix 6](#).

4.0 ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Assessment must be conducted with rigour, probity and fairness, and with due regard for security. As is recognised in Section 1 of this Policy, the University has a series of interlocking Regulations, Policies, Procedures and guidance documents through which this is put into operation.

The functions and terms of reference of Subject Assessment Panels (SAPs) and Progression and Award Boards (PABs) are governed by the University's [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#). In accordance with the relevant Quality Code indicator, these regulations identify the composition and conduct of SAPs and PABS, confirming their authority; roles and responsibilities; the generation of data; the recording of assessment decisions, and the communication of results to students.

The University recognises that there are several ways of improving the reliability of assessment. The AFP highlights two principles relevant to this issue:

- Ensuring that the design of both assessments and marking criteria or marking schemes is clear, transparent and explicitly related to learning outcomes and to performance descriptors. To this end, the design of assessments and marking criteria or marking schemes *must* undergo a process of peer scrutiny before assessment tasks are given to students, in advance of course delivery. The only exception to this would be where peer review by students was being used and the process of developing marking criteria formed a part of the assessment task given to the students.
- Internal moderation of the marks and double-marking of assessments by internal examiners improves the reliability of marking. It can be useful to use marking and moderation templates for the purpose. Where internal moderation is used, this must take place before the SAP, before students receive the marks for summative assessment and before they receive written feedback on summative assessments. *All summative assessment must be subject to scrutiny.*

Appropriate processes must exist within Faculties to confirm that items of assessment have appropriate rigour. Departments will be responsible for ensuring that assessment tasks are scrutinised and agreed in advance of their publication.

4.1 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

In the context of individual programmes or disciplines, Faculties are expected to ensure that assessment criteria and marking schemes meet the needs of different academic levels and stages of a programme to maintain academic standards, demonstrate openness, fairness and transparency, and encourage use of the full range of available marks. Generic criteria for the range of available marks can be found in the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards, under [Marking and Classification Conventions](#).

Encouragement of the use of the full range of marks means that marks above or below a certain level should not be proscribed or discouraged, either explicitly or by custom and practice. For example, in awarding first-class marks for undergraduate work, what has to be borne in mind is what more might reasonably be expected of any undergraduate student performing at a high level. The logical corollary of this is that it should be possible for a student on an undergraduate Honours degree to achieve marks in the 90s.

Equally, academic staff ought to feel able to mark work at the lower level of achievement honestly, although great care must be taken in giving feedback to students in such circumstances. The guiding principles for marking *must* be given by the FHEQ Level Descriptors; the learning outcomes for the programme, the course and the assessment, and the University's [generic marking criteria](#) within the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards. Exemplars of assessment grids, such as the one produced at [Oxford Brookes University](#) by Margaret Price and Chris Rust (see also [Appendix 4](#)), are available online. Assessment grids (rubrics) can also be produced in GradeMark within Turnitin, which can be useful for a team of tutors marking the same assignment (see [Appendix 4](#)).

Students should be provided with clear assessment criteria for specific assessment tasks. These should identify how the assessment relates to the learning outcomes and clearly describe what they are expected to do and how the marks will be allocated. Teaching teams should ensure students understand the criteria and also seek to engage them in the criteria through a range of exercises. Advice on how to do this is available from the University's [Educational Development Unit \(EDU\)](#).

4.2 ASSESSMENT OFFENCES

The AFP requires Faculties to ensure that assessment is designed to promote good academic practice and integrity, thereby attempting to minimise the opportunities for any form of cheating, including plagiarism, collusion, impersonation and the use of inadmissible material.

Support for the design of forms of assessment that prevent the occurrence of plagiarism can be obtained from the [EDU](#). Students also need to be given appropriate training on referencing by means of practical exercises, e.g. through the development of their own critiques of poorly referenced pieces of work.

4.3 INCLUSIVE ASSESSMENT

In line with the University's Examination and Assessment Regulations for Students with Disabilities, Dyslexia and Long Term Conditions and its [Equality and Diversity Policy Statement](#), assessment processes should be inclusive and appropriate arrangements should be made for the assessment of students with disabilities, dyslexia and long-term medical conditions. Inclusivity in assessment practices should, however, go beyond making special provision for those students with specific needs or giving consideration of what are defined as 'protected characteristics' in law and should consider the totality of the constituency of students undertaking the assessment.

Assessment processes should not (through design or omission) disadvantage any individual or group(s) of students, and Faculties should conduct evaluations of the impact of their assessment practices. The following represent some of the issues to bear in mind:

- **Age:** Does the range of assessment enable all ages of learner to participate equally (e.g. willingness to discuss in class; approach to reflection and/or assessment; learner's previous experience of assessment methods; preparation for taking exams; ability to use technology)?
- **Disability:** Are adaptations made to enable participation (e.g. for physical disabilities, is there appropriate seating and an opportunity to move if necessary in examinations; are all students able to participate equally in field trips and lab work; is provision made for students with dyslexia)?
- **Gender:** Do assessment items avoid gender bias, both intrinsically and in terms of their management (e.g. the range of assessments in place; flexibility for pregnancy/breast-feeding mothers during examinations; submissions taking account of paternity/maternity leave)?
- **Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender and Gender Reassignment:** Do assessment items contain forms of language which are unconsciously discriminatory? For example, are tacit assumptions made about 'normal' patterns of family life?
- **Culture and ethnicity/race:** Do assessment items recognise different approaches to learning (e.g. the willingness of students to give opinions/critique rather than receiving and reproducing or, at best, restructuring a tutor's ideas; the use of the English language by international students and whether the language used for assessment disadvantages them)?
- **Religion and belief:** Are assessments timed appropriately/sensitively (e.g. do fixed assessments, such as examinations, disadvantage any students; does clothing impact on assessment opportunities)?
- **Social class:** Do assessments disadvantage students from low-income households (e.g. in terms of access to technology when required or access to quiet work spaces at home; in relation to low expectations or a limited range of prior experience; not providing a range of assessment items to enable all students)?

4.4 AMOUNT AND TIMING OF ASSESSMENT

When courses and programmes are reviewed, the course or programme will be evaluated to determine whether the quantity of assessment is appropriate to ensuring that the learning outcomes are met. Assessment must also be matched to the volume of credit on the course. Departments should ensure there is comparability in workload within courses across their programmes, with appropriate ratios between credits, learning times, assessment loadings and, where relevant, word-lengths.

Programme teams are also required to schedule assessment to enable feedback to feed forward into future assessment tasks. Due regard also needs to be given to the links between learning on courses running in parallel. Assessments should be scheduled to ensure that students have time to review and prepare their work and act on any formative feedback they have received.

The scheduling of assessments in advance should enable students to work effectively and time-manage their work (see 2.3 above). For this purpose, the [Educational Development Unit \(EDU\)](#) can provide access to [electronic tools](#) to support the effective scheduling of assessments, including information about the analytical tools available from the HEA [TESTA](#) Project (Transforming the Experience of Students through Assessment), which the University has been piloting in 2014. Programme teams should also consider using a calendar for students to show the timing of all of the assessments. The [Map My Programme](#) tool provides an excellent visual representation of the scheduling of assessment tasks, making it clear where bunching might be occurring, and programme teams should make use of this to examine the scheduling of assessments across a whole programme.

4.5 MARKING AND GRADING

The AFP recognises that marking and grading are the processes by which judgments are made on the extent to which a learner has achieved the outcomes set in the assessment task. Transparent and equitable processes appropriate to the nature of the assessment tasks are essential if defensible and consistent judgments are to be reached.

With the exception of items of assessment marked on a pass/fail basis (e.g. where fundamental competency is being assessed), detailed marking and grading conventions must comply with the [marking conventions](#) of the Academic Regulations for Taught Awards, which require the use of numerical scales.

All assessments and marks must be open to scrutiny and all evidence of moderation or double-marking should be made available to the relevant External Examiners.

