



Anglia Ruskin
University

Cambridge & Chelmsford

Senate Code of Practice on The Assessment of Students

Fourth Edition
September 2009



Anglia Ruskin
University

Cambridge & Chelmsford

Senate Code of Practice on The Assessment of Students

Fourth Edition

September 2009

Foreword

This Senate Code of Practice is one of a series of Codes through which, in conjunction with other mechanisms, Anglia Ruskin University's academic standards and quality of education are maintained, assured and enhanced.

Each Code of Practice has been approved by the Senate for use throughout Anglia Ruskin University and its UK and international partner institutions.

The complete set of Codes, as at September 2009, covers (the date of initial Senate approval is shown in brackets):

- Admissions (24 September 2007)
- The Approval, Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review of Taught Pathways (18 June 2003)
- The Assessment of Students (15 June 2005)¹
- Collaborative Provision (13 June 2007)
- External Examiners for Taught Pathways (15 January 2003)
- Postgraduate Research Programmes (12 October 2005)
- Work-based and Placement Learning (20 November 2008)

The Codes are closely linked and share common elements of quality assurance policy and practice at Anglia Ruskin University. They should therefore be read as a set.

Further copies of this Code of Practice are available on request from the Academic Office. A separate document setting out the detailed procedural arrangements for all assessment processes is also available from the Academic Office.

This third edition of the Code of Practice incorporates revisions approved by the Senate on 25 June 2009 to reflect amendments which are necessary to ensure consistency with the second edition (revised and updated) of Anglia Ruskin's *Academic Regulations*.

An electronic copy of this Senate Code of Practice and the associated Procedural Document is available at www.anglia.ac.uk/codes.

Malcolm Morrison
Director of the Academic Office
September 2009

¹ Subsequent revisions approved by the Senate on: 11 July 2006, 29 November 2006, 25 June 2008 and 25 June 2009

Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. General Principles	4
2.1 Equity and clarity in the assessment process	4
2.2 Objectivity in the assessment process	5
2.3 Independence in the assessment process	6
2.4 The rights and responsibilities of students	7
3. Departmental Assessment Panels and Faculty Awards Boards	8
3.1 Departmental Assessment Panels	8
3.2 Faculty Awards Boards	8
4. Conduct of assessment	9
4.1 Examinations	9
4.2 Other forms of assessment	9
4.3 Extensions and the consequences of late submission	9
4.4 Excessive length and penalties for failing to adhere to word limits	9
4.5 Mitigation	9
4.6 Assessment offences	9
4.7 Special needs in assessment	10
4.8 Retention of items of assessment for defined period of time	10
5. Scheduling and volume of assessment	10
6. Marking	11
6.1 Assessment criteria and marking standards	11
6.2 Mechanisms for marking and for the moderation of marks	11
6.3 Evaluation and development of academic standards	12
6.4 Marking schemes and the aggregation of marks for student continuation and for determining student awards and award classifications	13
6.5 Failure and re-assessment	13
7. Feedback to students on performance	14
8. Staff development and training	14
9. Language of assessment	15
10. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements	15
11. Review of regulatory framework	15
12. Recording, documentation and publication of assessment decisions	15

Glossary of terms	17	
Appendix 1	Anglia Ruskin University's Generic Assessment Criteria and Marking Standards:	21
	Level 0 (Access)	22
	Level 1 (FHEQ level 4)	23
	Level 2 (FHEQ level 5)	24
	Level 3 (FHEQ level 6)	25
	Level 4 (FHEQ level 7)	26

Senate Code of Practice on the Assessment of Students

1. Introduction

1.1 This Code of Practice has been approved by the Senate and is based on the precepts contained in Section 6 (second edition, September 2006) of the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education's (QAA) Code of Practice for the Assurance of Academic Quality and Standards in Higher Education. It complements other Senate Codes of Practice for specific quality assurance activities including:

- Admissions
- The Approval, Annual Monitoring and Periodic Review of Taught Pathways
- External Examiners for Taught Pathways
- Collaborative Provision
- Postgraduate Research Programmes
- Work-based and Placement Learning

1.2 The Code of Practice applies equally to Anglia Ruskin University and its UK and international partner institutions.

1.3 Anglia Ruskin endorses and adopts the following definition of assessment contained in Section 6 (p 4) of the QAA's Code of Practice:

"In higher education, 'assessment' describes any processes that appraise an individual's knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills. There are many different forms of assessment, serving a variety of purposes. These include:

- promoting student learning by providing the student with feedback, normally to help improve his/her performance
- evaluating student knowledge, understanding, abilities or skills
- providing a mark or grade that enables a student's performance to be established. The mark or grade may also be used to make progress decisions
- enabling the public (including employers), and higher education providers, to know that an individual has attained an appropriate level of achievement that reflects the academic standards set by the awarding institution and agreed UK norms, including the frameworks for higher education qualifications. This may include demonstrating fitness to practise or meeting other professional requirements"

1.4 Anglia Ruskin also endorses and adopts the following definitions of types of assessment from Section 6 (Appendix 2, pages 34-36) of the QAA's Code of Practice:

- **Diagnostic assessment** is used to show a learner's preparedness for a module or programme and identifies, for the learner and the teacher, any strengths and potential gaps in knowledge, understanding and skills expected at the start of the programme, or other possible problems. Particular strengths may lead to a formal consideration of accreditation of prior learning.

- **Formative assessment** has a developmental purpose and is designed to help learners learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and on how it can be improved and/or maintained. Reflective practice by students sometimes contributes to formative assessment.
- **Summative assessment** 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 module or programme.

1.5 This Senate Code of Practice is primarily concerned with summative assessment.

2. General Principles

2.1 Equity and clarity in the assessment process

2.1.1 In developing pathways leading to an Anglia Ruskin award Faculties are required to take full account of the QAA's Academic Infrastructure² and, where applicable, the requirements of any professional, statutory or regulatory body (PSRB).

2.1.2 Assessment strategies for such pathways measure student achievement of approved learning outcomes for individual modules and do so in accordance with the following policies:

- a common set of regulations governing assessment is contained within Anglia Ruskin's **Academic Regulations**³ which are published by Anglia Ruskin University and made available to students
- the **assessment methods**⁴ for a module are clearly stated in the Module Definition Form (MDF)
- the assessment volume for a module is directly related to the credit volume for that module
- assessment is criterion-referenced not norm-referenced
- **assessment criteria**⁵ inform the assessment process by providing academic staff with a link between academic standards as set at the level of the award (these are defined in Section 2 of the *Academic Regulations*) and academic standards at module level. Assessment criteria are written in a language that is both generic and general, reflecting the generic learning outcomes of Anglia Ruskin University's awards.
- **marking standards**⁶, comprising bands of marks, are used to distinguish between grades of student achievement in completing an item of assessment for a module.

