

University of Greenwich

Assessment and Feedback Policy (2025)

Document Owner:	PVC Education, Professor Jenny Marie
Principal Contact:	Dr Gemma Mansi
Approving Body:	Academic Council
Date of Approval:	
Document Version	2.1
Date Effective From:	Phased implementation from 1 September 2025, full implementation 1 September 2027 (see section on implementation)
Date of next review	March 2028
Applies to:	UG programmes PGT programmes Online learning modules and programmes Apprenticeships, except for end point assessments
Public or internal access only	Public Access
Summary/Description:	
The Assessment and Feedback Policy supports inclusive assessment that fairly supports student learning and the determination of the extent to which students have met intended learning outcomes.	

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the University website. If this document is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the version on your copy matches that of the one on the University website. Approved documents are valid for use after their approval date and remain in force beyond any expiry of their review date until a new version is available.

Introduction

Assessment and feedback play an important role in the achievement of the University's strategic objectives. To support our vision of **Education Without Boundaries**, assessment must be inclusive, relevant to students' lived experience and their aspirations.

The purpose of assessment is twofold:

1. **To support student learning.** This occurs through the provision of feedback and opportunities to learn through the process of undertaking an assignment.
2. **To determine the extent to which students have met intended learning outcomes.** This enables decisions regarding students' progression and degree classification.

To achieve these objectives and our strategic ambitions, assessment must be designed with an understanding of our students, their needs at their point in the learning journey and their future goals.

Assessment & Feedback Principles

1. Summative assessment should be minimised and the purposes of supporting student learning and determining achievement of the learning outcomes combined wherever possible.
2. Assessments should be scaffolded, with students taught the academic and digital skills required and the expectations for each assessment.
3. Assessments should take a variety of forms, including choice where possible, to allow students to demonstrate their attainment of the learning outcomes in ways that best meet their needs.
4. Assessment should be inclusive by design, reducing the need for reasonable adjustments.
5. Assessment should be based on real world examples and lived experiences where possible.
6. Assessment and feedback should be positioned as a cyclical process, and students taught how to use feedback to enhance their performance.
7. Students should be seen as part of the learning community, who can support others to learn by giving formative feedback but must be supported to recognise the limits of this, so they do not jeopardise the assessment of learning achievement.

Scope

This policy applies to all assessed work, including reassessments, that contributes to an undergraduate or postgraduate taught programme of study, including on-campus and non-campus based, apprenticeships, online learning modules and programmes. It does not apply to end-point assessments for apprenticeships, for these please refer to the apprenticeship standard end-point assessment plan. Exemptions from the policy may only be granted by Student Success Board, following recommendation by the relevant Faculty Student Success Committee. Exemptions will normally relate to professional, statutory, and regulatory body (PSRB) requirements specific to assessment and must be evidenced in writing.

Designing Assessment

1. Each piece of assessment must be designed as **part of the whole programme**.
 - a. Programmes will ensure that an appropriate variety of assessment methods and choice is offered.
 - b. It should be clear to both staff and students, where students can practice each form of assessment and apply feedback in future assignments.
2. Summative assessment must be a **valid and reliable test** of the learning outcomes for the module.
 - a. At levels six and seven of a programme, all summative grades should be individual. Any requests for group grading at levels six and seven need to be agreed by the Faculty Student Success Committee. Groupwork may be marked with consideration of peer review of contribution, but other methods of reaching an individual mark are allowed and collective grades are permitted at

- levels three, four and five.
- b. All stages of study that count towards the degree classification must include at least one assessment that verifies the identity of the person being assessed (e.g. video presentation, in-person assessments).
 - c. Assessments tasks should be designed with choice as to how the learning outcomes are demonstrated, where possible.
 - d. Examination questions should be checked by the external examiner prior to submission.
3. Assessment should reflect **relevant academic, professional and graduate competencies** (see appendix two for a range of assessment types).
- a. Programmes should adopt authentic assessment relevant to the intended learning outcomes and graduate attributes.
 - b. Programmes are encouraged to integrate generative AI into the learning and assessment process, recognising its potential to augment education and prepare students for an AI-enabled world in an ethical manner.
 - c. Decisions about types of assessment should consider the information resit rates provide about the ease of demonstrating attainment of learning outcomes.
 - d. Traditional forms of assessment such as time-constrained, unseen examinations will only be used where there is strong pedagogic rationale, the learning outcomes require such approaches, or they are required by professional, statutory or regulatory bodies.
4. Assessment will be managed to **moderate students' assessment related stress**:
- a. Clashes of deadlines should be avoided as far as possible, with a reasonable spread of assessment deadlines throughout the academic year.
 - b. Opportunities to practice and get feedback should be available.
 - c. Additional support should be available for varieties of assessment that are related to assessment stress, such as exams and presentations.
5. Submission **deadlines** will not fall during university closure periods to ensure students maintain full access to university support. Coursework deadlines may be set within the exam period when there is no exam for the module.
- a. The deadline for coursework will be between 09.00-17.00 (local time zone) on a Mon-Wed. This ensures all work (including that submitted in the grace period) is submitted on a working day. Work that cannot be submitted digitally through Moodle/Turnitin will be submitted to the relevant faculty office, accompanied by a header sheet that is created by the module leader and made available via Moodle.
 - b. Coursework (excluding resubmissions) submitted up to 10 working days after the official submission deadline will be accepted and marked and if it meets the criteria for a 'pass', the mark will be capped at the minimum pass grade for that item of assessment. Working days do not include Saturday, Sunday or university closure days.
6. **Assessment load** will be proportionate to the amount and level of credit (see appendix one):
- a. Assessment load shall be manageable for students and staff, while providing sufficient breadth and depth to maintain standards and facilitate student learning;
 - b. Assessment workload shall be comparable across modules at the same level and credit weighting.

7. As far as possible, assessment should be designed to **minimise the need for individual learning adjustments**. Nevertheless, where appropriate, a Greenwich Inclusion Plan (GIP), will indicate where a student requires adjustments to the assessments to ensure accessibility. Module leaders will put these adjustments in place, following the [Greenwich Inclusion Plan guidance](#). Where an alternative assessment is needed, this requires approval of the Associate Dean for Student Success.
8. **Resubmission question(s)** may remain the same as the original assessment question where this does not affect the integrity of the assessment to acknowledge the limited timescale for students to prepare for resubmitted work and to empower students to apply feedback.