Marks awarded for summative assessments which are returned to students for information and feedback are provisional until they are ratified by the Subject Assessment Panel (SAP), which is the stage in the assessment process when standards for individual courses are confirmed, and endorsed by the Progression and Award Board and by the External Examiner. This must be made clear to students when marks are released or assessments returned to them in advance of the SAP. When marks are released progressively as they are entered on Banner and before they are confirmed by the SAP, care must be taken to manage student responses to those marks.

With the exception of assessments involving a necessary process of face-to-face involvement and feedback where anonymity is not practicable or appropriate (for example, where design portfolios, films, models evaluated in 'crits', artefacts, staging or clinical practice are involved), assessments **must** be marked anonymously.

4.6 SCRUTINY OF ASSESSMENTS

Unless they are subject to a form of electronic marking (e.g. through an online process, where a correct answer is agreed in advance and programmed into the marking system) or it represents a simple contribution to assessment based, say, on attendance, *summative assessments that contribute to a final award must be subject to one of the following:*

Blind double-marking: Two separate assessors each independently give marks for all the assessments submitted; they then agree a final mark, with the student receiving the agreed mark. Where the assessments are to be returned to the student for feedback, the assessors provide agreed comments against the learning outcomes and assessment criteria.

Double-marking: The work is marked by a first assessor and is then given to a second assessor who also marks the work, but is aware of any comments made by the first assessor and is given a list of the allocated marks for the student cohort proposed by the first assessor. A final mark must be agreed between the assessors and the student given the agreed mark.

Team/panel marking: This can also be called 'jury' marking or 'crits' (in design subjects), and is typically used for live performances; recitals; presentations of project work, and oral examinations. In these cases, there should normally be the involvement of *at least* two assessors, who should agree the final mark for each piece of work. A written report of their comments should be available as feedback to the student.

Team moderation: This is most suitable for the assessment of portfolios of design or art work. Each group of portfolios should be assessed by a minimum of two assessors, one of whom is not the student's tutor. All assessors (or several teams of assessors) jointly review a sample, containing at minimum a number of pieces of work in each classification band from each assessment team and

the overall moderation of marks is then jointly agreed. Additionally, all fails are checked jointly by all assessors.

Moderation: This is peer-based scrutiny of the marking, which is most suitable for large courses with experienced teams, but Faculties should use the risk-based approach described below to determine the appropriate level of scrutiny.

With the exception of final stage dissertations, Faculties should select marking and moderation practices most appropriate to given subject areas and types of assessment. All dissertations **must** be blind double-marked.

Evidence of such scrutiny must be made available to External Examiners.

*Summative assessments that do not contribute to a final award do not necessarily need to be double-marked, but **must** be subject to moderation. For example, Level 4 courses do not contribute to the final award on Honours degrees but do on HNDs or Foundation degrees. This can be done through sampling or through moderation of the spread of marks (e.g. where there is a team of tutors marking the same course) to ensure consistency.*

Where sampling is employed, or where team moderation is used, Faculties should employ a risk-based approach in determining the level and style of scrutiny of student work by moderators, taking into account key risk factors such as the type of assessment, the number of assessors and their experience.

The AFP acknowledges the following as some of the key risk factors that might require an increase in the scale of scrutiny and oversight required:

- When a course is delivered at more than one centre (e.g. University and partner);
- Where marking cannot be anonymized and the students being assessed are members of staff;
- When a course is delivered by several teams of tutors or if the same course is delivered by different tutors to different groups of students in the Department (e.g. separate delivery to part-time and full-time students);
- When the assessment team is inexperienced;
- If special circumstances have prevented the course being delivered to expectation;
- When there is an unusual pattern of results for the course (e.g. departing from KPIs);
- At the discretion of the course team or of the Head of Department, the Faculty Director of Learning and Teaching or the Pro Vice-Chancellor (e.g. if a course is a new development and there is a need to monitor results closely).

The overarching role of moderation is for moderators to advise and consult with markers, with the aim of providing feedback and agreeing the standards of marks. Where a mark cannot be agreed between different markers or between markers and moderators, or where there are significant discrepancies between marks awarded within or between different parts of a programme:

- The whole run of marks could be reviewed to establish the reason(s) for the discrepancies;
- Additional marking should take place through, for example, re-marking of all the work;
- For project or dissertation work, the use of a third independent assessor might be employed.

To avoid any confusion arising from the process of double-marking or moderation, only the final mark agreed between the markers or arrived at through the process of moderation should be returned to the student.

While the range of assessment tasks undertaken may vary widely according to purpose and discipline, the design and moderation of assessment tasks plays an important role in supporting the application of transparent and equitable marking and grading processes.

4.7 SAMPLING

Scrutiny can be applied either to all the pieces of work submitted for an assignment or to a sample of the work submitted for assessment. Where sampling is used, Faculty Academic Quality and Standards Committees will use the risk-based evaluation described above to establish a suitable sampling methodology, which will be outlined in their *Operational Implementation of the Assessment and Feedback Policy* document.

For submission of a sample to the External Examiner, the sample should consist of a selection of work representative of the full range of marks, and should be of sufficient size to judge the validity and reliability of the marking (*normally not less than 10%*). For courses with a very large number of students, however, this percentage may not be viable in terms of the burden it might place on an External Examiner, and Faculties will need to use their judgement as to the appropriate sample size. For courses with a small number of students, the sample should not normally be fewer than 5 students and should contain at least one example of each category of marks awarded (if available).

The AFP requires all assessment items contributing to a final award to be available for scrutiny by External Examiners. External examining is governed by the University of Greenwich [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#).

5.0 FEEDBACK

The AFP recognises that feedback should promote learning, enabling students to learn from the assessment task and improve their performance in future assessments. It should be linked to the assessment criteria and be appropriate to the nature of the assessment.

With the exception of examination scripts, students are entitled to feedback on all summative and submitted formative work. Feedback can also be provided on examination scripts at the discretion of the Faculty.

Feedback should provide a student with a clear explanation of how the marks have been derived or allocated and a clear understanding of how they can improve their work in the future. It should encourage learning and impact positively upon progression.

With the exception of dissertations and other work that is subject to a process of supervision, students can receive formative feedback on a draft of a substantial piece of summatively assessed work (e.g. an extended essay).

The scheduling of formative feedback on drafts will be dependent on the nature of the assessment task, and the timing for returning the work will be at the discretion of the course team. Clearly, however, teaching teams will need to ensure that students have sufficient time to act on any feedback received, and ought not to accept drafts from students at the last minute, close to an assessment deadline.

Academic staff should design feedback so that it:

- is prompt, constructive and improvement-oriented, as an entitlement (including prior notification, discussion and exemplification of grading criteria and/or assessment methods);
- uses methods that are most suitable for student development and make use of appropriate technologies, which could, for example, include feedback that is recorded but not necessarily written (see [Appendix 6](#)).

Feedback should be returned in a timely manner, and the extent, nature and timing of feedback for each task must be made clear to students in advance so that they can make the best use of the

feedback (see [Appendix 6](#)). The University norm for the provision of feedback is that this should be provided within three working weeks of final submission of an assignment. Where this is not practicable, a clear rationale must be provided to the students.

6.0 PSRB REQUIREMENTS

Where a programme is subject to accreditation by a PSRB, the assessment arrangements for that programme should be consistent with any requirements set by the PSRB.

Any additional requirements associated with PSRB accreditation must be published to students by the Department in course and programme handbooks and specifications. As outlined in the University [Academic Regulations for Taught Awards](#), where professional body requirements differ from the University Regulations, Faculties may apply to Academic Council for derogation from the Regulations.

7.0 MANAGING HIGHER EDUCATION WITH OTHERS

All of the protocols described in the AFP are applicable in the delivery of programmes by partners.

8.0 OTHER REQUIREMENTS

All academic staff are required to make themselves familiar with the current policies and procedures for assessment within the University and the Faculty. Through use of [the Staff Appraisal Scheme](#), Faculties are required to ensure that staff are well prepared to undertake assessment-related activity and to use the University [Staff Development Policy](#) to this end.