² particularly Subject Benchmark Statements, Programme Specifications and the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications

³ available at www.anglia.ac.uk/academicregs; see glossary

⁴ see glossary

⁵ see glossary

⁶ see glossary

- the determination of award classifications and other levels of overall student achievement are clearly defined in the *Academic Regulations* and cannot be altered by individuals or Faculty Awards Boards (FAB).

2.1.3 The Senate's Academic Standards, Quality and Regulations Committee (ASQRC) is responsible for keeping the above policies under review and for approving and securing the implementation of appropriate assessment procedures.

2.1.4 In discharging this responsibility ASQRC is informed by the outcomes of the annual monitoring and periodic review of Anglia Ruskin's taught pathways.

2.2 Objectivity in the assessment process

2.2.1 In their delivery of pathways leading to an Anglia Ruskin award at both undergraduate and postgraduate level, Faculties are required to ensure objectivity in the assessment process by adhering to the following key principles:

- all examination scripts are subject to **anonymous marking**⁷
- all other items of assessment are subject to anonymous marking wherever possible. In cases where this is not possible **double marking**⁸ is adopted
- the Major Project, as defined in the *Academic Regulations*, is subject to **unseen double marking**⁹
- all items of assessment (including those at level 1) are subject to **internal moderation**¹⁰
- the determination of award classifications and other levels of overall student achievement are based on a University-wide system of arithmetic calculation, as defined in the *Academic Regulations*, with no subjective element of discretion to alter marks or awards once these have been approved by the appropriate Departmental Assessment Panel (DAP) (see paragraph 2.3.1 below) following a process of internal and **external moderation**¹¹.

2.2.2 The Senate's ASQRC is responsible for:

- publishing information on assessment which is accessible to all staff, students and External Examiners
- keeping this information current, appropriate and accessible
- ensuring that Anglia Ruskin University's policies on objectivity in assessment are implemented by Faculties and are consistently applied.

⁷ see glossary

⁸ see glossary

⁹ see glossary

¹⁰ see glossary

¹¹ see glossary

2.3 Independence in the assessment process

2.3.1 In their delivery of pathways leading to an Anglia Ruskin award at both undergraduate and postgraduate level Faculties are required to ensure independence in the assessment process by adhering to the following key principles:

- the assessment methods for individual modules are agreed through a module approval process which normally includes a subject specialist external to Anglia Ruskin University
- approval of a student's assessment outcome for individual modules is made in accordance with national academic standards by a formally constituted DAP, attended by one or more External Examiners, reporting to the appropriate FAB (alternative arrangements are made if unforeseen circumstances exceptionally prevent an External Examiner from attending such a meeting: for details see the *Senate Code of Practice on External Examiners for Taught Pathways*)
- all items of assessment which contribute towards a student's individual award (normally level 2 modules or higher) are subject to external moderation by an External Examiner(s)
- the determination of a student's eligibility for an award is made by a formally constituted FAB, attended by one or more External Examiners, reporting to the Senate (alternative arrangements are made if unforeseen circumstances exceptionally prevent an External Examiner from attending such a meeting)
- student appeals in relation to assessment processes are considered in accordance with the *Academic Regulations* under the authority of the Senate's Committee for Inquiry and Review using procedures which are independent of individual members of staff.

2.3.2 In relation to assessment processes students have access to an independent appeals procedure under the authority of the Senate's Subcommittee for Inquiry and Review. Information about this procedure is made available to students when they first register at Anglia Ruskin University.

2.3.3 An independent procedure under the authority of the Senate's Subcommittee for Inquiry and Review considers any allegation of an **assessment offence**¹² by an individual student or group of students. Information about assessment offences and the procedure governing them is made available to students when they first register at Anglia Ruskin University.

2.3.4 The Subcommittee for Inquiry and Review submits an annual report on its activities to ASQRC.

¹² see glossary

2.4 The rights and responsibilities of students

2.4.1 Students have the right to:

- be informed about the basis for determining their award classification and/or their overall level of achievement on the pathway for which they are registered, as set out in the *Academic Regulations*
- be informed about the assessment methods and assessment criteria for the individual modules they are taking
- be provided with teaching and/or tutorial guidance in preparation for the assessment of the pathway for which they are registered and of the individual modules they are taking
- be assessed and, where appropriate, be re-assessed in accordance with the *Academic Regulations*
- request a review of an examiner's decision if there is evidence of any irregularity in the conduct of the assessment process or if a student's performance has been affected by personal circumstances which, for valid reasons, could not be notified to the examiners before the examiners' decision was taken, and to have that request formally considered by the body authorised to consider such requests (see Section 9 of the *Academic Regulations* for details)
- to provide the appropriate Faculty Mitigation Panel, through the Director of Studies, Programme Leader or Student Adviser, in advance of the meeting and in writing, with any relevant information on personal circumstances which may have affected their academic performance
- be consulted (but not necessarily individually) on any proposed changes to the regulations governing student continuation and assessment which relate to students currently registered on pathways to which those changes apply and which may directly affect individual students
- seek redress through the appropriate channels if Anglia Ruskin University, without valid cause, has failed to provide the teaching and/or tutorial guidance specified in the *Academic Regulations* for the pathway or has failed to provide reasonable alternative arrangements or has failed to provide information on assessment processes, procedures and methods as required by this Senate Code of Practice.

2.4.2 Students have the following responsibilities:

- to attend those taught elements of their pathway as may be prescribed in the Student Handbook and/or Module Guides published by the Faculty, unless sickness or other valid circumstances pertain
- to participate in learning activities in those taught elements in an appropriate way
- to attend the prescribed examinations and to submit work for assessment in accordance with the *Academic Regulations*, without committing an assessment offence or otherwise seeking to gain unfair academic advantage.

3. Departmental Assessment Panels and Faculty Awards Boards

[NB Anglia Ruskin University operates a two-tiered assessment process for its undergraduate and postgraduate pathways: for details see the Academic Regulations and the Procedural Document associated with this Code of Practice]

3.1 Departmental Assessment Panels (DAPs)

3.1.1. The constitution, quorum and terms of reference of DAPs are set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

3.1.2. The Chair of a DAP must **not** be the Head of Department responsible for the modules under consideration.

3.1.3. The role and responsibilities of External Examiners appointed to DAPs is set out in the *Senate Code of Practice on External Examiners for Taught Pathways*. The External Examiner(s) appointed to a DAP are required to attend at least one meeting of that Panel each year (alternative arrangements are made if unforeseen circumstances exceptionally prevent an External Examiner from attending such a meeting) and to have access to all assessed work, including assessed work related to meetings which he/she is unable to attend.

3.1.4. DAPs do not consider cases of **mitigation**¹³. These are considered by Faculty Mitigation Panels (on behalf of the Faculty Awards Board).