Preparing Students for Assessment

9. Summative assessment will be **scaffolded** through formative assessment and teaching activities.
 - a. Students will be given at least one formative task within their programme that provides an opportunity to experience the assessment *type* (e.g. essay, report, presentation) without it affecting the module outcome. This formative work will have a significantly lower demand than the summative assessment and will be followed by actionable feedback.
 - b. Students will be given a formative examination at each stage that they have summative examinations during class time. This does not need to be undertaken under full exam conditions but will allow students to practice answering exam-style questions in timed conditions. This will be followed by feedback on the assessment, including on exam technique.
 - c. Each module will include formative activities within the timetabled teaching sessions that will engage students in learning and support their preparation for the summative assessment(s). For transparency, these activities will be signposted in the module's schedule of teaching sessions in the module handbook.
10. One module at stage one (level 3, 4 or 7) should include a **formative diagnostic assessment** in the first 3-4 weeks of the programme, which is designed to improve student confidence, provide an early understanding of student performance, and assist staff and students to monitor learning, academic-skills and digital-skills development. This may be delivered online. Students who arrive after the assignment should complete it within their first 3-4 weeks.
11. **Module handbooks** will provide clear and transparent information on assessment including guidance and where to find:
 - a. resources
 - b. grading criteria
 - c. the number and weighting of components
 - d. the type of assessment(s)
 - e. which assessments are submitted anonymously
 - f. word count/time limit (where these apply)
 - g. referencing guidance
 - h. a breakdown of portfolio components or exam time (where applicable)
 - i. method of submission
 - j. deadline
 - k. feedback arrangements.

12. Students will be advised of **assessment requirements** at the beginning of each module to plan workloads.
13. Staff should provide reasonable **opportunities** within teaching sessions to:
 - a. enhance the students' understanding of the marking criteria, through discussions and where possible, practice applying it to exemplars.
 - b. identify previous feedback they can draw upon to enhance their assignment(s).
14. Staff will support the development of **a shared understanding** of:
 - a. academic integrity to:
 - i. encourage good academic practices
 - ii. minimize opportunities or incentives for academic misconduct
 - b. how to appropriately declare/cite the use of generative AI.
 - c. how Studiosity can be best used to support academic writing.

Marking

15. Summative assessments must be **submitted anonymously** for marking wherever possible. All summative assessments are subject to marking moderation as outlined in appendix 3.
16. Formative assessments normally include students' names to support individual assessment needs. However, a decision as to whether the formative is submitted anonymously or not must consider whether this would jeopardise the anonymity of summative assessment.
17. Markers must maintain **regular dialogue** to develop a shared understanding of the marking practices, criteria, expectations and standards (also see appendix 3 on calibration).
18. Where a **word count or timing limit** has been set, this should be used with a tolerance of +10%. Beyond this margin, markers should not consider the content and students should lose marks as per the English criterion (see point 19 and appendix four). There is no penalty for work submitted below the word count/ time limit, but students should be advised that this risks failing to meet the learning outcomes and marking criteria.
19. Assessments should be written in the **English language**, unless assessing competency in a foreign language. Where an assessment is submitted in English, the criteria must include a marking criterion on the use of written English, mapped to assessment domain 4, Communication, Organisation and Presentation, of the rubric (see appendix 4). Exceptions are only permitted where an assessment is designed to test a specific competency for PSRB requirements. Written English must be marked against this criterion, either as part of a holistic assessment of the work or by allocating marks against the criterion.
20. The **step-marking system** (i.e. only marks ending in 2,5,8) should be used, except where the assessment requires marking on a discrete numerical scale (e.g. because marks are allocated per question) or on a pass/fail basis (e.g. assessment of competencies).
21. **Marking and moderation of marking** (see appendix three) will be conducted and completed within seventeen working days of the submission deadline or no later than

a week before the scheduled SAP meeting, whichever is sooner. Working days do not include university closure days or weekends.

22. All summative grades are **provisional** until ratified at a Progression and Award Board. The Progression and Award Board must consider students' outcomes anonymously unless exemption has been granted by the Head of Quality Assurance.

Feedback

23. Feedback should be considered a **cyclical process**, which facilitates the development of self-assessment and directs learning by:
- Encouraging staff and student dialogue throughout the assessment process, shifting the emphasis of providing feedback away from after submission.
 - Helping to clarify what good performance is (e.g., goals, criteria, standards expected).
 - Providing opportunities to close the gap between current and desired performance.
 - Ensuring opportunities for students to develop their understanding of assessment expectations and related skills are part of module learning activities.
 - Delivering high-quality information to students about their learning.
 - Encouraging positive motivational beliefs, self-esteem and self-concept through clarifying personal strengths and areas for development.
24. Staff are encouraged to adopt the most appropriate **method of providing feedback** (which may be audio, video etc).
25. Markers on a module/programme team, and in consultation with their students, should agree a **consistent approach to feedback processes** (e.g. the quantity of feedback under the three headings and on the script; the provision of feedback on exams).
26. **Constructive and developmental feedback** will follow guided principles and formats (see appendix 5) and will be provided on all assessments except exams. It will be of sufficient quality and quantity to facilitate student learning and include feedforward that can be applied on a future task. In addition, markers will provide a descriptor of performance based on the Greenwich marking rubric (see Appendix 4). Feedback should address, but need not be limited to, the three headings provided in Appendix 5.
27. Feedback on coursework will **be provided within 17 working days** of the original deadline submission, which allows for the grace period. Working days do not include university closure days or weekends. Students who submit coursework up to 10 working days after the original deadline can expect to receive their feedback within 27 working days of the original due date.
28. Staff will support students to develop an understanding of **how to use feedback** to enhance their performance and to see this as a professional competency.
29. Guidance will be given as to the **next opportunities to apply the feedback** (e.g. when the next similar assessment type is on the programme, and/or which modules will build on the content that has been assessed). This will support both the use of feedback and reduce the siloing of knowledge/thinking within modular structures.

References

30. Normally, referencing will be conducted in the Harvard style. However, disciplinary areas will have a diversity of approaches to referencing and bibliographies. Programme leaders will ensure that a **consistent approach** is taken across a programme, including programmes where assessments are completed in more than one discipline or school.
31. Staff will provide students with the university's [guide on referencing generative AI](#), [video on using AI effectively](#) and [Declaration of AI use](#) via the VLE to support students' understanding of **acceptable AI usage** in assessments.
32. **Where marks are allocated for referencing** (domain 5 on the rubric), this should count for no more than 5% of the available marks, except where referencing skills are the focus of the assessment (e.g. study skills module).

Learning Technologies

33. The University of Greenwich will seek to utilise the **latest learning technologies** and internet systems to facilitate consistent, sustainable, and user-friendly submission, marking and feedback processes.
 - a. Learning technologies shall be used to facilitate efficient and user-friendly assessment, marking and feedback for students and staff.
 - b. Learning technologies shall be used in ways that respect and support the development of students as data subjects and data citizens.
 - c. Learning technologies shall be used with consideration of potential biases and limitations of automation.
 - d. Assessment will be designed to ensure that integrity and standards are maintained where students have access to generative AI, without sacrificing the importance of authenticity of assessment and pedagogic practice.
34. Staff are encouraged to **incorporate generative AI as a learning tool** and equally facilitate responsible AI usage from students. To promote transparency in assessment, staff should annually keep themselves appraised of the [University's AI guidance](#), the latest [Academic Misconduct Procedure](#), and to incorporate suggestions and best practice from [CPD workshops](#) and [AI in Teaching and Learning resources](#).