Anonymous marking: The identity of students is not revealed to markers and/or to the assessment panel or examination board. There may be a point towards the end of the assessment process where anonymity ends.

Assessment criteria: These provide the means for evaluating the knowledge, understanding and skills that markers expect a student to display in the assessment task; they are based on the intended learning outcomes for the work being assessed.

Award: This refers to a qualification or certificated credit conferred upon a student who has achieved the intended learning outcomes and passed the assessments required to meet the academic standards set by an institution for the award.

Blind double-marking: Two separate assessors each independently give marks for all the assessments submitted; they then agree a final mark, with the student receiving the agreed mark.

Diagnostic assessment: This is used to show a learner's preparedness for a course or programme and identifies, for the learner and the teacher, any strengths and potential gaps in the knowledge, understanding and skills expected at the start of a programme.

Double-marking: All the work is marked by a first assessor and is then given to a second assessor who also marks the work, but is aware of any comments made by the first assessor and is given a list of the allocated marks for the student cohort proposed by the first assessor. A final mark must be agreed between the assessors and the student given the agreed mark.

Feedback: The process by which students are given a commentary on work they have carried out and suggestions about how their work can be improved in the future.

Feed-forward: The process by which students are given guidance to inform work they are about to undertake, or are carrying out, so that they can make adjustments to what they are doing; however, the term is also used to describe the adjustments made in teaching based on an evaluation of the results of student assessment.

Formative assessment: This is designed to help students to learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and on how it can be improved, but does not contribute to their success or failure on a course or programme.

Grade descriptors: These encapsulate a level of achievement in relation to bands of marks. For individual assignments they indicate how well the assessment criteria have been met.

Marking grid: This is a detailed framework for assigning marks, where differential levels of achievement are provided for each of the criteria in an assignment. An exemplar can be found in [Appendix 4](#). The marking grid can also be used to compile a summary feedback sheet as in the criterion-based marking example from Castel et al. given by the [Higher Education Academy](#), pp. 93-4.

Marking scheme: This is a detailed framework for assigning marks, where a specific number of marks is given to individual components of the answer. An exemplar can be found in [Appendix 3](#).

Moderation: This is a process intended to assure that an assessment outcome is fair and reliable and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently through scrutiny by one or more assessors, of the marking or the range of marks awarded. The scrutineers may or may not have been involved in the original marking process.

Peer assessment or review: This involves students in looking at and assessing each other's work against predetermined criteria and giving each other feedback. This process can be extended to involving students in the construction and formulation of marking criteria.

Sampling: This is most commonly used in the process of moderation and entails looking at a selection, or sample, of work. It normally involves internal or external examiners scrutinising a proportion of the work from a student cohort to review the standard and consistency of marking.

Summative assessment: This is used to indicate the extent of a learner's success in meeting the assessment criteria used to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a course or programme. In that sense, it can be considered to sum up a student's achievement. Summative assessment contributes to a student's success or failure on a course or programme.

Synoptic assessment: This is an assessment that encourages students to combine elements of their learning from different parts of a programme and to show their accumulated knowledge and understanding of a topic or subject area.

APPENDIX 2 – EXEMPLARS OF TYPES OF ASSESSMENT

- **Essay:** Classically, the discursive presentation of an argument, in a relatively short piece of work (typically between 1,000 – 5,000 words). The term ‘essay’ can, however, be used to cover such things as a photographic essay, in which a connected series of images are put together, with or without linking text.
- **Dissertation:** A more sustained piece of argumentation embodying an extended analysis, usually the result of a small research project (empirical or theoretical), presented at either undergraduate or Master’s level (typically between 5,000 – 20,000 words, depending on Level).
- **Thesis¹ or Doctoral Dissertation:** Sustained presentation of the results of an independent piece of research (empirical or theoretical), containing detailed and sophisticated argumentation, for a PhD or other form of doctorate (typically, for a PhD, encompassing 80,000 – 100,000 words).
- **Proposal:** Usually, a description of a proposed project or piece of research, normally entailing some methodological discussion and a description of the techniques or methods the student intends to use and perhaps suggesting hypotheses to be tested. A precursor to work towards a dissertation or thesis.
- **Literature Review:** Most often a component of a dissertation or thesis, but often conducted as an exercise in its own right, whether or not it is ultimately to form part of a dissertation or thesis or not. Normally, it examines the existing literature to discover the strengths and weakness in the field, identifying gaps in the literature that the thesis/dissertation is intended to address or fill and thereby providing the rationale for conducting the research.
- **Bibliography:** This is most often annotated and may be related to a dissertation or project or to a topic specified on a course. It may form a part of training students in the skills of research skills can be especially useful in helping students in the early stages of undergraduate work develop a sense of themselves as independent researchers as part of inquiry-based learning.
- **Outline:** A coherent plan of a programme of work, the required format of which will be stipulated but will most likely include the following: an introduction indicating main thrust of the argument and a justification of this; the division of the argument into sections; a list of the main sources to be used with a note of their salient points, and how this information is likely to be integrated into a conclusion. This is most often one of the preparatory stages to the writing up of a dissertation or project.
- **Project:** This is typically an individual or collective enterprise designed to achieve an objective, but is often used simply to describe the kind of activity that will result in the writing of a dissertation, and understood to mean ‘research project’. It could equally be used, however, in relation to the design of a piece of software and the writing of the relevant code. In terms of work-related activity, a project could mean activity undertaken by one or more students for a client (whether real or imaginary).

¹ In some countries, ‘thesis’ is reserved for work at undergraduate or Master’s level and ‘dissertation’ for work submitted in support of a doctorate.

-
- **Creative Project:** Most often the creation of an artefact, in any expressive medium or combination of media, which can be a response to a topic set by academic staff or devised by the student or students. In architectural or landscape design, this will be assessed by means of a 'crit', which might or might not involve peer review by other students. Performance or other forms of artistic production could also be assessed in a similar way.
 - **Portfolio:** This is typically, but not exclusively, a collection of creative pieces of work designed to showcase skill in a way which is synoptic. It can be used in a variety of productive ways and for a range of purposes, and could combine formative and summative assessment (for example, by gathering together work which had previously been given formative feedback and improved to be submitted for summative assessment).
 - **Supervision Meeting/Review:** Although many supervision meetings can be relatively informal, and designed simply to provide feedback, these will often be punctuated by more formal review processes, where progress is assessed against a series of defined markers or expectations.
 - **Supervisor's Report:** In a clinical context, this can be the report made by a supervisor assessing the student's capacity to work safely, competently and appropriately within a professional environment, according to defined criteria. This can be compiled in discussion and through consultation with the student.
 - **Report:** Normally a written text intended to convey information, a report is usually intended to convey the results of an investigation or inquiry, tailored to a specific audience. Report-writing can often be useful in giving students a means to rehearse work-related activities, providing a simulation of something they may later be doing in their professional lives. A clinical report, for example, might report on intervention with a client in a therapeutic situation.
 - **Review:** A detailed review of a single book, artwork or performance of the kind that might be found in the book review section of a journal, arts magazine or quality newspaper. Used with academic texts, this can be a very useful way of developing in students the skill of identifying and evaluating arguments.
 - **Briefing Paper:** This would have the primary purpose of communicating to a defined audience the basic features of a problem or issue, together with the relative merits of alternative approaches to addressing the problem or issue. This could be a component of a **simulation** (see below).
 - **Case Study:** Usually an analysis of one or more individuals, events, decisions, periods, projects, policies, institutions, etc., considered holistically, possibly from a number of different vantage points or using a range of methods, to provide a picture 'in the round'. Like the report, this can be especially useful as a rehearsal for students, related to their future professional lives. The case study could be selected by the student or provided to them by the teaching team.
 - **Simulation:** Students are given an activity to undertake which in some senses 'mimics reality' and provides a holistic experience, in which they may be asked to take on specific roles. This may result in a range of activities that could be assessed, for which a variety of forms of assessment might be used, depending on the role the students are asked to take on, and the learning outcomes the activity is designed to engender. The simulation could be broken down into a series of stages, with different forms of assessment associated with each of the stages.