3.2 Faculty Awards Boards (FABs)

3.2.1. The constitution, quorum and terms of reference of FABs are set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

3.2.2. The Chair of a FAB is the Dean (or nominee) of the appropriate Faculty.

3.2.3. The role and responsibilities of External Examiners appointed to FABs are set out in the *Senate Code of Practice on External Examiners for Taught Pathways*. The External Examiner(s) appointed to a FAB is required to attend a minimum of one meeting each year at which decisions on recommendations for awards are made (alternative arrangements are made if unforeseen circumstances exceptionally prevent an External Examiner from attending such a meeting). No award of Anglia Ruskin University can be conferred without the attendance of at least one External Examiner at the meeting of the FAB at which the decision to recommend the award is made.

3.2.4. FABs do not consider individual cases of mitigation. These are considered by Faculty Mitigation Panels on the FAB's behalf.

¹³ see glossary

4. Conduct of assessment

At initial registration all students are given a copy of the Undergraduate or Postgraduate Student Handbook (as appropriate) and the regulations governing assessment (i.e. an extract from the *Academic Regulations*). Collectively these publications provide students with full information on the conduct of Anglia Ruskin University's assessment processes including the following:

4.1. Examinations

Examinations are conducted by invigilators in accordance with the following documents approved by the Senate:

- Regulations governing assessment within the *Academic Regulations*
- Rules for Invigilators
- Instructions to Candidates
- Arrangements for Students with Special Needs in Assessment
- Rules for the Conduct of Examinations at Locations outside Anglia Ruskin University including Overseas

4.2. Other forms of assessment

The conduct of assessment methods other than formal examinations is in accordance with the appropriate regulations contained in the *Academic Regulations* and is published and explained to students in the appropriate Student Handbook and Module Guides. The submission of all work for assessment is at the sole discretion of the student.

4.3. Extensions and the consequences of late submission

A mark of zero is awarded for any assignment submitted after the published deadline unless an extension to the deadline has been approved for an individual student in advance of the deadline. In certain circumstances a short or long term extension to a published deadline may be agreed in advance by a Student Adviser (short term extension) or a Student Adviser **and** the Director of Studies for the Faculty (long term extension), as set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

4.4. Excessive length and penalties for failing to adhere to word limits

Failure to submit work for assessment which satisfies any constraints such as word limits incurs mark penalties, as set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

4.5. Mitigation

Mitigation is the process by which Anglia Ruskin University makes allowances for any matter or circumstance which may have seriously affected a student's performance in an assessment element(s). The process for considering a claim for mitigation is set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

4.6. Assessment offences

Any attempt by a student to gain unfair academic advantage during the assessment process is treated as a serious offence. The process for handling an alleged assessment offence is set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

4.7 Special needs in assessment

The *Academic Regulations* permit the assessment methods for a particular module, as set out in the Module Definition Form (MDF) to be varied, as appropriate, with the approval of the appropriate Director of Studies if a student is unable through disability or disposition to be assessed by those methods. Any such variation shall take full account of:

- the specific needs of the student
- the intended learning outcomes of the pathway and/or module for which the student is registered/enrolled
- the need to ensure that the student is assessed on equal terms with other students.

4.8 Retention of items of assessment for a defined period of time

Assessed work, once marked, is retained in the appropriate administrative office for collection by the student concerned (see also paragraph 7.4 below). If uncollected, it is retained until the time limit for the retention of such work has expired. This time limit is linked to the period within which a student may appeal against a decision of a FAB. In addition a sample of marked work may be retained in the appropriate administrative office to assist Anglia Ruskin University in the evaluation, moderation and enhancement of academic standards (see paragraph 6.3.3. below). Full details of the archive requirements are contained in the Procedural Document which accompanies this Senate Code of Practice.

5. Scheduling and volume of assessment

- 5.1 A module's volume of assessment directly relates to its credit volume, as set out in the *Academic Regulations*. The assessment workload normally approximates to one third of the total notional learning hours for the module as reflected in its approved credit rating.
- 5.2 Assessment is directly linked to student achievement of learning outcomes. Assessment criteria identify student achievement of generic learning outcomes in the broadest possible terms by correlating three key variables - level of learning, marking standards, and student achievement - in taxonomy of statements about assessment.
- 5.3 While the attainment of all learning outcomes must be evidenced by assessment, Anglia Ruskin University has developed policies to avoid assessment overload, including due consideration to the range of learning outcomes which can reasonably be required for a given volume of credit.
- 5.4 Initial (i.e. first attempt) assessment is conducted during and/or at the end of a module and is not normally deferred.
- 5.5 Students are entitled to receive adequate notice of the form and timing of assessment for an individual module.

6. Marking

6.1 Assessment criteria and marking standards

- 6.1.1 Assessment criteria and marking standards are used to define and evaluate student achievement in the completion of assessed work for an individual module.
- 6.1.2 The Senate has defined the relationship between Anglia Ruskin University's generic assessment criteria and marking standards (see **Appendix 1** for details). These are communicated to staff and students in University publications, including this Senate Code of Practice and the Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Handbooks.
- 6.1.3 These generic criteria and standards are either used directly, or customised for individual assessment tasks, as appropriate, by Module Leaders and/or Heads of Department for use within the Faculty. They are communicated to staff and students by Module Leaders and/or Programme Leaders in Faculty publications, including Module Guides and/or Student Handbooks.

6.2 Mechanisms for marking and for the moderation of marks

- 6.2.1 All examination scripts are subject to anonymous marking.
- 6.2.2 All other items of assessment are subject to anonymous marking where the method of assessment allows. If this is not possible for a particular item of assessment, the work submitted by all students is either subject to internal double marking or the Module Leader provides an alternative means of evidencing to the appropriate DAP the integrity of the assessment method for subsequent scrutiny by the External Examiner during the external moderation process.
- 6.2.3 All Major Projects (at both undergraduate and postgraduate level), as defined in the *Academic Regulations*, are subject to unseen double marking.
- 6.2.4 All items of assessment for a module (including modules at Level 1) are subject to internal moderation. For each assessment period, the sample for internal moderation in advance of meetings of the appropriate DAP comprises a minimum of eight items or 10% (whichever is the greater) of the assessed work for each assessment element contributing 25% or more of the overall assessment for a module. Samples are internally moderated on this basis for each assessment period for **all** modules within a Department.
- 6.2.5 The sample for each assessment element covers the full range of marks, including failures and borderline cases (where such examples exist). The sample includes assessed work in partner institutions. Every location of delivery is represented within the sample. The minimum sample size may need to be exceeded to ensure effective external moderation (i.e. satisfying the minimum number of items of assessed work does not necessarily mean that all the criteria for a sample have been met). All samples are accompanied by a full

schedule of all marks achieved by all students enrolled on the relevant module(s) for all assessment methods and for all locations of delivery.