Implementation

35. The policy will be implemented alongside the new **Greenwich Curriculum Framework**. All programmes will be brought into compliance with it when they are redesigned as part of the Curriculum Shape project. Prior to this, there will be a faculty-led approach to implementation. While it is accepted that a programme may be compliant with some but not all elements of this policy during the transition period, they should be compliant with the Assessment and Feedback policy (2019) for those aspects for which they are not yet compliant with this one. It is anticipated that the Greenwich Curriculum Framework and this policy will be fully implemented by September 2027 for on-campus programmes.

Appendices

1. Quantity of assessment and assessment tariff
2. Assessment categories
3. Marking and moderation
4. The Greenwich marking rubric
5. The Greenwich approach to feedback
6. Portfolio and Laboratory Books/ Reports
7. Guidelines for the supervision of postgraduate projects/dissertations
8. Further guidance and reading

Appendix 1 – Quantity of assessment

The volume of assessment within a module should consider a student's assessment load across a programme, including formative assessment activity, to ensure that students are not overburdened. Staff should also take into consideration the impact on marking and feedback turnaround deadlines when deciding on appropriate assessment methods. This guidance serves as a conversation starter for programme teams when they consider the assessment load for modules.

Number of summative assessments

The number of summative assessments per level of the programme are as follows:

Level	Maximum number of summative tasks
3, 4, 5 & 6	8
7	10

Assessments should be mapped to module learning outcomes. 30-credit modules should have a **maximum** of two summative assessments and have 5-6 learning outcomes.

Tariff of assessment lengths

The tariff (see below) is an indicative benchmark to facilitate use of a variety of assessments with parity, consistency, and proportionality. It is based on a 30-credit module and should be scaled appropriately for modules with other credit values. Recommended options for combining different weightings of assessments have been colour coordinated.

The length of a group assessment must be a maximum of 20% higher than the tariffs stated below, reflecting the shared input.

For examinations, additional reading time of up to 15 minutes is permitted in exceptional cases when agreed by the Faculty Student Success Committee. This time can be used for students to read questions and make notes on the exam paper but should not be used to begin writing in the answer booklet. The overall time, including the exam and reading time, should be used for calculating adjustments to exams for students with a GIP. Where there is a need for a longer period of reading/ thinking/ planning time, a seen exam or coursework should be used.

Up to one hour of technical time allowance should be given for online exams for steps such as reading online instructions, opening or downloading the exam paper at the start, and then submitting a response. The specified time should be agreed with the Faculty Student Success Committee.

Weighting of assessments

Only assessment weightings of 25%, 50%, 75% and 100% are permitted.

Assessment type/tariff

The following tariffs are based on a 30-credit module and should be scaled appropriately for modules with other credit values.

Level 3 Assessment weighting	Coursework (academic)	Coursework (practice based)	Oral assessment (academic)	Oral assessment (practice based)	Coursework (creative) Prose	Coursework (creative) Poetry	Coursework (creative) Script	Creative output(s) (student time)	Exam
25%	Up to 500 words	Up to 500 words	Up to 5 min of content	Up to 5 min of content	Up to 500 words	Up to 50 lines	Up to 5 (pp or min)	Up to 5 hours	Up to 30 min quiz
50%	Up to 1250 words	Up to 1250 words	Up to 8 min of content	Up to 8 min of content	Up to 1250 words	Up to 100 lines	Up to 10 (pp or mins)	Up to 15 hours	60 min
75%	Up to 2000 words	Up to 2000 words	Up to 10 min of content	Up to 10 min of content	Up to 2000 words	Up to 150 lines	Up to 15 (pp or mins)	Up to 20 hours	90min
100%	Up to 2500 words	Up to 2500 words	Up to 15 min of content	Up to 15 min of content	Up to 2500 words	Up to 200 lines	Up to 20 (pp or mins)	Up to 25 hours	120min

Levels 4 and 5 Assessment weighting	Coursework (academic)	Coursework (practice based)	Oral assessment (academic)	Oral assessment (practice based)	Coursework (creative) Prose	Coursework (creative) Poetry	Coursework (creative) Script	Creative output(s) (student time)	Exam
25%	Up to 750 words	Up to 750 words	Up to 5 min of content	Up to 5 min of content	Up to 750 words	Up to 75 lines	Up to 5 (pp or min)	Up to 10 hours	Up to 30 min quiz
50%	Up to 1750 words	Up to 1750 words	Up to 10 min of content	Up to 10 min of content	Up to 1750 words	Up to 125 lines	Up to 13 (pp or min)	Up to 18 hours	60min
75%	Up to 2750 words	Up to 2750 words	Up to 15 min of content	Up to 15 min of content	UP to 2750 words	Up to 175 lines	Up to 20 (pp or min)	Up to 25 hours	90 min
100%	Up to 3500 words	Up to 3500 words	Up to 20 min of content	Up to 20 min of content	Up to 3500 words	Up to 250 lines	Up to 25 (pp or min)	Up to 35 hours	120 min

Levels 6 and 7 Assessment weighting	Coursework (academic)	Coursework (practice based)	Oral assessment (academic)	Oral assessment (practice based)	Coursework (creative) Prose	Coursework (creative) Poetry	Coursework (creative) Script	Creative output(s) (student time)	Exam
25%	Up to 1500 words	Up to 1500 words	Up to 7 min of content	Up to 7 min of content	Up to 1500 words	Up to 75 lines	Up to 10 (pp or mins)	Up to 15 hours	60 mins
50%	Up to 2750 words	Up to 2750 words	Up to 12 min of content	Up to 12 min of content	Up to 2750 words	Up to 150 lines	Up to 15 (pp or mins)	Up to 22 hours	90 mins
75%	Up to 3000 words	Up to 3000 words	Up to 18 min of content	Up to 18 min of content	Up to 3000 words	Up to 225 lines	Up to 20 (pp or mins)	Up to 30 hours	120 mins
100%	Up to 4500 words	Up to 4500 words	Up to 25 min of content	Up to 25 min of content	Up to 4500 words	Up to 300 lines	Up to 30 (pp or mins)	Up to 45 hours	180 mins

Appendix 2: Assessment categories

The following assessment types fall into the assessment categories used in appendix one. Other assessment types may be used and a judgement made about the appropriate category.