-
- **Assessment of Practice:** This is a collaborative, constructive process undertaken between students, academic staff and the student's mentor or practice assessors whereby the practice outcomes and skills developed during placements are assessed, based on observation of students in practice and evidence presented in a Practice Assessment Document or equivalent.
 - **Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs):** This is a formalised practical exam which requires the practitioner to demonstrate their ability to undertake a range of clinical skills and articulate relevant applied clinical knowledge. OSCEs are undertaken in the Clinical Skills Laboratories under exam conditions within a given time limit relevant to the skills being tested.
 - **Clinical Skills Assessment:** This can take a variety of forms, depending on the clinical context and the form of professional practice, but students would be expected, under controlled conditions, to demonstrate sufficient competency and, where relevant, conformity to the requirements (which may include ethical requirements) of the relevant professional code of conduct.
 - **Clinical Commentary:** A student is required to comment on clinical material provided, e.g. a video or audio recording of a simulated interview with a patient.
 - **Presentation:** This involves the student(s) in demonstrating and explaining the content of a topic. Although it is most often associated with a business context, almost anything could be the subject of a presentation, which means that this is a skill students could acquire in any number of contexts and with any number of purposes in mind: e.g. an interior designer presenting information to a client; a fund-raiser working for a charity; a campaigner for a political party, or a lecturer on antique porcelain talking to museum curators.
 - **Poster:** Posters are increasingly being used as a form of presentation at scientific conferences and can act as a useful simulation activity for students. Typically, it is used for the presentation of information gleaned from research, identifying research methods used and outcomes, but adopts a visual format to do so.
 - **Reflective Writing:** This is normally understood to mean a form of writing that explores the meaning or significance of an experience in a broader context to try to evaluate what might be learned or what conclusions might be drawn from the experience. Any practitioner who is required to be or to become self-aware will be likely to need to do some form of reflective writing.
 - **Journal:** This could cover a range of different activities, but is usually understood to mean a piece of reflective writing in the form of a professional diary of some kind, recording a process or set of experiences and analysing their meaning through the ongoing process of recording the process, events or experiences involved.
 - **Self-assessment:** This is not entirely dissimilar to various forms of reflective writing but the focus here is on the application of criteria by a student to their own work. The student may well require both training in the process of evaluation and support in doing so, but this can be a very valuable strategy in developing awareness in students of the meaning of various criteria applied to their work by tutors.
 - **Peer-assessment:** This may take a number of different forms (e.g. mutual assessment of group presentations), but the focus here is on developing awareness in students of the meaning of assessment criteria.

-
- **Peer Review:** Students are given the role of assessors for one another's written work. This may entail involving them in the construction of assessment criteria and in giving feedback.
 - **Group work:** The key feature of this is that it is a task or tasks set to students as a group, which then requires evaluation as such, but may also demand evaluation of individual contributions, depending on the nature of the learning outcome(s) it is intended to address. This can therefore be complex to design, to manage and to assess, but has the advantage that it develops a different set of skills from those engendered in students working on their own.
 - **Field/Laboratory Notes:** The emphasis here is going to be on accuracy of recording and obeying the protocols required for recording and description (e.g. of findings) and the methodological imperatives of different disciplines. It could be taking place in any number of disciplinary or professional contexts, from anthropological, biological or geological field notes to recording the results of experiments in the physical sciences or engineering.
 - **Log/Workbook:** Compared to the journal, this places greater emphasis on the process of recording (in the way that a ship's log might) and is intended as a means of keeping track of something, usually over time, so it might be used in a number of different contexts with students, where accuracy in recording is important. This could, for example, be a production log for a video or a workbook related to a project undertaken for a client.
 - **Blog:** This is an online journal created by an individual or group, which allows users to post content, and allows readers to comment on posts. A collaborative or individual blog could be used to provide evidence of understanding of key themes, concepts and ideas.
 - **Learning Diary:** This is a reflective account by a student of the learning undergone during a specified time period (e.g. on a single course, or over a placement period). This needs to entail identification of issues related to their learning by the student, evidence of developing understanding and of any progress made, which are pulled together and synthesized through the process of on-going reflection.
 - **Document Pack assessment:** Usually within an unseen examination, students are provided with a set of documents on which they are required to answer questions or comment, or use as the basis for an analysis.
 - **Seen/Open Book/Open Note Examination:** Student respond to material to which they have been given access before the examination, or are able to bring specified materials in with them. This could be assessing the students' skills in reading and interpretation, research, problem-solving or communication, or any combination of these.
 - **Multiple Choice Questions:** Since the correct answers for these can be pre-programmed, this is one example of an assessment task that can be marked online, and would only require moderation at the setting stage.
 - **Short answer:** This form of assessment might be used in lieu of an essay, for example to evaluate a student's skill in assessing or understanding something (say, an argument in a short piece of text, or key features of a case study presented to them). Unlike an essay, where argumentation is key, a short answer can test a student's capacity to respond to something on the spur of the moment.
 - **Concept note:** Students are required to write a short synoptic account of a fundamental but complex or contentious concept, e.g. 'nationalism' or 'culture'.

-
- **Exercise:** A short written, practical or oral task (e.g. involving the manipulation of data, the analysis of a document, identification of specimens, the provision of a solution to a problem etc.).
 - **Aural Examination:** Most usually a test of comprehension in another language, designed to test competency in that language.
 - **Quiz:** In one respect, this is self-explanatory, but a quiz can be used in quite a wide variety of ways, from group activity in the seminar room to online self-assessment.

Where marking guidelines are given to a team of tutors marking assessments on a course, it can be useful to provide an indication of the likely pattern of response students will have to the question or problem set; the sorts of errors that will typically be produced or difficulties students may encounter at different levels of achievement. Students can also be made aware, through supporting notes, of possible pitfalls in approaching particular questions or problems. The following represents an exemplar of this kind of information, provided in relation to a specific assessment task and offering guidance on the specifics of the question set. This is adapted from a Level 4 social science course, produced for students and tutors by the Open University, but is a customisable approach.

Essay Question:

What are some of the problems associated with studying culture and, especially, cultural diversity? In your answer, make specific reference to the projects we have studied on the course.

Recommended reading: Course reader, Chapter 3 and key course materials, in particular Eileen Barker's *The Making of a Moonie*.

Notes to Students: Although the reading for this question might seem less substantial than for the others, remember that the problems that researchers like Eileen Barker and the others raise for consideration are by no means simple or purely technical ones, but involve the whole nature of social science research. You will need to show, not only that you understand the varying definitions and uses of the concept of 'culture', but also that you appreciate some of the methodological, ethical and technical difficulties associated with studying culture, as they are presented by Eileen Barker and others, and the *implications* these might have for social science research. So do not aim simply to describe these difficulties but try to think of what they represent for the disciplines involved. Do not forget, also, that Eileen Barker and the other researchers present their approaches as only one perspective amongst others.

Your essay should have:

A clear structure:

A clear and concise **introduction** outlining the argument you are going to make in the essay; a **discussion** of the issues as you see them that develops an argument and presents supporting evidence, and a **conclusion** that pulls together and summarises that argument.

An argument:

In writing an essay, you are **making a case**, producing a **reasoned argument**, which is supported by **relevant evidence or illustration**. It needs to be organised to move from point to point steadily towards your conclusion. Along the way, you need to try to identify any **counter-arguments** that might be put to your point of view and demonstrate why they do not work as well as your argument, using your knowledge and application of the relevant literature.

Good presentation:

Your discussion should be **fully referenced**, so that whenever you use an idea which you have read elsewhere, or provide a quotation, you give a short reference in the text, which is picked up in a full listing at the end of your essay, produced using the Harvard referencing system.