6.2.6 Assessed work for all taught pathways leading to an undergraduate or postgraduate award is subject to external moderation. For each assessment period, the sample for external moderation in advance of meetings of the appropriate DAP comprises a minimum of eight items or 10% (whichever is the greater) of the assessed work for each assessment element contributing 25% or more of the overall assessment for a module. Samples are externally moderated on this basis for each assessment period for **all** modules within a Department which contribute towards to the classification of students' individual awards. For most awards the modules concerned are at Level 2 or higher. For the awards of Cert HE, HNC, HND and Cert Ed, modules at Level 1 contribute towards the classification of the award. In such cases a sample of assessed work for Level 1 modules, undertaken by students registered for those awards, must be moderated by the appropriate External Examiner.

6.2.7 The sample for each assessment element covers the full range of marks including failures and borderline cases (where such examples exist). The sample includes assessed work in partner institutions. Every location of delivery is represented within the sample. Assessed work selected for inclusion within the sample must include work which has been subject to internal moderation but may also include work which has not been internally moderated. The minimum sample size may need to be exceeded to ensure effective external moderation (i.e. satisfying the minimum number of items of assessed work does not necessarily mean that all criteria for a sample have been met). All samples are accompanied by a full schedule of all marks achieved by all students enrolled on the relevant module(s) for all assessment methods and for all locations of delivery.

6.3 Evaluation and development of academic standards

6.3.1 DAPs are responsible for confirming the appropriateness and academic standards of mark ranges. To discharge this responsibility they consider trends in assessment results over time and in assessment outcomes across the range of modules for which the Panel is responsible.

6.3.2 FABs are responsible for setting and maintaining the academic standard of the awards and, in certain cases, the classification of the awards for which the Board is responsible.

6.3.3 An archive of sample marked scripts is maintained under the authority of each DAP to assist in the periodic evaluation of the maintenance and development of academic standards and in the staff development associated with this activity (see paragraph 4.8 above).

6.4 Marking schemes and the aggregation of marks for student continuation and for determining student awards and award classifications

6.4.1 **Marking schemes**¹⁴ are used at module level to inform the first marking and internal and external moderation of each item of assessment. Marking schemes identify the knowledge and skills which students must demonstrate to achieve the learning outcomes of the module, and are used to calculate the total mark to be awarded for an individual item of assessment. Anglia Ruskin University's generic assessment criteria are intended to advise the writing of marking schemes, ensuring that they are broadly comparable across Anglia Ruskin University.

6.4.2 Anglia Ruskin's *Academic Regulations* define the basis on which marks for individual modules are aggregated when determining:

- a student's continuation between levels of learning and years of study
- a student's award classification and/or overall level of achievement for the pathway for which they are registered.

6.4.3 The determination of award classifications and other levels of overall student achievement is based on a University-wide system of arithmetic calculation, as defined in the *Academic Regulations*. There is no subjective element of discretion to alter the marks of students whose overall aggregate mark places them within an award or award classification borderline. When determining an award classification the arithmetic mean is rounded to the nearest integer, as set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

6.5 Failure and re-assessment

6.5.1 In certain circumstances and within prescribed limits, as defined in the *Academic Regulations*, compensation is permitted for a failed module within an undergraduate pathway.

6.5.2 Students who fail a module at the first attempt are permitted **one** further opportunity to pass the module, subject to:

- the *Academic Regulations* governing compensation which apply only to undergraduates
- the outcome of any claim for mitigating circumstances
- the provisions of the *Academic Regulations* with regard to replacement and retake modules

6.5.3 If a student has failed a module, re-assessment after further attendance may be undertaken only where deemed necessary by the DAP in view of the subject area (e.g. laboratory work for a science-based subject).

6.5.4 The module result for a student who passes a module at re-assessment is capped at 40%.

¹⁴ see glossary

7. Feedback to students on performance

- 7.1 Students are entitled to receive feedback from markers on all assessed work when it is returned to them. Such feedback is written or otherwise, as appropriate.
- 7.2 Written feedback is normally through completion of a cover sheet on which markers relate feedback to assessment criteria and learning outcomes.
- 7.3 Feedback on all assessed work is given to students **within 20 working days** of the submission deadline or the date of an examination, except that feedback on the Major Project is given **within 30 working days** of the submission deadline. For these purposes “working days” excludes those days when Anglia Ruskin University is officially closed. These arrangements apply equally to work submitted during and at the end of the teaching period and to any work submitted for an approved reason outside the teaching period. Such feedback clearly states, if applicable, that the mark awarded is unconfirmed and subject to internal and external moderation.
- 7.4 At the main Anglia Ruskin University campuses, each Faculty publishes details of the arrangement for the return of assessed work to students (except examination scripts which are not returned) within 20 working days of the submission deadline. After a further 20 working days, all uncollected assessed work is returned to the iCentres (or designated alternative location at a partner institution) from where it can subsequently be collected. Any work not collected by a student is disposed of after the time limit for the retention of such work has expired (see also paragraph 4.8 above).

8. Staff development and training

- 8.1 All academic and administrative staff associated with assessment receive copies of this Senate Code of Practice, the associated Procedural Document and the regulations governing assessment contained in Anglia Ruskin’s *Academic Regulations*.
- 8.2 All members of academic staff associated with the management of the curriculum and/or assessment processes are strongly encouraged by the Dean of their Faculty (or a designated alternate) to attend appropriate and relevant staff development events.
- 8.3 All members of administrative staff associated with the management of the curriculum and/or assessment processes are strongly encouraged by the Head of their Administrative Unit (or a designated alternate) to attend appropriate and relevant staff development events.
- 8.4 All newly-appointed academic staff who are required to complete a probationary period are required to pass within their first year of appointment Anglia Ruskin’s Postgraduate Certificate in Learning & Teaching which includes a module on the assessment of students.

9. Language of assessment

9.1 All taught pathways leading to an Anglia Ruskin award are delivered and assessed in English. This principle does not apply to:

- appropriate assessment methods in modern foreign languages
- appropriate stages of dual awards
- students transferring certificated prior learning to count towards the credit requirements of an Anglia Ruskin award under an approved credit recognition with an institution whose language of assessment is not English. In such cases assessment of the certificated prior learning has not been conducted in English.

10. Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements

10.1 Anglia Ruskin's Pathway Specification Form (PSF) is used to define the structure and content of all pathways leading to an Anglia Ruskin award. The PSF identifies the PSRB from whom professional recognition or accreditation of the pathway has been, or will be, sought.

10.2 The Student Handbook for the pathway ensures that any PSRB requirements (e.g. those modules which must be taken and passed) for progression towards a professional qualification are made clear to students.

11. Review of regulatory framework

11.1 This Senate Code of Practice is reviewed every three years (or more regularly if necessary) by the Senate's ASQRC. The Committee submits to the Senate any recommendations for revision.