Written coursework (academic)	Essay; Annotated bibliography; Written brief; Written plan; Reflective essay; Article; Case History; Proposal; Critique letter; Problem solving scenario; Dissertation.
Written coursework (practice based)	Report; Portfolio; Lab report; Creative writing; Audit tool; Software Code Review; Web content; Blog; Business plan; Leaflet; Reflective journal; Diary; Trading logbook; Timed assessments including open book exam and take away exam; Project write-up.
Oral assessment (academic)	Viva Voce; Seminar contribution; Debate; Critical dialogue.
Oral assessment (practice based)	Presentation; Language translation; Listening comprehension; Interview; Mediation; Role play; OSCE; OSPE; Lab test; Observed practice; Practical skills exam; Podcast.
Written coursework (creative)	Script writing; Poetry; Prose.
Creative output(s)	Portfolio; Exhibition; Design exercises; Media productions; Artworks; Games and toys; Clothing; Figurines; Jewelry; Pottery; Music and Sound Works; Films; Plays; Performances; Digital Works; Installations Media file (film/music/radio show/website); Video; Animation; Podcast; Vlog; Virtual reality; Trading challenge; Portfolio performance; Poster.
Exam	Seen exam; Unseen exam; Timed online exam; In-class tests including a quiz with multiple choices questions (MCQ's) ¹ .

For dissertation and equivalent modules, please see Appendix 7 below and the [handbook for research students and supervisors](#) for guidance on word count. Where relevant, the additional guidance for portfolio and laboratory practical assessments (Appendix 6) should also be considered.

Portfolios may consist of different creative outputs including a combination of written, oral, visual, digital, artistic etc. Equivalency can be calculated based on weighted hours and indicative time/word count. To mediate against assessment related stress, staff should provide indicative deadlines for each component of a portfolio across the academic year where possible. Complete portfolios will be submitted as a single collection by the

¹ Multiple choice quizzes should not account for more than 25% of the total assessment.

summative assessment deadline, providing a single overall mark.

Exam categories

Closed exam	These exams are normally in-person, and only allow students to bring their writing and drawing instruments.
Restricted exam	These exams allow students to bring in only specific things such as a single page of notes, or a calculator or a formula sheet. Students may be required to hand in their notes or formula sheet with their exam paper.
Timed online exam	These exams can take the form of a quiz and are designed to be completed in one sitting, starting immediately after the exam paper/quiz is released and completed by the end time indicated. The exam can be undertaken on campus or remotely. Normally they do not require any additional materials.
In-class tests	In-class tests normally take place during class time and can take different approaches such as multiple-choice tests, problem-based tests, short-answer tests, or essay tests. These will often be time-limited and may be undertaken in written form, orally, or be computer based. In-class tests can be one-off events, or they could be arranged in a series of sessions.
Seen exam	These exams are where students are given the questions in advance, allowing them to focus on preparing their answers for the day of the exam under controlled conditions.

Online exams that do not meet invigilated conditions must take reasonable steps to

mediate against the risk of assessment misconduct. This must be considered in the preparation stage of the exam questions and arrangements for undertaking an online exam. Examples of how this may be managed include:

- use a quiz bank, shuffle and/or randomise the questions and answers
- ask students to justify their reasons for choosing an answer following a multiple-choice question
- ask students to apply a topic to a specific context
- conducting a follow-up online viva after the online exam based on the answers provided by the student to ensure student authentication.

Appendix 3: Marking and moderation

Before marks are released to students, summative assessment tasks should be moderated via internal peer review where the assessment counts towards students' classification (i.e. levels 5, 6 and 7). All assessments that contribute to the degree outcome or where this is a professional body requirement, will also require External Examiner review prior to ratification of the mark.

Calibration of marking

When there are more than four markers, calibration must occur prior to marking to facilitate consistency of grading and feedback. All markers and moderators will participate in the calibration activity. Where available and appropriate, calibration based on a sample of work from a previous year is recommended to help guard against grade inflation.

Moderation of marking

Marking of all summative assessments that count towards students' classification is subject to moderation via the relevant process below. Students should be informed of the process to be used in the assessment brief. Marking and internal moderation of marking must be completed before provisional grades are released to students and within the timeframe set out in this policy. Moderation must be evidenced to allow for external scrutiny by using the Online Assessment Setting and Moderation System or by completing the Moderation Reporting Form below or an equivalent, as required by the faculty.

Moderation will involve an independent marker checking a sample of work, along with the first marker's marks and comments, to verify the overall standard of marking and the use of the marking criteria. Unless there is a summation error in adding up marks, moderation cannot lead to the revision of marks for an individual piece of work. The moderator should produce a report, which should instigate a dialogue between the marker and moderator; this may lead to scaling of all the marks in one or more marking band. The conclusions of the dialogue should be formally captured as part of an audit trail.

Live assessments should be moderated at the time of the event or alternatively the live assessment should be recorded to allow for subsequent moderation.

The only exception to the requirement for internal moderation where an assessment counts towards students' classification is for objective tests, such as closed multiple-choice questions.

Sample Moderation

Sample moderation is the most common practice used to demonstrate peer evaluation

and oversight of marking. This requires the moderator(s) to scrutinise the first marker(s)' marking by considering the overall distribution of marks as well as the marks and feedback provided on a sample of students' work.

The sample reviewed by the moderator(s) must be representative. It should include 10% of the total submissions (with a minimum of five scripts and a maximum of 20 scripts). It must include examples from all markers and each marking band including a representative sample of work in the fail range.

If the distribution of marks and quality of the feedback are deemed suitable, the moderator(s) endorse the first marking. However, if the moderator(s):

- a. consider the marking is not at an appropriate level or in line with the marking criteria; or
- b. believe the distribution requires adjustment; or
- c. consider that the feedback in the sample is not based on good practice as set out in the Assessment and Feedback Policy;

then the first marker(s) and moderator(s) must discuss this and take any required actions, for example, increase/ decrease all grades within one or more marking band. Individual grades must **not** be adjusted following sample moderation, unless there is a summation error in adding up marks.

If necessary, the feedback provided by the first marker(s) should be adjusted following moderation to address any issues raised by the moderator(s) about the quality of the feedback and /or to ensure consistency with the agreed mark. The moderator role does not include provision of feedback to students.

Any unresolved issues regarding marking, feedback and moderation of marks must be negotiated by the Programme Leader/ Head of School before the marks/ feedback are released to students and before the External Examiner is provided with the sample, marks and evidence of moderation. The External Examiner's role does not extend to undertaking marking or negotiating compromises. However, the External Examiner can request an increase/decrease of marks at the Subject Assessment Panel (SAP).

Double Marking

Double marking should only be used for 60-credit projects and for Level 7 dissertations. Double marking involves two markers evaluating all scripts. Blind double marking should be used where the supervisor is the first marker; in all other cases open double marking should be used.

In open double marking, the second marker is aware of the first marker's proposed grade and feedback when they mark the work. If the second marker agrees with the marks and quality of the feedback, they endorse the first marking. If they disagree with individual marks or the distribution of marks or consider that the feedback is not based on good practice as set out in the Assessment and Feedback Policy, then the

two markers must discuss this and take any required actions. This may include adjusting feedback to be consistent with the agreed mark.