GRADE	ESSAY CONTENT
70-100%	This will be an essay that has successfully addressed all three components: structure, argument and presentation. It will consist of a clear and concise introduction that sets out the issues; a well structured discussion exploring each of those issues in turn, and a conclusion that pulls all of the points made together. The discussion will follow a logical sequence, developing a reasoned argument about the problems associated with studying culture and cultural diversity and it will provide detailed evidence and illustration from the projects we have studied. It will be well presented, with full and correct referencing and a complete list of references at the end.
60-69%	This is likely to be an essay that addresses all three components but may not quite sustain the same quality of discussion throughout. The discussion may be uneven <i>either</i> in the quality of the argument (i.e. how sophisticated it is) <i>or</i> in the materials used to support it (i.e. the evidence or illustrations used). The essay will demonstrate a good grasp of the issues or problems that might arise in studying culture and cultural diversity, although the structure of the argument might be able to be strengthened. It will generally be well presented and referenced.
50-59%	An essay in this category will be likely to address only two out of the three components successfully, in other words, it might have a reasonable structure, but the argument might not be very strong (for example, because it concentrates too much on describing approaches to studying culture rather than identifying and exploring the issues or problems), or it might be putting forward quite a good or interesting argument, but the discussion might not be very well structured. It is likely to have an acceptable level of presentation, but the general impression of the essay is that there would be scope for improvement throughout.
40-49%	This is likely to be an answer that concentrates on describing the materials we have studied but doesn't manage to put together an argument about them. It may well demonstrate some understanding of the issues involved in studying culture and cultural diversity, but this is going to be at too superficial a level. There could also be substantial problems with the structuring of the essay, so that it doesn't develop an argument with a logical sequence of points but focuses on description of the materials studied. The presentation will be acceptable but there is likely to be a need for considerable improvement.
0-39%	Essays in this category are likely to contain a lot of errors or misunderstandings and have major problems of structure. They may show little understanding of the issues involved in studying culture and cultural diversity and may also struggle to describe the materials we have studied accurately. They could also have a large number of errors of presentation and not be referenced appropriately or accurately. Towards the lower end of the scale, it may be clear that there isn't sufficient understanding of what the course is trying to deliver.

Good practice would also be to train students in understanding and engaging with marking criteria; this can be accomplished through a number of different exercises, for example, asking students to mark pieces of work using the criteria. More detailed information and support in designing such activities can be obtained from the University's [Educational Development Unit](#).

Notes to Tutors from the Course Leader:

Expected content:

This essay demands more than just a close look at Eileen Barker's study (or those of the other researchers explored on the course), although weaker essays will most likely concentrate on descriptive accounts of the research projects and fail to appreciate their theoretical and methodological content, or the relationship between this and the 'problems' mentioned. I would expect students to focus on the problem of 'other cultures' as objects of study, rather than on those associated with culture as such and the issues of *verstehen*², which will escape all but the strongest of them.

Grading advice:

Third Class Honours (Bare pass): 40 -49

These essays are likely to concentrate on the definitional part of the directions in the student notes and on a descriptive and rudimentary account of Barker's research (and possibly those of other researchers), with perhaps scant reference to, or focus on, 'problems'.

2: 2 (Clear pass): 50-59

Essays meriting a 2:2 will at least provide a **full** summary of the main project, and some reference to the others, and may begin actively to consider 'problems', albeit largely in an anecdotal framework.

2:1 (Good pass): 60-69

Essays in this classification band will demonstrate some attempt to get to grips with the distinctively theoretical character of the problems, but are more likely to see these in terms of perceived technical difficulties associated with participant observation and the dangers of ethnocentrism than in terms of the 'problems' generated by the theoretical position adopted.

1st Class (Excellent): 70+

Such essays may be able to locate such problems as are found in Barker's research (and that of other researchers) within the context of social science research as a whole and may actively confront issues of relativism, *verstehen* and the construction of meanings, even hinting at the effects of Barker's theoretical orientation and those of others in this regard.

² **Verstehen** ("understand"): Since the late 19th century, in the context of German philosophy and the social sciences in general, it has been used in the special sense of "interpretive or participatory examination" of social phenomena. In anthropology, it has come to mean a systematic interpretative process through which an outside observer of a culture attempts to relate to and understand it. Verstehen is seen as a method central to a rejection of positivistic social science and refers to understanding the meaning of action from the actor's point of view. This has substantial, and complex, methodological and epistemological implications. (Adapted from Wikipedia)

Marking Criteria for a Practical Report in Science, with Exemplar Marking:

The following represents the way in which marking criteria can be broken down and allocated a given percentage of the available marks, with an exemplar of the way in which this works in the feedback provided to the student. This is for a Level 5 course, and is customisable to other subjects.

General criteria	Specific criteria
20% Scientific understanding – introduction, explanation of the rationale etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding the rationale – why we carry out dietary assessments (5 marks) • Evaluation of the limitations and validity of dietary assessment techniques (5 marks) • Understanding of the methods involved –(5 marks) • Role of sodium and potassium in diet and Nitrogen (5 marks)
20% use of the literature – evidence of reading, use of literature, lack of plagiarism etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of literature search and reading around the subject (5 marks) • Using the literature within the text (5 marks) • Evaluation of the literature (5 marks) • Evidence of using own words (5 marks)
30% evaluation of the results – critical analysis of personal and group data, comparison with expected values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Critical Evaluation of own diet – how diet can be improved (10 marks) • Critical evaluation of class data and comparison with published literature (10 marks) • Evaluation of the methodologies – sources of error (10 marks)
20% structure, organisation and presentation – logical structure, use of data, grammar and presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical report follows a logical structure and is written in full sentences and paragraphs (5 marks) • Minimal typographical, and grammatical errors (5 marks) • Good use of figures and tables – which are properly referred to within the text (5 marks) • High level of presentation – table of contents, pagination etc. (5 marks)
10% calculations – accuracy, explanations etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculations are clearly set out with units with explanations (5 marks) • Calculations are accurate (5 marks)

Total 100%

General criteria	Specific criteria
<p>20% Scientific understanding – introduction, explanation of the rationale etc.</p>	<p>Overall this is work of very high quality; unfortunately there are a few areas that have brought you down. For example, while I know, because you have articulated it very clearly in class, that you understand why we analyse diets, how we do it, and the limitations of these methods, there is little or no introduction in your report on dietary assessments and their validation through the use of biomarkers. You need to explain what is going on far more. You have also not included aims and rationales, which is important as it would show that you understand what you did and why you did it. 10/20</p>
<p>20% use of the literature– evidence of reading, use of literature, lack of plagiarism etc.</p>	<p>You have obviously made good use of the literature, and researched it thoroughly. Well done for expressing it all in your own words. In places you need to cite your sources e.g. on page 12 you refer to Nitrogen Balance but you don't reference it. By Level 5, you should also be starting to evaluate the literature (as we have done in the tutorial work in class this term) 14/20.</p>
<p>30% evaluation of the results – critical analysis of personal and group data, comparison with expected values</p>	<p>Unfortunately this is weak in places – e.g. on page 2, you say that Emma has an unreliable recorded energy intake – and yet you don't explain why. Again you articulate it so well in class I wish I could see it written on the page. You have spent time considering the individuals within the group (which exceeds my expectations); however it is not usual to identify subjects, as you have done with Emma: use initials or 'subject A' or 'B'. Scientific writing expects anonymity. I would have liked you to discuss how the class data for dietary intakes compares with other published sources e.g. the NDNS of British Adults etc. You were also one of the few people who evaluated the lab data e.g. you discussed the background contamination of glassware with sodium. 21/30</p>
<p>20% structure, organisation and presentation – logical structure, use of data, grammar and presentation</p>	<p>Generally the structure and organisation are very good – unfortunately you tend to present your work in bullet points – it would be better to use full sentences and paragraphs. Your graphs are interesting but you need to refer to them in the text and you should use a numbering system for them. 10/20</p>
<p>10% calculations – accuracy, explanations etc.</p>	<p>Excellent – clear presentation of results, calculations are explained thoroughly. 10/10</p>

APPENDIX 4 – COMPREHENSIVE UNDERGRADUATE ASSESSMENT GRID

Grid devised for Business courses by Margaret Price and Chris Rust, Oxford Brookes University (slightly modified), but adaptable to a wide range of subjects.