11.2 Students are normally governed by those *Academic Regulations* in force at the point of their initial registration with Anglia Ruskin University. If the Senate determines that a change of regulation should apply to students already registered for a pathway leading to an Anglia Ruskin award, Anglia Ruskin University formally advises those students in writing of the changes and the effective dates, particularly if the changes relate to the assessment process.

12. Recording, documentation and publication of assessment decisions

12.1 The Academic Office provides an Executive Secretary to all DAPs who is responsible for the accurate recording of assessment decisions made by the Panel at its formal meetings. The Chair of the Panel is responsible for approving in writing all such decisions. Any decisions desired at other points require the written approval of the Chair. However, delegated responsibility is exercised by the Chair only in exceptional circumstances, as set out in the *Academic Regulations*.

- 12.2 The Academic Office provides an Executive Secretary to all FABs who is appropriately qualified/experienced to advise the Chair during the meeting and is responsible for the accurate recording of student continuation and award decisions made by the Board at its formal meetings. The Chair of the Board is responsible for approving in writing all decisions made by the FAB. Any decisions desired at other points require the written approval of the Chair. However, delegated responsibility is exercised by the Chair only in exceptional circumstances, as set out in the *Academic Regulations*.
- 12.3 The Assistant Director (Quality Systems) of the Academic Office publishes to students during each teaching/learning period a final date by which the module results and all decisions on student continuation and the conferment of awards related to that period will be communicated to students.

Senate Code of Practice on the Assessment of Students

Glossary of Terms

[NB: These terms are defined solely in the context of Anglia Ruskin University and its partner institutions. They do not necessarily apply to other institutions.]

- **Anonymous marking** is the process whereby the identity of individual students is, wherever possible, not revealed to markers at the marking stage.
- **Assessment criteria** inform the assessment process by providing academic staff with a link between academic standards as set at the level of the award (these are defined in Section 2 of the *Academic Regulations*) and academic standards at module level. They identify student achievement of generic learning outcomes in the broadest possible terms by correlating three key variables - level of learning, marking standards, and student achievement - in a taxonomy of statements about assessment.

The Senate has approved (29 November 2006) a set of generic assessment criteria and marking standards for each level of learning (Levels 0-4, Access and FHEQ levels 4-7). They are published annually in Anglia Ruskin's Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Handbooks and in this Code of Practice in **Appendix 1**.

The generic assessment criteria are customised by Module Leaders for individual modules within each Faculty. These module-specific assessment criteria are communicated to:

- students in Module Guides and/or individual assignment sheets
- External Examiners when their approval is sought for draft examination questions or the major item of assessment for a module in accordance with the *Senate Code of Practice on External Examiners for Taught Pathways*.
- **Assessment methods** are the range of assessment instruments used by a teaching team to evaluate the level of a student's knowledge, understanding, skills and competencies when taking a module, successful completion of which results in the award of credit for that module.
- An **assessment offence** is action taken by a student, whether knowingly or unknowingly, when completing an individual item of assessment which results in the student gaining unfair academic advantage over other students. Such advantage may take a variety of forms including the award of a higher mark than would otherwise be given or in the unwarranted granting of an extended period of time within which to complete an item of assessment.
- The **Academic Regulations** are Anglia Ruskin's principal set of regulations governing all aspects of curriculum delivery. They are approved by the Senate and may from time to time be revised by the Senate. The second edition (revised and updated) of the *Academic Regulations* is dated July 2009. See:

www.anglia.ac.uk/academicregs

- **Double marking** (sometimes known as “second marking”) is the use of two markers to mark an item of assessment. As defined and implemented by Anglia Ruskin, it is the process whereby the work submitted by **all** students for a particular item of assessment is assessed by a second marker with access to the approved assessment criteria and marking scheme for that item of assessment. The second marker knows the mark awarded by the first marker and the purpose of the process is to agree a mark for each student. In certain circumstances more than one staff member may be used as the second marker for a particular item of assessment submitted by a student cohort.

Double marking as defined above is adopted at Anglia Ruskin **only** in cases where the principle of anonymous marking cannot be applied to a particular assessment instrument.

In certain cases where anonymity cannot be achieved a variant of the above arrangements is necessary e.g. for an assessed seminar presentation given by an individual student two markers attend and confer after the presentation to identify an agreed mark. A further variant of this principle is applied to the assessment of artefacts in the Creative Arts.

In other cases where a student is assessed in clinical or non-clinical practice or in the workplace anonymity cannot be maintained. These cases include:

- the use of objective structured clinical examination (OSCE) as an assessment method in some modules in the Faculty of Health and Social Care
- certain clinical practice assessments in the Faculty of Health and Social Care and Faculty of Science and Technology
- practice or workplace assessments in all Faculties (eg initial teacher training or the assessment of work-based learning within Foundation Degrees)

In such cases “the Module Leader shall provide an alternative means of evidencing to the appropriate Assessment Panel the integrity of the assessment method for subsequent scrutiny by the External Examiner during the external moderation process” in accordance with paragraph 6.2.2 of the *Senate Code of Practice on the Assessment of Students*. Such evidence could take various forms including written confirmation from the Module Leader to the Assessment Panel that the practice assessment was conducted with the placement supervisor in attendance or that the OSCE was conducted in accordance with the clearly defined guidelines and assessment criteria of the relevant professional body.

- **External moderation** is the process whereby an External Examiner reviews and moderates a defined **sample** of student work for a module. The sample draws on all items of assessment contributing to the overall assessment of the module, including written assignments and examination scripts. The sample includes student work associated with delivery of the module by a partner institution.

The External Examiner has access to the approved assessment criteria and marking scheme for each assessment instrument in the sample, knows the mark awarded by the internal marker(s), and also has access to any written feedback given to the student by the internal marker(s).

The purpose of external moderation is to check that appropriate standards of assessment are being set and maintained by the internal marker(s) and that these are comparable to those set on similar programmes at the same level at other higher education institutions in the UK.

- **Internal moderation** is the process whereby an internal moderator (i.e a member of academic staff of Anglia Ruskin University) reviews and moderates a defined **sample** of student work for a module which has been anonymously marked by a first marker. The sample draws on all items of assessment contributing to the overall assessment of the module, including written assignments and examination scripts. The sample includes student work associated with delivery of the module by a partner institution.

The internal moderator has access to the approved assessment criteria and marking scheme for each assessment instrument in the sample, knows the mark awarded by the first marker, and also has access to any written feedback given to the student by the first marker.

The purpose of internal moderation is to check the consistent application by the first marker of the assessment criteria, marking scheme and marking standards for the items of assessment in the sample (see the definitions for these terms contained elsewhere in this glossary).