In blind double marking, each marker arrives at their initial mark and feedback independently. After initial marking is completed, the two markers compare notes to arrive at a jointly agreed mark and feedback.

In both blind or open double marking, the student receives only the agreed mark and one set of feedback comments that reflect the agreed mark. A record should be made of the marker agreement process to allow for internal / external scrutiny.

Where an assessment is double marked by multiple pairs of markers and/or new markers, sample moderation after double marking may be used to ensure consistency across the team of markers and with previous years.

Marking & moderating paper-based exams

In respect of examination scripts, the marker is to ensure:

- a. a consistent method is used to confirm that all the students' work has been marked (e.g. a tick or marker's initial on each page).
- b. the marks for each question are written in the margin (e.g. 6/8) and on the front cover.
- c. calculation of the final percentage for the script is written on the front cover.

In respect of examination scripts, based on the sample reviewed, the moderator is to ensure:

- a. first marking of all pages have been confirmed;
- b. the marks for each question are correct and transcribed correctly to the front cover;
- c. the final percentage calculated is correct;
- d. there is agreement with the first marker over the marking of all questions on the paper, following the sample moderation process described above.

Guidance for marking & moderating "live" assessments

For live assessments (e.g. presentations, debates, clinical skills, presentation of an artefact or model), marking is completed with one marker viewing the live assessment. If moderation is required, recording is made to allow this. The standard process for external examining is used i.e. the marks and feedback and a sample of recordings are provided to the External Examiner for scrutiny.

Where an External Examiner is present at a 'live' assessment, this is solely for the purpose of providing commentary on the quality oversight of the module and not to act as a marker, unless there is an additional PSRB requirement.

Online assessments

Module Leaders should ensure that they have properly checked for errors on online tests

that are marked by the system. This should be confirmed in their end of module report.

Moderation by the External Examiner

The Module Leader (or nominee) should identify the sample of work for review from the full set of marked work. The sample should include 10% of the total submissions (or up to 5 pieces of work, whichever is greatest) up to a maximum of 20 items. The sample should be representative, covering the full range of marks, including work in the fail range if applicable. It can include a mix of work that was and was not internally moderated.

The Module Leader (or nominee) will provide the sample of work, assessment information and Moderation Reporting Form (or equivalent) to the appointed External Examiner. The Moderation reporting form is *indicative* of the protocols that should be used for recording the processes of marking, moderation and external oversight. Where the on-line moderation system is not used, the moderation report form (below) should be used.

All samples of work should be stored according to the faculty's standard procedures and made available for the External Examiner in a timely manner to facilitate their workloads.

Moderation Reporting Form

Academic Year:	School:
Module code and title:	Module Leader:
Name of Greenwich campus or Partner:	Assessment type:
Number of submissions:	Number of items in sample provided for moderation:
Number of submitted student self-assessment forms:	

1a. Distribution of initial grades across grading bands

Grade	<30%	30-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-79%	≥80%
Number							

Stats (if 30 or more submissions)		Mean		Standard Deviation	
--	--	-------------	--	---------------------------	--

1b. Distribution of initial grades across pass/fail boundary

Grade	Pass	Fail
Number		

Expected documents

Tick the boxes next to the following that are available to moderator and external:

Module handbook		Assessment task, marking schema and rubric	
Marked assessments (documents, files, or link)		Grades awarded for this cohort on this task	

Appendix 4 – The Greenwich marking rubric

The Greenwich marking rubric is organised around six domains (see left hand column) which are likely to feature in assessments across disciplines and through programme levels. A customised rubric should be created for each coursework assessment and provided to students in Turnitin/ Moodle.

To create a customised rubric, module leaders should:

- allocate each of their marking criteria to the most appropriate assessment domain, using their professional judgement. On a given assessment, a domain may be used once, more than once or not all, except for domain 4, which should be used on all assessments with a word/time limit and all assessments submitted in written English, unless a PSRB requirement does not allow this.
- ensure the marking band across the top of the rubric reflects the correct pass mark (40% for UG, 50% for PG) and type of marking to be used (numerical or pass/fail).
- write a brief descriptor of performance for each marking criterion for each marking band, drawing on the wording in the generic template as appropriate. It is recommended that module leaders begin with the descriptor for a pass level performance and then edit the wording for the range of performance from fail through to exceptional.
- Ideally the rubric should be created in Moodle. It is also possible to create the rubric in Excel for Turnitin assignments or word for Moodle assessments.
- where a rubric is set to calculate the percentage automatically (this is optional and not the recommended approach), also consider the work holistically, with a view to increasing the grade to the next step mark if appropriate.

For staff, the rubric provides an efficient and effective way to provide feedback to students. Once the rubric is set up, it can be used again in future iterations of the module. The assessment domains can also be used by the module/ programme team to reflect on their marking criteria and consider whether adjustments may be needed to ensure coverage of all relevant assessment areas. For students, the rubric is intended to be one element of a consistent, structured, and developmental approach to feedback that they will experience across modules and throughout their programme.

In addition, the rubric can be used in formative activities with students to support their understanding of the marking criteria and expectations of the standards of work e.g. using the rubric, students can take part in activities such as self-assessment of own draft work, peer assessment and marking of exemplars.

Greenwich Marking Rubric Generic Template							
Assessment Domains	0-29 Fail	30-39* Fail	40-49* Satisfactory	50-59 Good	60-69 Very Good	70-79 Excellent	80-100 Exceptional
Assessment Domain 1: Knowledge and understanding of content	<p>Level 3: A developing factual and conceptual knowledge base, with some appreciation of the breadth of the field of study and relevant terminology. Increasing knowledge and understanding of main concepts and theories. A good grasp of the skills and knowledge covered. Awareness that knowledge is contested, socially mediated and is constructed through research.</p> <p>Level 4: Knowledge of underlying concepts and principles associated with the subject area. Accurate, consistent knowledge and understanding of main concepts and theories. Beginning to show awareness of the limitations of the knowledge base, its terminology and discourse. Shows understanding that knowledge is contested, socially mediated and is constructed through research.</p> <p>Level 5: Accurate knowledge through research and critical and comprehensive understanding of the well-established principles, theories, and concepts of the area(s) of study, and of the way in which those principles have been developed. Demonstrates an awareness of different and contested ideas through research, contexts, and frameworks, and recognition of those areas where the knowledge base is most or least secure.</p> <p>Level 6: Systematic understanding of key aspects of the area of study, including acquisition of coherent and detailed knowledge, at least some of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, research, or area of professional practice. Understanding of the way in which key concepts relate to one another. Detailed appreciation of ways in which some aspects of the material are contested, uncertain or contradictory through research.</p> <p>Level 7: Sophisticated, systematic and comprehensive knowledge of the subject area. Critical awareness of current problems and/or new insights, much of which is at, or informed by, the forefront of their academic discipline, research or area of professional practice. Ability in the appropriate use of the relevant literature, theory, methodologies, practices, or tools to analyse and synthesise at M level.</p>						
Assessment Domain 2: Use of research informed evidence	<p>Level 3: Within a defined context, able to manage information and collect data from a range of straightforward sources. Able to collate and categorise ideas and information. Good reference to and application of research informed evidence. Emerging ability to analyse and interpret information through interdisciplinary lenses.</p> <p>Level 4: Can collect and interpret appropriate data and successfully undertake research with a degree of autonomy. Developing ability to present, evaluate and interpret qualitative and quantitative data, to develop lines of argument from an interdisciplinary perspective and make sound judgements in accordance with basic theories and concepts of the subject area. Able to use a range of evidence which is interpreted with insight in its application. Some perception and persuasion demonstrated. Explicit understanding of other stances.</p>						