ONLY SELECT CRITERIA RELEVANT TO YOUR COURSE. YOU ARE NOT REQUIRED TO USE ALL OF THE CRITERIA ON THE LIST.

	CRITERION	70-100%	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	0-39%
	Presentation & style					
1	Presentation of assignment	Shows a polished and imaginative approach to the topic	Carefully and logically organised	Shows organisation and coherence	Shows some attempt to organise in a logical manner	Disorganised/ incoherent
2	Clarity of expression (incl. accuracy, spelling, grammar, punctuation)	Fluent writing style appropriate to document; grammar and spelling accurate.	Language fluent; grammar and spelling accurate	Language mainly fluent; grammar and spelling mainly accurate	Meaning apparent, but language not always fluent. Grammar and/or spelling contain errors	Meaning unclear and/or grammar and/or spelling contain frequent errors
3	Communication and presentation (appropriate to discipline)	Can engage effectively in debate in a professional manner and produce detailed and coherent project reports	Can communicate effectively in a format appropriate to the discipline and report practical procedures in a clear and concise manner with all relevant information in a variety of formats	Can communicate effectively in a format appropriate to the discipline and report procedures in a clear and concise manner with all relevant information	Some communication is effective and in a format appropriate to the discipline. Can report practical procedures in a structured way	Communication is unstructured and unfocused and/or in a format inappropriate to the discipline
4	Presentation (visual)	Material is imaginatively presented resulting in clarity of message and information	Material is carefully structured with clear message and visual effect	Material included is relevant to the topic and has been structured. Visual aspect of presentation is limited	Material presented is relevant but lacks structure or visual impact	Not all material is relevant and/or is presented in a disorganised manner

5	Presentation (oral)	Imaginative presentation of material resulting in clarity of message and information	Well structured and signposted presentation. Audible and pace appropriate to audience. Visual aids used to support the presentation	Clearly structured and addressed to audience. Pace and audibility satisfactory. Visual aids used	Shows some attempt to structure material for presentation, pace and audibility are satisfactory most of the time	Material is difficult to understand due to poor structure and/or pace and audibility
Conforming to instructions/clarity of objectives.						
6	Conforming with instructions (e.g. word length)	Work has been submitted within time boundaries and within prescribed parameters			Deviates slightly from the required parameters	Work has been submitted late with no allowable reason, or it deviates significantly from the required parameters
7	Attention to purpose	Has addressed the purpose of the assignment comprehensively and imaginatively	Has addressed the purpose of the assignment coherently and with some attempt to demonstrate imagination	Has addressed the main purpose of the assignment	Some of the work is focused on the aims and themes of the assignment	Fails to address the task set
8	Referencing	Referencing is consistently accurate	Referencing is mainly accurate		Some attempt at referencing	Referencing is absent/ unsystematic
9	Clarity of objectives and focus of work	Has defined objectives in detail and addressed them comprehensively and imaginatively.	Has defined objectives and addressed them through the work	Has outlined objectives and addressed them at the end of the work	Has provided generalised objectives and focused the work on the topic area	No information provided

Content and knowledge						
10	Content and range	Comprehensive/detailed knowledge of topic with areas of specialisation is depth and awareness of provisional nature of knowledge	Reasonable knowledge of topic and an awareness of a variety of ideas/contexts/frame-works	Has given a factual and/or conceptual knowledge base and appropriate terminology	Evidence of limited knowledge of topic and some use of appropriate terminology	Lacks evidence of knowledge relevant to the topic and/or significantly misuses terminology
11	Use of literature/evidence of reading	Has developed and justified using own ideas based on a wide range of sources which have been thoroughly analysed, applied and discussed	Able to critically appraise the literature and theory gained from variety of sources, developing own ideas in the process	Clear evidence and application of readings relevant to the subject; uses indicative texts identified	Literature is presented uncritically, in a purely descriptive way and indicates limitations of understanding	Either no evidence of literature being consulted or irrelevant to the assignment set
12	Knowledge of theory	Assignment demonstrates integration and innovation in the selection and handling of theory	Insightful and appropriate selection of theory in key areas	Most key theories are included in the work in an appropriate straight forward manner	Selection of theory is appropriate but some aspects have been missed or misconstrued	Inaccurate or inappropriate choice of theory
13	Subject's limitations and boundaries/ relation to other frameworks	Boundaries of the subject and relationships with other disciplines and frameworks have been explored and tested. Examples illustrating subject boundaries are provided	Some boundaries are explored and the relevance of relationships with other disciplines and frameworks are recognised	Awareness of subject boundaries is demonstrated and some connections with other disciplines and frameworks identified	Limited awareness of subject boundaries and/or relationships with other disciplines and frameworks demonstrated	Lacks awareness of subject boundaries or relationships
14	Context in which subject is used	Takes account of complex context and selects appropriate technique	Takes some account of context and selects some appropriate techniques	Recognises defined context and uses standard techniques for that context	Context acknowledged but not really taken into account	Context not recognised as relevant

Thinking/analysis/conclusions						
15	Conclusions	Analytical and clear conclusions well grounded in theory and literature showing development of new concepts	Good development shown in summary of arguments based in theory/literature	Evidence of findings and conclusions grounded in theory/literature	Limited evidence of findings and conclusions supported by theory/literature	Unsubstantiated/invalid conclusions based on anecdote and generalisation only, or no conclusions at all
16	Analysis	Can analyse new and/or abstract data and situations without guidance using a wide range of techniques appropriate to the topic	Can analyse a range of information with minimum guidance, can apply major theories and compare alternative methods/techniques for obtaining data	Can analyse with guidance using given classification/principles	Can analyse a limited range of information with guidance using classification/principles	Fails to analyse information
17	Conceptualisation	Able to recognise consistency and reconcile inconsistency between information using cognitive and hypothesising skills	Consistent understanding demonstrated in a logical, coherent and lucid manner	Demonstrated understanding in a style which is mostly logical, coherent and flowing	Attempts to demonstrate a logical and coherent understanding of the subject area but aspects become confused or undeveloped	Understanding of the assignment not apparent or lacks a logical and coherent framework or the subject is confused or undeveloped
18	Critical reasoning	Consistently demonstrates application of critical analysis well integrated in the text	Clear application of theory through critical analysis/critical thought of the topic area	Demonstrates application of theory through critical analysis of the topic area	Some evidence of critical thought/critical analysis and rationale for work	Lacks critical thought/analysis/reference to theory
19	Reflection/evaluation	Can review evidence critically, supporting conclusions/recommendations including their reliability, validity and	Can select appropriate techniques of evaluation and can evaluate the relevance and significance of data	Can evaluate the reliability of data using defined techniques and/or tutor	Limited and only partially accurate evaluation of data using defined techniques	Fails to evaluate or use techniques of evaluation, or evaluations are totally

		significance and can investigate contradictory information/identify reasons for contradictions.	collected.	guidance.	and/or tutor guidance.	invalid.
20	Synthesis	With minimum guidance can transform abstract data and concepts towards a given purpose and can design novel solutions	Can reformat a range of ideas/information towards a given purpose	Can collect/collate and categorise ideas and information in a predictable and standard format	Partially collects/collates and categorises information in a structured way	No organisation of ideas and information
21	Flexibility	Independently takes and understands multiple perspectives and through these can develop/adjust personal point of view	Recognises multiple perspectives which may affect personal view point	Can recognise alternative perspectives	Limited ability to see alternative perspectives	Fails to recognise alternative perspectives
Methodology/ies						
22	Choice and use of methodology	Methodology used is the most appropriate to the aims and objectives of the task, and the process and rationale for its selection is provided.	Attention is given to the selection of a methodology and the method chosen is appropriate to the task.	Methodology is appropriate to the task.	Methodology lacks clarity and/or may not be the most appropriate but there is evidence of a planned approach.	Issue of methodology not addressed and/or inappropriate methodology used and/or little planning used to complete the task.