- A **marking scheme** customises Anglia Ruskin University's generic assessment criteria and marking standards to fit a specific item of assessment for a module, identifying the basis on which marks are awarded. A marking scheme may range from the fairly general to the highly specific. In relatively open-ended assessments (e.g. where students are asked to select one of a range of essay questions) a Module Leader is not necessarily expected to provide a detailed marking scheme specifying a 'model answer' to each specific essay question, but rather to provide a general marking scheme which identifies the characteristics of a good essay and can be applied to any of the essay questions set. The same would apply to many aspects of practice, performance or studio work. In contrast, less open-ended assessment tasks such as translation would require both a 'model translation' of the passage and a detailed marking scheme adapted to the specifics of the passage translated.

To facilitate consistency first markers constantly refer to the marking scheme when marking student work. They pass the marking scheme on to the internal moderator/second marker and eventually to the External Examiner with student scripts. This enables all parties to understand the basis on which marks are awarded and lends a fundamental transparency to the assessment process. It should always be clear to the internal moderator and External Examiner how marks have been determined.

- **Marking standards** comprise bands of marks normally on a percentage scale (e.g. 60-69%) or occasionally on a pass/fail basis. They are accompanied by descriptors and are used by markers to distinguish between grades of student achievement in completing an item of assessment for a module.

The Senate has approved a set of generic marking standards which apply to assessed work at all award levels (HE Levels 0-4). These generic marking standards are incorporated into one document (by level), the *Anglia Ruskin University's Generic Assessment Criteria and Marking Standards*, published

annually in Anglia Ruskin's Undergraduate and Postgraduate Student Handbooks and in this Senate Code of Practice as **Appendix 1**. See:

http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/students/pdfs/UG_Handbook_08-09.pdf

http://web.anglia.ac.uk/anet/students/pdfs/PG_handbook_08-09.pdf

www.anglia.ac.uk/codes

The generic assessment criteria and marking standards may be customised by Departments for application to all modules within a particular subject area. Any local customisation of the generic marking standards is communicated to students in individual Module Guides published by Faculties.

- **Mitigation** is the process by which Anglia Ruskin University makes allowance for any matter or circumstance which may have seriously affected a student's performance in an assessment element(s).
- **Unseen double marking**, as defined and implemented by Anglia Ruskin, is the process whereby the Major Project (at undergraduate or postgraduate level), as defined in the *Academic Regulations*, is assessed by a second marker with access to the approved assessment criteria and marking scheme for that item of assessment. More than one staff member may be used as the second marker for the Major Project submitted by a student cohort. The second marker does **not** know the mark awarded by the first marker and the purpose of the process is to agree a mark for the Major Project.

Anglia Ruskin University's Generic Assessment Criteria and Marking Standards

Assessment criteria inform the assessment process by providing academic staff with a link between academic standards as set at the level of the award (these are defined in Section 2 of the *Academic Regulations*) and academic standards at module level. Assessment criteria are written in a language that is both generic and general, reflecting the generic learning outcomes of Anglia Ruskin awards which, in turn, reflect the Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) (QAA, 2008).

Assessment criteria are not to be confused with marking schemes.

Assessment criteria identify student achievement of generic learning outcomes in the broadest possible terms by correlating three key variables - level of learning, marking standards, and student achievement - in a taxonomy of statements about assessment.

- **level** is as identified in the FHEQ and Anglia Ruskin's *Academic Regulations*, ranging from Level 0 (Access), through Levels 1-3 (Undergraduate) to Level 4 (Postgraduate). A separate table is provided for each of the five levels.
- **marking standards** are identified by means of a percentage scale covering six mark bands: 70%+, 60%-69%, 50%-59%, 40%-49%, 30%-39% and 1%-29%. Marking standards are expressed as *columns* in the following tables.
- **student achievement** consists of a set of descriptors which are used by markers to distinguish between grades of student achievement.

A **marking scheme** is used at module level to inform the first marking and internal and external moderation of each item of assessment. Marking schemes identify the knowledge and skills which students must demonstrate to achieve the learning outcomes of the module, and are used to calculate the total mark to be awarded for an individual item of assessment. Anglia Ruskin University's generic assessment criteria are intended to advise the writing of marking schemes, ensuring that they are broadly comparable across the institution.

A module marking scheme customises the Anglia Ruskin's generic assessment criteria to fit a specific item of assessment for a module, identifying the basis on which marks are awarded. A marking scheme may range from the fairly general to the highly specific. In relatively open-ended assessments (eg where students are asked to select one of a range of essay questions) a Module Leader would not necessarily expect to provide a detailed marking scheme specifying a 'model answer' to each specific essay question, but rather to provide a general marking scheme which identifies the characteristics of a good essay and can be applied to any of the essay questions set. The same would apply to many aspects of practice, performance or studio work. In contrast, less open-ended assessment tasks such as translation would require both a 'model translation' of the passage and a detailed marking scheme adapted to the specifics of the passage translated.

To facilitate consistency first markers constantly refer to the marking scheme when marking student work. They pass the marking scheme on to the internal moderator/second marker and eventually to the External Examiner with student scripts. This enables all parties to understand the basis on which marks are awarded and lends a fundamental transparency to the assessment process. It should always be clear to the internal moderator and External Examiner how marks have been determined.

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS
LEVEL 0

Assessment criteria by level		Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations, Section 2)	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band →	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO, MDF may permit compensation	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation
	Level 0 (Access) prepares students to function effectively at HE Level 1. Criteria for assessment at Level 0 reflect the preparatory nature of these modules. Students are expected to demonstrate the acquisition of generic learning skills appropriate for self-managed learning in an HE context. Students are expected to demonstrate that they have acquired the underpinning discipline-specific skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to undertake a programme of higher education	Excellent information base and understanding of ethical issues.	Good information base covering all major/ ethical issues.	Satisfactory information base covering most major issues and their ethical dimension.	Basic information base; limited understanding of major/ ethical issues of discipline.	Limited information base; limited understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension.	Inadequate information base; lack of understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 0 (Access) prepares students to function effectively at HE Level 1. Criteria for assessment at Level 0 reflect the preparatory nature of these modules. Students are expected to demonstrate the acquisition of generic learning skills appropriate for self-managed learning in an HE context. Students are expected to demonstrate that they have acquired the underpinning discipline-specific skills, knowledge and understanding necessary to undertake a programme of higher education	Excellent management of learning resources. Contributes well to teams. Structured and largely accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual skills and practical/ professional skills	Good management of learning resources. Expression is structured and mainly accurate. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Expression shows some lack of structure and/or accuracy. Acceptable but undistinguished skill sets. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional skills	Basic use of learning resources, with significant lack of structure and/or accuracy in expression. Some issues with academic/ intellectual skills. Basic team/ practical/ professional skills	Limited use of learning resources with little contribution to team work. Weak academic/ intellectual skills and difficulty with expression. Insecure practical/ professional skills	Inadequate use of learning resources. Major problems with structure and accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills

A mark of 0% may be awarded for non-submission, poor or dangerous practice, incoherent and insufficient work, and in situations where the student fails to address the assignment brief and related learning outcomes

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS

LEVEL 1

		Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations, Section 2)	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band →	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO. MDF may permit compensation	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation
	Level 1 (FHEQ level 4) introduces students to HE. Students are expected to demonstrate relevant skills and competencies; to be articulate in expressing ideas orally; and to be coherent and structured in terms of written or other media. Forms of expression at this level may be descriptive or imitative, but students are expected to demonstrate an increasing understanding of the theoretical background of their study and the analytic competence to explore it, as well as its relationship, where appropriate, to particular skills. Students are expected to develop an awareness of strengths and weaknesses in their skill sets	Excellent information base, exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with considerable originality.	Good information base; explores the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with some originality.	Satisfactory information base that begins to explore and analyse the discipline and its ethical issues but is still mainly imitative.	Basic information base; omissions in understanding of major / ethical issues. Largely imitative.	Limited information base; limited understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension.	Inadequate information base; lack of understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension. Wholly imitative.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 1 (FHEQ Level 4) introduces students to HE. Students are expected to demonstrate relevant skills and competencies; to be articulate in expressing ideas orally; and to be coherent and structured in terms of written or other media. Forms of expression at this level may be descriptive or imitative, but students are expected to demonstrate an increasing understanding of the theoretical background of their study and the analytic competence to explore it, as well as its relationship, where appropriate, to particular skills. Students are expected to develop an awareness of strengths and weaknesses in their skill sets	Excellent management of learning resources, complemented by self-direction/ exploration. Structured/ accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual and team/ practical/ professional skills	Good management of learning resources with some self-direction. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/practical/professional skills	Satisfactory use of learning resources and input to team work. Some lack of structure/accuracy in expression. Acceptable academic/ intellectual skills and satisfactory practical/professional skills	Basic use of learning resources with no self-direction. Some input to team work. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Some difficulties with academic/ intellectual skills and developing practical/ professional skills	Limited use of learning resources, No self-direction, little input to team work and difficulty with structure/ accuracy in expression. Weak academic/ intellectual skills Practical/professional skills are not yet secure	Inadequate use of learning resources. Failure to contribute to team work. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills and practical/ professional skills

A mark of 0% may be awarded for non-submission, poor or dangerous practice, incoherent and insufficient work, and in situations where the student fails to address the assignment brief and related learning outcomes

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS

LEVEL 2

		Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations, Section 2)	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band →	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO
	<p>Level 2 (FHEQ level 5) reflects continuing development from Level 1. At this level students are not fully autonomous but are able to take responsibility for their own learning with some direction. Students are expected to locate an increasingly detailed theoretical knowledge of the discipline within a more general intellectual context, and to demonstrate this through forms of expression which go beyond the merely descriptive or imitative. Students are expected to demonstrate analytical competence in terms both of problem identification and resolution, and to develop their skill sets as required.</p>	Excellent knowledge base, exploring and analysing the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with considerable originality and autonomy.	Good knowledge base; explores and analyses the discipline, its theory and ethical issues with some originality, detail and autonomy.	Satisfactory knowledge base that begins to explore and analyse the theory and ethical issues of the discipline.	Basic knowledge base with some omissions and/or lack of theory of discipline and its ethical dimension.	Limited knowledge base; limited understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension.	Inadequate knowledge base; lack of understanding of discipline and its ethical dimension.
Knowledge and Understanding	<p>Level 2 (FHEQ level 5) reflects continuing development from Level 1. At this level students are not fully autonomous but are able to take responsibility for their own learning with some direction. Students are expected to locate an increasingly detailed theoretical knowledge of the discipline within a more general intellectual context, and to demonstrate this through forms of expression which go beyond the merely descriptive or imitative. Students are expected to demonstrate analytical competence in terms both of problem identification and resolution, and to develop their skill sets as required.</p>	Excellent management of learning, with a degree of autonomy/ exploration that may exceed the brief. Structured/ accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Good management of learning with consistent self-direction. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Acceptable structure/accuracy in expression. Acceptable level of academic/ intellectual skills, going beyond description at times. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional skills. Inconsistent self-direction	Basic use of learning resources with little self-direction. Some input to team work. Some difficulties with academic/ intellectual skills. Largely imitative and descriptive. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression, but developing practical/ professional skills	Limited use of learning resources, working towards self-direction. General difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Still mainly imitative and descriptive. Team/ practical/ professional skills that are not yet secure	Inadequate use of learning resources. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills. Wholly imitative and descriptive. Very weak team/ practical/ professional skills. No ability to direct own learning
		<p>Level 2 (FHEQ level 5) reflects continuing development from Level 1. At this level students are not fully autonomous but are able to take responsibility for their own learning with some direction. Students are expected to locate an increasingly detailed theoretical knowledge of the discipline within a more general intellectual context, and to demonstrate this through forms of expression which go beyond the merely descriptive or imitative. Students are expected to demonstrate analytical competence in terms both of problem identification and resolution, and to develop their skill sets as required.</p>	Excellent management of learning, with a degree of autonomy/ exploration that may exceed the brief. Structured/ accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Good management of learning with consistent self-direction. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Acceptable structure/accuracy in expression. Acceptable level of academic/ intellectual skills, going beyond description at times. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional skills. Inconsistent self-direction	Basic use of learning resources with little self-direction. Some input to team work. Some difficulties with academic/ intellectual skills. Largely imitative and descriptive. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression, but developing practical/ professional skills	Limited use of learning resources, working towards self-direction. General difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Still mainly imitative and descriptive. Team/ practical/ professional skills that are not yet secure
Intellectual and Transferable Skills	<p>Level 2 (FHEQ level 5) reflects continuing development from Level 1. At this level students are not fully autonomous but are able to take responsibility for their own learning with some direction. Students are expected to locate an increasingly detailed theoretical knowledge of the discipline within a more general intellectual context, and to demonstrate this through forms of expression which go beyond the merely descriptive or imitative. Students are expected to demonstrate analytical competence in terms both of problem identification and resolution, and to develop their skill sets as required.</p>	Excellent management of learning, with a degree of autonomy/ exploration that may exceed the brief. Structured/ accurate expression. Very good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Good management of learning with consistent self-direction. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional skills	Satisfactory use of learning resources. Acceptable structure/accuracy in expression. Acceptable level of academic/ intellectual skills, going beyond description at times. Satisfactory team/ practical/ professional skills. Inconsistent self-direction	Basic use of learning resources with little self-direction. Some input to team work. Some difficulties with academic/ intellectual skills. Largely imitative and descriptive. Some difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression, but developing practical/ professional skills	Limited use of learning resources, working towards self-direction. General difficulty with structure and accuracy in expression. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Still mainly imitative and descriptive. Team/ practical/ professional skills that are not yet secure	Inadequate use of learning resources. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills. Wholly imitative and descriptive. Very weak team/ practical/ professional skills. No ability to direct own learning