	<p>Level 5: Knowledge and skills in the main methods of enquiry in the subject area. Some evidence of the ability to evaluate critically the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems in the field of study. Draws on a comprehensive range of evidence, reflection, and reasoned argument. Ability to apply underlying concepts and principles from an interdisciplinary perspective.</p> <p>Level 6: An ability to deploy accurately established techniques of analysis and enquiry within the academic discipline. The ability to describe and comment on specific aspects of current research, or equivalent advanced scholarship, from an interdisciplinary perspective. Able to make use of scholarly reviews and primary sources, for example, refereed research articles and/or original materials appropriate to the discipline.</p> <p>Level 7: A comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to their own research or advanced scholarship. Originality in the application of knowledge, together with a practical understanding of how established techniques of research and enquiry are used to create and interpret knowledge in the discipline. Conceptual understanding that enables the student to evaluate critically current research, interdisciplinary matters, and advanced scholarship in the discipline, as well as to evaluate methodologies.</p>
Assessment Domain 3: Evaluation and analysis	<p>Level 3: A developing ability to analyse key concepts and show emerging recognition of the complexity of associated issues. An increasing ability to apply contemporary knowledge, tools and skills within a defined context and evaluate own strengths and weaknesses within criteria largely set by others. Able to develop a sustained argument. Can generate a range of appropriate responses to given problems.</p> <p>Level 4: Evaluate the appropriateness of different approaches to solving problems related to the area of study. Information /data is organised and interpreted using appropriate structures to address the question. Coherent and well balanced – comparative reasoning with some analytical arguments beginning. Conclusions are a cogent integration of theories, contemporary evidence, concepts, and academic arguments.</p> <p>Level 5: Demonstrates systematic thinking and the ability to critically evaluate contemporary knowledge, arguments and make judgements. Use a range of established techniques to initiate and undertake critical analysis of information, and to propose solutions to problems arising from that analysis. An understanding of the limits of their knowledge, and how this influences analyses and interpretations based on that knowledge.</p> <p>Level 6: Demonstrates critical evaluation and interpretation. Apply the methods and techniques learnt to review and consolidate. Initiate and carry out projects. Devise and sustain arguments, and/or to solve problems, using contemporary ideas and techniques, some of which are at the forefront of the discipline. Appreciation of the uncertainty, ambiguity, and limits of knowledge; mature and independent approach to problem-solving. Create appropriate hypotheses and use well-justified, imaginative, and innovative approaches to explore them.</p> <p>Level 7: Demonstrates critical thinking and enquiry, deals with complex issues both systematically and creatively, makes sound judgements in the absence of complete data, able to communicate conclusions clearly to specialist and non-specialist audiences where appropriate. Able to draw upon critical evaluation of contemporary knowledge in the field to propose new hypotheses. Originality in critical analysis and interpretation and application to appropriate contexts.</p>

Assessment Domain 4: Communication Organisation and Presentation	<p>Level 3: A coherent, concise and well-structured assessment with an appropriate level of detail (within the maximum word/time limit), ideas organised effectively. Proof-reading undertaken to eliminate errors in academic presentation. Present a professional approach that may be understood by different audiences, and transferable skills to enable them to operate in defined contexts that require use of a specified range of standard techniques. Use of clear, accurate English, with flow and progression. Syntax and grammar indicate an appropriate level of maturity in communication.</p> <p>Level 4: Communicate the results of their study/work accurately, reliably and with an appropriate level of detail capturing different audiences through coherent arguments which are fluent and appropriately structured, as well as systematic and logical. Act with a limited amount of personal autonomy, under direction, within defined guidelines. Use of clear, accurate English, well organised, with flow and progression.</p> <p>Level 5: Produce a coherent and well-structured assessment which professionally and effectively communicates information, arguments, and analysis in a variety of forms to diverse audiences and deploy key techniques of the discipline effectively with an appropriate level of detail (within the maximum word/time limit). Emerging evidence of innovation and/or well-judged experimentation. Use of clear, accurate English, well organised, with flow and progression.</p> <p>Level 6: Produce a professional, cohesive and well-structured assessment which makes judgements and frames appropriate questions to achieve a solution - or identifies a range of solutions to a problem. Evidence of innovation and/or well-judged experimentation and risk-taking. Expresses ideas effectively, fluently and with an appropriate level of detail capturing a diverse audience. Use of clear, accurate English, well organised and well presented with flow and progression.</p> <p>Level 7: Demonstrates self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, and able to act autonomously in planning and implementing tasks at a professional or equivalent level. Expresses ideas effectively, fluently and with an appropriate level of details capturing a diverse audience. Evidence of innovation and/or well-judged experimentation and risk-taking. Use of clear, accurate English, well organised and well presented, with flow and progression.</p>
Assessment Domain 5: Referencing and coverage	<p>Level 3: Sources used are acknowledged in the text and reference list/bibliography using correct academic citation – including online sources and declaring the use of generative AI tools. Referencing is consistently accurate. Work has followed the academic practice required for the module in terms of citation and referencing. Reading list is adequate in terms of number of sources. There may be many secondary sources.</p> <p>Level 4: All literature is correctly and consistently referenced both within the text and reference list/bibliography. Reading list demonstrates wide reading and assignment includes primary sources. All sources are referenced appropriately, including declaration to any use of generative AI tools all references written in the correct format, including online sources.</p> <p>Level 5: Sources including use of generative AI tools are all acknowledged in the text and reference list/bibliography uses correct academic citation, including online sources. Bibliography is wide and includes many primary sources. Evidence of broad, independent reading from appropriate sources.</p> <p>Level 6: Sources including use of generative AI tools used are all acknowledged in the text and reference list/bibliography, using correct academic citation, including online sources. Referencing is consistent throughout. Follows a professional approach to</p>