Practical/Interpersonal Skills						
23	Performance Skills	Can perform complex skills consistently with confidence. Able to choose an appropriate response from a repertoire of actions, and can evaluate own and others' performance.	When given a complex task can choose and perform an appropriate set of actions to complete it adequately. Can evaluate own performance.	Able to perform basic skills with awareness of the necessary techniques and their potential uses and hazards. Needs external evaluation.	Able to perform basic skills with guidance on the necessary technique. Needs external evaluation.	Fails to perform even basic skills.
24	Client Satisfaction	Understood client's problems/needs and developed specific objectives which meet the client's needs and which the student can reasonably be expected to meet.	Understood client's needs but has developed objectives which the student cannot reasonably be expected to meet.	Has developed objectives which for the most part meet the client's needs.	Has used objectives given by the client without reflection on how appropriate they are or to what extent they can reasonably be met.	Little or no attempt to ascertain client's needs and develop a workable brief.
25	Data/information gathering/processing	Selects and processes data with confidence and imagination.	Selects appropriate data and processes using relevant tools.	Makes a selection from data and applies processing tools.	Collects some information and makes some use of processing tools.	Random information gathering. Inappropriate use of processing tools.
26	Imagination/Creativity	Uses imagination and explores a variety of perspectives. Employs appropriate creative techniques to enhance thinking.	Uses imagination to go beyond boundaries and applies creative techniques with skills.	Uses imagination and a limited range of creative techniques.	Shows little imagination. Aware of some creative techniques and uses them with limited success.	Lacks imagination. does not exercise creative skills.
27	Originality	Uses creative and lateral thinking to develop and present original ideas which have been critically evaluated.	By taking a variety of perspectives presents an original idea which has been evaluated.	Use imagination to produce an idea with elements of originality.	Originality is marginal to the basic idea.	No real attempt at originality

28	Self-criticism (include reflection on practice)	Is confident in application of own criteria of judgement and in challenge of received opinion in action and can reflect on action	Is able to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses; can challenge received opinion and begins to develop own criteria and judgement	Is largely dependent on criteria set by others but begins to recognise own strengths and weaknesses	Dependent on criteria set by others. Begins to recognise own strengths and weakness	Fails to meaningfully undertake the process of self-criticism
29	Independence/ Autonomy (include planning and managing learning)	With minimum guidance can manage own learning using full range of resources for discipline; can seek and make use of feedback	Identifies strengths of learning needs and follows activities to improve performance; is autonomous in straight forward study tasks	Can work independently within a relevant ethos and can access and use a range of learning resources	Can undertake clearly directed work independently within a relevant ethos and, with some guidance, use the standard learning resources	Unable to work independently, needing significant guidance on methods and resources
30	Self-presentation	Adopts a style of self-presentation and selects from a range appropriate interpersonal skills consistent with the individual's aims and the needs of the situation.	Can be flexible in the style of presentation adopted and interpersonal skills used.	Can adopt both a formal and informal style, and uses basic interpersonal skills appropriately	Can adopt both a formal and informal style, and uses basic interpersonal skills but not always matching the needs of the situation	No obvious sense of self and/ or interpersonal skills and/or skills used inappropriately
31	Time-management/self-management	Plans well ahead, sets self-determined deadlines, and uses contingency planning	Always meets deadlines. Plans management of work and monitors progress against plan	Almost always meets deadlines. Makes plans and implements them in a satisfactory manner	Usually meets important deadlines, but often despite lack of planning.	Rarely meets deadlines. Unable to make and implement plans
32	Interactive and group skills (include teamwork, negotiation/micro-politics & empathy)	Can interact effectively within a learning or professional group; can recognise or support or be proactive in leadership; can negotiate and handle conflict	Can interact effectively within a learning group, giving and receiving information and ideas and modifying responses where appropriate	Meets obligations to others (tutors and/or peers); can offer and/or support initiatives; can recognise and assess alternative options	Makes efforts to develop interactive skills. Uses basic interactive skills appropriately.	Has problems working with others/ avoids work with others. Does not contribute or contributes inappropriately in groups

33	Communication and Presentation (appropriate to discipline)	Can engage effectively in debate in a professional manner and produce detailed and coherent project reports	Can communicate effectively in a format appropriate to the discipline and report practical procedures in a clear and concise manner with all relevant information in a variety of formats	Can communicate effectively in a format appropriate to the discipline and report practical procedures in a clear and concise manner with all relevant information	Some communication is effective and in a format appropriate to the discipline; can report practical procedures in a structured way	Communication is unstructured and unfocused and/or in a format inappropriate to the discipline
34	Critical review (to be used in peer assessment)	Able to assess/examine the work of others using broad ranging criteria. Can provide commentary on its marks and offer insight into how it could be developed	Able to assess/study work of others and judge against criteria, areas for improvements	Able to examine work of others and identify its strengths and weaknesses	Able to comment in general terms on the work of others.	Unable to make reasoned comment on the work of others
35	Initiative (imagination, leadership, taking action, independence)	Uses imagination to assess the needs of the situation and underlay a series of actions to achieve goals	Can assess needs of the situation and takes action towards goals	With guidance can assess needs of situation and take action necessary to achieve goals	Where goals and methods are defined will undertake tasks requiring some imagination and independence	Unable to undertake tasks beyond routine and standardised
36	Rationale	Uses all available data to evaluate the options. Clear criteria are applied to demonstrate reasons for final decision/choice/outcome	Uses data to evaluate options and selections of final outcome clearly follows from evaluation	Uses data to evaluate some options and selection of final outcome is linked to the evaluation	Presents benefits and disadvantages of some potential outcomes but without providing clarity on reason for final outcome/choice	Little explanation of how the final outcome/choice was made OR no indication of final outcome/choice

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE DESCRIPTIONS ARE TYPICALLY IN THE MIDDLE OF THE GRADE RANGE.

APPENDIX 5 – GENERIC LEVEL 7 POSTGRADUATE MARKING CRITERIA – ESSAY AND EXAMINATION

ESSAY

Class	Mark Range	Criteria
Fail	0 - 15	Very little material; or irrelevant or incomprehensible material.
Fail	16 - 29	Wholly unsatisfactory, little or no evidence of preparation, analytical or evaluative skills. No evidence of understanding of the material or ability to structure or present material. Hastily thrown together. Presentation poor. Expression/style/grammar extremely poor
Fail	30 - 34	Very unsatisfactory. Lacking evidence of preparation, evaluative or reflective skills. Largely irrelevant. Little or no understanding. Expression/style/grammar/presentation very poor. Hardly any, or no, evidence of reading/organisation
Fail	34 - 39	Generally unsatisfactory. Little or no reading at an appropriate level. A small amount of material of relevance, with major omissions and errors. A few redeeming features, e.g. some evidence of preparation and of very limited understanding. Expression/style/grammar poor.
Fail	40 - 44	Fails to achieve designated learning outcomes. A small amount of relevant material and a few examples, but little or no attempt to relate this to the question. Insufficient evidence of reading and limited understanding. Unsubstantiated remarks. Naïve – i.e. simplistic and lacks control/awareness of the subject material and reflective thought. Referencing poor. Material not well organised and lacks appropriate structure. Expression/style/grammar weak
Fail	45 - 49	Bare fail. Shows some very basic understanding of the subject area. Argument obscure, weak or unbalanced, and only partially relevant, with some major omissions. Demonstrates a small degree of understanding, reflection, structure and referencing. Partially successful attempt to use relevant examples and facts. Some reading and reflective thought. Conclusions weak. Expression/style/grammar limited
Pass	50 - 54	Bare pass. A barely satisfactory piece of work which shows some structure, some relevant use of examples and a little evidence of background reading. Some evidence of independent thought and the development of a substantiated argument, not simply regurgitated lecture material, but at a fairly minimal level. Conclusions not well developed. Referencing may be limited. Expression/style/grammar adequate
Pass	55 - 59	A slightly more competent piece of work which shows the beginnings of a reasonable understanding of the material and presents it satisfactorily with appropriate examples and referencing. Structure is apparent and there is a coherent (although possibly not very strong) argument with an adequate conclusion. No obvious weaknesses, except a lack of originality. Evaluative/critical/analytical skills present but not highly developed. Expression/style/grammar moderately good
Merit	60 - 64	A good piece of work. Shows a firm grasp of the majority of the relevant material. Argues well and effectively. Is able to criticise and evaluate material. Well structured and shows good evidence of wider background reading. Correctly and appropriately referenced. Some evidence of originality of thought. Expression/style/grammar good
Merit	65 - 69	A very good piece of work. Demonstrates all the qualities of 60-64 level essay to a higher degree of development. Evidence of extensive background reading beyond the materials suggested. Sustained argument throughout, demonstrates a sound understanding of the material and issues
Distinction	70 - 79	An excellent piece of work. High level of understanding of all relevant material with excellent, relevant use of referencing and examples. Communicates clearly and effectively using a coherent structure showing insight and perceptiveness. A commendable degree of academic originality. Expression/style/grammar excellent
Distinction	80 - 89	An outstanding piece of work. Has total control of relevant material and shows an excellent synthesis of factual and conceptual components. Work of a very high order. Expression/style/grammar excellent
Distinction	90 - 100	A brilliant piece of work of outstanding quality and innovation. Has total control of all relevant material. Shows outstanding insight and an ability to structure and synthesise material. Work of the highest order. The candidate could be expected to achieve no more. Expression/style/grammar outstanding. With some re-writing could be publishable in an academic journal