A mark of 0% may be awarded for non-submission, poor or dangerous practice, incoherent and insufficient work, and in situations where the student fails to address the assignment brief and related learning outcomes

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS
LEVEL 3

Assessment criteria by level		Marking standards (by mark band)					
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%	1-29%
Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations, Regulation 2.26-2.41.2)	Characteristics of student achievement per mark band →	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO. MDF may permit compensation	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO and is not eligible for compensation
	Level 3 (FHEQ level 6) is characterised by an expectation of students' increasing autonomy in relation to their study and developing skill sets. Students are expected to demonstrate problem solving skills, both theoretical and practical. This is supported by an understanding of appropriate theory; creativity of expression and thought based in individual judgement; and the ability to seek out, invoke, analyse and evaluate competing theories or methods of working in a critically constructive and open manner. Output includes is articulate, coherent and skilled in the appropriate medium, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialism.	Excellent knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory/practice/ethics of discipline with considerable originality.	Good knowledge base that supports analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory/practice/ethics of discipline with some originality.	Satisfactory knowledge base that supports some analysis, evaluation and problem-solving in theory/practice/ethics of discipline.	Basic knowledge base with some omissions at the level of theoretical/ethical issues.. Restricted ability to discuss theory and/or solve problems in discipline	Limited knowledge base; limited understanding of discipline/ethical issues.. Difficulty with theory and problem solving in discipline	Inadequate knowledge base; lack of understanding of discipline/ethical issues. Unable to discuss theory or solve problems in discipline.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills	Level 3 (FHEQ level 6) is characterised by an expectation of students' increasing autonomy in relation to their study and developing skill sets. Students are expected to demonstrate problem solving skills, both theoretical and practical. This is supported by an understanding of appropriate theory; creativity of expression and thought based in individual judgement; and the ability to seek out, invoke, analyse and evaluate competing theories or methods of working in a critically constructive and open manner. Output is articulate, coherent and skilled in the appropriate medium, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialism.	Excellent management of learning, with degree of autonomy/ research that may exceed the assessment brief. Structured and creative expression. Very good academic/ intellectual skills and practical/ team/professional/ problem-solving skills	Good management of learning, with consistent self-directed research. Structured and accurate expression. Good academic/ intellectual skills and team/ practical/ professional/ problem solving skills	Satisfactory management of learning. Some autonomy in research but inconsistent. Structured and mainly accurate expression. Acceptable level of academic/ intellectual skills going beyond description at times Satisfactory team/practical/professional/ problem-solving skills	Basic use of learning resources with little autonomy. Some difficulties with academic/ intellectual skills with structure/ accuracy in expression, but evidence of developing team/ practical/ professional/ problem-solving skills	Limited use of learning resources. Unable to work autonomously. Little input to teams. Weak academic/intellectual skills. Still mainly descriptive General difficulty with structure/ accuracy in expression/ practical/professional/ problem-solving skills that are not yet secure	Inadequate use of learning resources. Failure to contribute to team work. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills. and weak practical/professional skills. No ability to direct own learning

A mark of 0% may be awarded for non-submission, poor or dangerous practice, incoherent and insufficient work, and in situations where the student fails to address the assignment brief and related learning outcomes

ANGLIA RUSKIN UNIVERSITY GENERIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA AND MARKING STANDARDS

LEVEL 4

		Marking standards (by mark band)				
		70%+	60-69%	50-59%	40-49%	30-39%
Generic Learning Outcomes (Academic Regulations, Section 2)	Assessment criteria by level Characteristics of student achievement per mark band →	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Achieves a marginal pass in the module outcome/s related to this GLO at this Level of Study	Fails marginally to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO	Fails to achieve module outcome/s related to this GLO
	Knowledge and Understanding Level 4 (FHEQ level 7) is characterised by an expectation of students' expertise in their specialism. Students are semi-autonomous, demonstrating independence in the negotiation of assessment tasks (including the major project) and the ability to evaluate, challenge, modify and develop theory and practice. Students are expected to demonstrate an ability to isolate and focus on the significant features of problems and to offer synthetic and coherent solutions, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialism that is worthy of publication or public performance or display.	DISTINCTION As MERIT but showing independence of thought, a high level of intellectual rigour and consistency.	MERIT Good analysis of key issues/ Concepts/ethics. Development of conceptual structures and argument making consistent use of scholarly conventions.	PASS Satisfactory knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Descriptive in parts but some ability to synthesise scholarship and lapses in use of scholarly conventions	PASS Basic knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Largely descriptive, with restricted synthesis of existing scholarship and little argument. Use of scholarly conventions inconsistent.	Limited information base, understanding or research skills in discipline.
Intellectual (thinking), Practical, Affective and Transferable Skills Level 4 (FHEQ level 7) is characterised by an expectation of students' expertise in their specialism. Students are semi-autonomous, demonstrating independence in the negotiation of assessment tasks (including the major project) and the ability to evaluate, challenge, modify and develop theory and practice. Students are expected to demonstrate an ability to isolate and focus on the significant features of problems and to offer synthetic and coherent solutions, with some students producing original or innovative work in their specialism that is worthy of publication or public performance or display.	DISTINCTION As MERIT but excellent research skills, independence of thought, a high level of intellectual rigour and consistency, excellent expressive/professional skills, and considerable creativity and originality. Excellent academic/intellectual skills, and considerable creativity and originality	MERIT Good analysis of key issues/ Concepts/ethics. Development of conceptual structures and argument, making consistent use of scholarly conventions.	PASS Satisfactory knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Descriptive in parts but some ability to synthesise scholarship and lapses in use of scholarly conventions	PASS Basic knowledge of key issues/ concepts/ ethics in discipline. Largely descriptive, with restricted synthesis of existing scholarship and little argument. Use of scholarly conventions inconsistent.	Limited research skills impede use of resources and problem solving. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Team/ Professional skills not yet secure. Weak academic/ intellectual skills. Inconsistent use of scholarly conventions	Inadequate research skills prevent use of learning resources and problem solving. Major problems with structure/ accuracy in expression. Very weak academic/ intellectual skills. Ignorance of scholarly conventions Very weak team/ practical /professional skills

A mark of 0% may be awarded for non-submission, poor or dangerous practice, incoherent and insufficient work, and in situations where the student fails to address the assignment brief and related learning outcomes



Anglia Ruskin
University

Cambridge & Chelmsford

**Additional copies of the Senate Code of Practice on
The Assessment of Students are available from:**

Director of the Academic Office
Anglia Ruskin University
Bishop Hall Lane
Chelmsford
CM1 1SQ
Tel: 0845 196 4931

www.anglia.ac.uk/codes