	<p>academic practice. Bibliography has strength in breadth and depth and all sources are primary sources.</p> <p>Level 7: Sources including use of generative AI tools are all acknowledged in the text and reference list/bibliography using correct academic citation – including online sources. Referencing is consistent throughout. Follows a professional approach to academic practice. Bibliography has considerable strength in breadth and depth and all sources are primary sources. Comprehensive range of evidence used.</p>
<p>Assessment Domain 6: Graduate employability and application of skills</p>	<p>Level 3: Awareness of areas of professional practice relevant to academic discipline. Developing transferable and interpersonal skills required for employment and ability to reflect on these skills within interdisciplinary contexts. A basic understanding of what a professional online presence means. Developing experience of working with diverse individuals, teamwork, debate, and creativity. Demonstrates motivation, self-management, and inter-personal skills. Able to communicate effectively and engage an audience.</p> <p>Level 4: Developing knowledge of career pathways, job market(s) including selection procedures within relevant sectors. Developing interpersonal and transferable skills and ability to reflect on these skills and identify areas for development. A basic understanding of what a professional online presence means. Developing evidence of successful teamwork with diverse individuals, goal setting, debate, creativity. Demonstrates motivation, self-management, and inter- personal skills. Effective communication in different formats.</p> <p>Level 5: Able to relate theory to professional practice. Understand how to apply for jobs, placement and/or internship relevant to degree discipline. Able to reflect on skills needed for careers relevant to disciplines and other areas of interest. Knowledge of organisation and structures in relevant sectors. Understanding of professionalism and the importance of networking. Growing evidence of successful goal setting, working in diverse teams, debate, creativity, understanding of motivation and resilience, interpersonal skills. Effective communication in different formats and for different audiences.</p> <p>Level 6: Able to reflect on, evaluate and action plan for the development of transferable skills. More advanced practical and/or technology-based skills. Successful self-management. Strong evidence of successful group work with diverse teams, goal setting, debate, interpersonal skills. Demonstrates initiative and creativity. Understanding of motivation and resilience. Practice in making applications (including graduate job and further study). An established professional online identity. Effective communication in a range of different formats; able to engage the audience.</p> <p>Level 7: Able to reflect on, evaluate and action plan in detail for the development of interpersonal and transferable skills. More advanced practical and/or technology-based skills. Sustained successful self-management. Strong evidence of successful group work with diverse teams, goal setting, debate, interpersonal skills. Demonstrates initiative and creatively. Understanding of motivation and resilience. Practice in making job/ training applications appropriate following M level award. An established professional online identity. Effective communication in a range of different formats; able to engage the audience.</p>

*For PG modules, the marking band headings are: 0-29% Fail, 30-49% Fail, 50-59% satisfactory, 60-69% good, 70-79% Very Good, 80-89 excellent, 80-100% Exceptional.

Appendix 5 – The Greenwich approach to feedback

Use of the following form is optional but considered good practice. Students benefit from reflecting on their assessment and are more likely to engage with feedback they have requested.

Student self-assessment form

Student self-assessment is an integral part of the learning process, playing an important and meaningful role in closing the feedback loop.

For each assessment students should complete this form and submit it alongside their assessment. This will enable their marker to understand their reflections on the assessment and to return a response specific to what students felt were their strengths and areas for development. Students should answer the following questions as fully as they can in line with the assignment brief and grading criteria.

Students' grades are not affected by the answers given in this self-assessment form, it is purely to support meaningful feedback.

1. What do you think you have done well in this assignment?

2. What did you find most challenging about this assignment?

3. Is there anything specific you would like feedback on? Please give details.

Feedback principles

Good feedback includes:

- Positive reinforcement of areas that the student is doing best, irrespective of their grade.
- Specific areas of improvement, and constructive suggestion for how these can be enhanced.
- Actions that can be taken forward for future assessments.

Examples of positive reinforcement:

"The essay was structured effectively, with key points being signposted clearly and presented in a logical order."

"Your presentation was confident and well-paced, containing the right amount of content for the time allocated."

Examples of identifying specific areas of improvement in a constructive way:

"While your discussion of the theory is promising, your development of critically analysing the literature needs further work. For example, you would demonstrate your understanding in a more critical way if you illustrated how different ideas/evidence/perspectives relate to each other (this is linked to Miller's concept of X...building on Jones (2015) perspective. Green (2019) similarly provides a perspective...).

"I see from your self-assessment form that reading widely was one of your strengths and is evidently a strength through the excellent range of content presented. However, the layout of your ideas makes it a little difficult to follow. Organising and structuring your evidence is very important in getting your ideas across in a logical way. For example, try to finish each slide with a transition phrase or topic sentence. Imagine if the slides were all cut up and spread out on a table. Someone should be able to put them back together in the correct order, and they should be able to clearly see which slide comes next."

Examples of setting out actions that can be taken forward for future assessments:

"Remember to explore and evaluate concepts and research findings by critically reflecting on your knowledge claims, make sure they are well supported with a variety of evidence from the literature."

"Take advantage of the feedback tutorials offered to you, where you will be able to talk through your drafts and plans and build on those to develop a logical order of ideas before undertaking future presentations."

Feedback proforma

The headings in the template below should form the basis of structured, developmental feedback from staff on summative assessments. The feedback provided under these headings should be informed by the students' self-assessment

form and be provided to students within seventeen working days of the submission deadline, ideally in advance of the next comparable assessment task.

This can be achieved by:

- Returning the completed proforma to students
- Pasting the headings into the summary comments box in Turnitin/Moodle
- Using the headings to structure feedback that is presented in audio/video form.

Feedback and Feedforward for next assignment
What was done well in this assignment:
What could be improved in this assignment:
What to take forward to your next assignment:
Marker's name:

Appendix 6: Portfolio and Laboratory Books/ Reports

Scope

Assessments that contribute to an undergraduate or postgraduate programme of study and take the form of a 1) portfolio or 2) laboratory book or report.

Exemptions may only be granted by the respective Faculty Student Success Committee and will normally relate to specific professional, statutory, and regulatory body (PSRB) assessment requirements, which must be evidenced in writing at the time of the request.

Requirements

- A portfolio or laboratory book/ report will be recognised as one summative assessment within the overall context of the module assessment workload. The weighting and, where applicable, word limit should be aligned with Appendix 1 of this policy.
- For portfolios, each item within the portfolio should have clearly specified word counts and weightings to reflect their contribution to the overall task, which is aligned with the assessment tariff and must be articulated in the assessment brief.

Formative assessment

- A summative portfolio assessment will be preceded by formative element(s) on the programme, which do not affect the student's module outcome but support the development of one or more of the summative portfolio items. The feedback from the formative element will be an enabler for the summative work.
- Each branch of a discipline using summative laboratory assessments will have its own formative exercise on the programme, which does not affect the student's module outcome, and precedes the summative assessments. Where additional 'exercises' are used to engage students with formative feedback, it should be made clear to students that this constitutes formative feedback.