EXAMINATION

Class	Mark Range	Criteria
Fail	0 - 15	Very little material; or irrelevant or incomprehensible material
Fail	16 - 29	Wholly unsatisfactory. Little or no evidence of examination preparation, reflective or evaluative skills. No evidence of understanding of the material or ability to structure an answer. Very little command of material. Expression/style/grammar extremely poor
Fail	30 - 34	Very unsatisfactory. Lacking evidence of examination preparation on the topic. Little evidence of synthesis or reflection. Largely irrelevant. Little or no understanding. Expression/style/ grammar very poor. Hardly any, or no, evidence of reading or structure of the answer
Fail	34 - 39	Generally unsatisfactory. Little or no reading, or reading at an inappropriate level. A small amount of relevant material but with major omissions and errors, and not applied to the question. Very little evidence of reflective/evaluative skills or command of the material. A small number of redeeming features, e.g. evidence of preparation, some very limited understanding. Expression/style/grammar poor
Fail	40 - 44	Fails to achieve designated learning outcomes. Little or no reference to literature and limited understanding. Some relevant material but not organised into an answer. Few/no relevant examples to support an argument; little attempt to relate these to the question. Naïve – i.e. simplistic and lacks control/awareness of the subject material and reflective thought, with many unsubstantiated remarks. Expression/style/grammar weak
Fail	45 - 49	Bare fail. Argument obscure, weak or unbalanced. Only partially relevant, with some major omissions. A small degree of understanding and structure and may have some reference to the literature. Partially successful attempt to use relevant examples and material. Some evidence of reading and the beginnings of reflective/evaluative skills. Expression/style/grammar limited
Pass	50 - 54	Bare pass. An adequate answer which shows some structure, relevant use of examples and evidence of background reading. Some limited reference to the literature and limited evidence of an argument. Shows some reflective/evaluative skills and very basic command of material. Conclusions not well developed. Expression/style/grammar moderately good
Pass	55 - 59	A slightly more competent answer that shows a reasonable understanding of the material and presents it satisfactorily with appropriate examples and reference to sources. Structure is apparent, with some development of an argument, and drawing of conclusions. Evaluative/critical/analytical skills present but not highly developed. Good basic command of material. No significant weaknesses except lack of originality, and breadth and/or depth. Expression/style/grammar moderately good
Merit	60 - 64	A good answer. Shows a firm grasp of the majority of the relevant material. Maintains an argument. Is able to criticise and evaluate material. Reasonably well structured and shows clear evidence of background reading and reference to sources. Expression/style/grammar good
Merit	65 - 69	A very good answer. Shows a firm understanding and command of the material. Structured and very relevant. Appropriate use of examples and reference to sources. Is able to evaluate/criticise/analyse material well. Clear development of an argument. Expression/style/grammar very good
Distinction	70 - 79	An excellent answer. High level of understanding of material with excellent use of reference to sources and examples. Maintains central relevance to question. Communicates clearly and effectively using a good structure showing insight and perceptiveness. Demonstrates some academic originality. Expression/style/grammar excellent
Distinction	80 - 89	An outstanding answer. Total control of relevant material and an excellent synthesis of factual and conceptual components. Makes extensive and effective use of reference to sources and examples. Work of a very high order. Expression/style/grammar excellent
Distinction	90 - 100	An outstanding, brilliant and innovative answer. Has total control of all material. Shows outstanding insight and a very marked ability to structure and synthesise material. Work of the very highest order. The candidate could be expected to achieve no more. Expression/style/ grammar outstanding

Information given to students about feedback at institutional level (for example, in the leaflet prepared by the Educational Development Unit) stresses that it can take place in a wide range of different contexts, that it can come from a range of different sources and that it can take a variety of forms. In preparing students to use feedback productively, it is therefore important to make them aware of occasions when they might be receiving feedback, which are not necessarily signalled as such, for example, when a tutor and other students respond to a presentation, when comments are made in interactive lectures or through exchanges during online conversations. Students also need to have their attention drawn to generic feedback, for example, feedback given to a whole group of students about the handling of a topic, as well as to the small bits of advice given in passing, say, in response to something said in a seminar. Spotting when feedback is being given and making the best use of it is a skill in itself, which it is useful to foster in students.

Ideally, feedback should be fairly continuous and be perceived as such by students, and received as honest, constructive and *always* supportive, so that it is never taken as personal criticism and enables them to identify what to do next. Students need to become aware of the fact that feedback can be written *or* spoken, formal *or* informal, face-to-face *or* online; that it can come from tutors, lecturers, workplace mentors, supervisors *or* other students; that it can be as much a result of self-assessment and peer-assessment as tutor-assessment; that it can provoke a whole range of emotions (some more positive than others), but that it should always be understood as a means of developing and moving forwards. In short, this awareness of the fact that feedback is continuous needs to be balanced by the sense that it is, above all, something which is *useful* and it should be accompanied by guidance on how best to make use of it. Rather than making students feel that they are under continuous scrutiny, it should make them feel that they are being continuously supported to develop (for helpful advice, see the [University of Ulster's assessment and feedback cards](#)).

An important principle, of which most tutors will be well aware, is that students will respond best where honest criticism is accompanied, or better still, preceded by an identification of the strengths of what has been said, written or contributed, and this is something that students also need to be made aware of when they are either called upon to give feedback to other students, or simply when they respond to work or interventions made by other students. This means that there is a virtue in training students to do peer-mentoring or peer-evaluation, or simply in how to respond in seminars. Useful information on peer assessment or review and feedback can be found on the University of Sussex Teaching and Learning Development Unit [web pages](#).

A variety of methods of providing feedback can be used: for example, formal feedback does not necessarily have to be written, but could be recorded. There are said to be numerous advantages to this, which were captured by a University of Liverpool [project](#): the feedback was perceived as more personal; it was more in-depth; it required less time to provide it and there was a considerable increase in the amount provided; it was better able to convey the meanings and discourses that characterise a discipline; it was more intelligible and more accessible, and could be revisited easily by the students. This is not to say that staff did not have concerns about the provision of this form of feedback, but that it is worth considering different strategies and approaches to providing feedback. More details (and numerous links) can be found on the Sussex TLDU [web pages](#), mentioned above. The Higher Education Academy (HEA) also has an [archive](#) of resources on feedback and assessment and the Open University has a series of [brief video presentations](#). The Oxford Brookes [ASKe](#) project is also a valuable resource. In short, there are numerous sources of information and ideas on the web, many of which can provide inspiration and advice.