Submission and marking

- Portfolio items will be submitted as a single collection by the summative assessment deadline. This will be either as an online submission or as a physical artefact with the appropriate header sheet, adhering to the hand-in times stated in the policy.
- Laboratory books will normally be submitted immediately after completion of the practical activity. Although laboratory assessments cannot be marked strictly anonymously, assessors should aim to mark without reference to the student details on the front cover (for example, by stacking the books face down).

Appendix 7 - Guidelines for the supervision of postgraduate projects/ dissertations

Individually supervised dissertations are only taught at level 7. Dissertation type assessments and extended projects may be taught at level 6, but these will be supported through structured group sessions rather than individually supervised and so do not fall within scope of this appendix.

The postgraduate project/dissertation provides an opportunity for students to undertake a piece of research/extended practice under the guidance of an experienced researcher, tutor or practitioner and to demonstrate key skills including independent working and communication. However, dissertations are not a compulsory element of programme design.

The use of innovative forms of dissertations such as real-world case studies, lab-based and consultancy projects is encouraged. These guidelines are:

- To be used as part of a supportive approach to assist students in undertaking their dissertation.
- To help ensure that areas of concern are identified and addressed as early as possible.

Level 7 dissertations will have the following word counts:

Credits	Word count
30	8000-10000
60	12000-15000

Changes to word count will only be permitted with evidence of PSRB requirements.

Dissertation support

Support for students undertaking a dissertation will involve a complimentary approach of individual supervision and structured activities such as drop-in sessions and group sessions that cover research skills, research ethics, time management, bibliographic referencing and a guide to the structure of the report.

The purpose of individual supervision is to guide students through the research process, supporting students to anticipate issues/problems and to facilitate problem-solving.

There should usually be 4-6 supervision meetings across the dissertation. These typically cover:

Meeting	Activity
---------	----------

1	Discussing the approach to a literature review and how this will be used to refine the problem to be tackled; consideration of the methodology and ethics; and planning the dissertation.
2	Discussing literature review findings and refining the problem and methodology. Planning data collection.
3	Findings and how these relate to the literature.
4	Writing up and feedback on part of a draft.

Up to 2 additional meetings may be required to discuss issues as they arise, for example in terms of data collection or gaining ethics approval. International students require a minimum of one meeting per month in the case of supervision meetings acting as the point of attendance monitoring for UKVI.

Responsibilities of supervisors

The responsibilities of supervisors are to:

1. Guide students through the dissertation process via supervision meetings as set out above.
2. Ensure a record is kept of all supervision meetings, including any actions and deadlines agreed with the student. These records can also serve as supplementary evidence of engagement e.g. for students with a visa or where required by a Professional Standards Regulatory Body (PSRB).
3. Keep a record of any occasions when a student fails to attend a scheduled meeting, including any reasons given and the efforts made to encourage the student to attend.
4. Respond to emails within two-working days. However, this may be limited to a single email response per-week if emails are numerous.
5. In the event of the supervisor being granted a leave of absence, the Head of School should ensure that adequate alternative arrangements are in place and are communicated to the student.
6. Raise with the module leaders any issues of concern relating to the dissertation as early as possible.

It is not the responsibility of the supervisor to provide any content for inclusion in the dissertation or for any solutions to be provided in respect of the work undertaken. Supervisors are to support the student to think through any issues themselves. Neither is it their responsibility to proof-read the dissertation, nor to provide feedback on a draft of the complete dissertation.

The supervisor should not indicate any grading of the work in progress as it is only the final submission that will be formally assessed.

Responsibilities of students

1. Lead on the identification of a suitable topic and develop the research proposal, taking advice from the supervisor.

2. Develop a plan for the dissertation with milestones, to be discussed and refined with the supervisor.
3. Identify any skills/knowledge gaps and seek appropriate support to address these.
4. Read and review relevant literature and refine the problem to be tackled.
5. Submit the research ethics application by the set deadline(s), if applicable.
6. Conduct the research in a manner that complies with issues of a legal, health and safety, data protection, ethical and professional nature.
7. Record the agreed action points from supervision meetings and share with the supervisor.
8. Address any concerns relating to the dissertation with the supervisor as early as possible. Where concerns remain, raise them with the module leader.
9. Author the dissertation.

Appendix 8: Further guidance and reading

This policy was developed with reference to documentation from:

Bovill et al (2021) Student partnerships in assessment (SPiA) Advance HE, [AdvanceHE Student Partnerships in Assessment](#)

Cheetham, J., Bunyan, N. and Uscategui, S.S., (2023). *Calculating student assessment workloads and equivalences*. University of Liverpool.

Healy, R. (2023) *A guide for working with students as partners*, cited at: [University of Chester, Students as Partners Guidance](#)

O'Neill, G., & Padden, L. (2022). Diversifying assessment methods: Barriers, benefits and enablers. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 59(4), 398–409.

O'Neill, G. (2017). It's not fair! Students and staff views on the equity of the procedures and outcomes of students' choice of assessment methods. *Irish Educational Studies*, 36(2), 221–236.

City University, London (2020) *Assessment and Feedback policy* cited at: [Assessment and Feedback Policy](#)

University of Bristol, University Assessment and Feedback Strategy 2022-30, cited at: [Assessment and Feedback Strategy, University of Bristol](#)

University of East London, (2023) *Assessment and Feedback policy*, cited at: [Assessment and Feedback Policy, University of East London](#)

University of Edinburgh (2022), *Assessment and Feedback, Principles and Priorities*, last assessed 12:11:24 at: [assessment feedback principles priorities](#)

University of Leeds, (2021) *Institutional Assessment Strategy*, cited at: [Assessment strategy 2021f](#)

University of Loughborough, (2023) *Assessment guidance*, cited at: https://www.lboro.ac.uk/media/media/services/academic-registry/documents/aqph/Guidelines_for_assessment_load_07-12-23.pdf

University of Northampton, (2023) *Assessment and Feedback policy 2023-24*, cited at: [Assessment and Feedback Policy](#)

University of Plymouth (2021), *Assessment Policy 2021-25* cited at: [Assessment Policy](#)

Sheffield Hallam, (2023) *Principles and Procedures for Assessment*, cited at: [Principles and Procedures for Assessment, Sheffield Hallam University](#)

University of Westminster, *Assessment and Feedback Policy 2021-2026*, cited at:
[University of Westminster Assessment and Feedback Policy 2021 to 2026](#)

Further guidance and reading can be found:

[University of Greenwich Assessment Hub](#)

[Advance HE \(Higher Education Academy\) – ‘A Marked Improvement’ assessment toolkit](#)

[Advance HE \(Higher Education Academy\) – Re-assessing innovative assessment](#)

[National Union of Students – Assessment and Feedback benchmarking tool](#)

[Graham Gibbs - '53 Powerful Ideas': Numbers 27 \(Making Feedback Work: Assessment\) and 28 \(Making Feedback Work: Students\)](#)

[Graham Gibbs - Improving student learning through assessment and feedback \(video lecture\)](#)