University Centre Colchester Regulations for Students on University of Essex Programmes

2022/23

Internal Verification and Marking Policy for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Work

Version: 5.0
Updated: September 2022
Review Date: September 2023

Contents

List of Appendices:

Appendix A: Internal Verification Policy for all Taught Students

Appendix B: Form for requesting a re-mark of work

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback Form

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Appendix G: Level 4 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Appendix H: Level 5 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Appendix I: Level 6 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Appendix K: Level 4 Internal Verification Form (Assessment Decisions)

Appendix L: Level 5 Internal Verification Form (Assessment Decisions)

Appendix M: Level 6 Internal Verification Form (Assessment Decisions)

1   Foreword

1.1   This policy applies to all taught course students studying on University of Essex validated programmes at University Centre Colchester.

1.2   The policy applies to assessments contributing to a mark at all levels, as well as the mark appearing on the Assignment Tracking Systems (ATS2) from which a student's final degree classification is derived.

1.3   A list of definitions and marking policies is given below; a table showing the requirements applied to different forms of assessment is shown in Appendix A.

2   Definitions

2.1   Internal Verification

Internal Verification is the over-arching term for incorporating all types of quality assurance methods used to quantify and validate the marks provided for assessments. Internal Verification covers the terms Moderation, Second Marking and (Blind) Double Marking.

2.2   Moderation

Moderation is a process separate from that of marking and provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers, and is an approach which enables consistency across academic subjects. A moderator reviews a sample of the marked student work and liaises with the first marker if they believe that the marks were not at the correct level. A moderator would not change individual student marks for the work, but the first marker and moderator would agree whether marks should be reviewed across the particular piece of assessment, or module, which may lead to marks being adjusted. In the case of a major discrepancy, it might be necessary for all the work to be re-marked (by second marking or double marking).

2.3   Single Marking with Moderation

Work is marked by one member of staff and Moderation (see section 2.2) is applied.

2.4   Second Marking

Second Marking requires the work to be marked by a second individual, but with full access to the first marker's marks and any written feedback or comments. Marks must be reconciled and must take place in consultation with the 1st marker. – see section 4 below.

2.5   (Blind) Double Marking

Double Marking is where two markers produce independent sets of marks for an assessment, without access to each other's marks. Both marks must be reconciled. This takes place in consultation between both markers – see section 4 below.

2.6   Monitored Assessment

This is all assessment carried out under invigilation or supervision – for example: examinations, multiple-choice tests, time-controlled essays, open-book essays, presentations, performances, group discussions and viva voces.

2.7   Unmonitored Assessment

This is an assessment piece of work that is produced in a student's own time – for example: essays, journal articles, lab reports.

2.8   Performance-based Coursework with Non-permanent Output

This is coursework such as presentations or acting, dance and music assessments

where the student does not provide an output capable of being shown to the external examiner. (A presentation where output such as a PowerPoint presentation is submitted would still count as performance- based coursework with non-permanent output, unless the key learning outcome being assessed is academic content rather than presentation skill.)

2.9   Performance-based Coursework with Permanent Output
This is coursework, such as presentations and performances in acting, dance and music where the student does provide an output capable of being shown to the external examiner (for instance a video or audio recording).

3   Marking Policies
3.1   Assessment Strategy (requirement of all Schools)
3.1.1   Schools should develop an assessment strategy for each course, or set of courses, which is consistently implemented across all programme validation documents. The assessment strategy should be incorporated into every validation or periodic review and address the following issues:

- Specificity of course work
- Diversity of assessment within a course;
- Coverage of module learning outcomes by assessment methods;
- The balance between monitored and unmonitored assessment;
- Approaches to prevent and detect plagiarism in assessment;
- Professional Body Requirements, if appropriate;
- Alternative assessments.

In cases of School proposing to have modules assessed by 100% coursework;

- Appropriate use of the academic year.

3.2   Assessment Instrument Tracking Sheets
3.2.1   All programmes are required to submit a completed Assessment Instruments Tracking (AIT) sheet to UCC Academic Services at the start of the academic year. The sheet should contain a breakdown of the modules due to be taught during the year, details of all assessments including details of which learning outcomes they will assessing, due dates and named markers and internal verifiers. For programmes commencing mid-year the AIT sheets should be submitted prior to the first taught session.

3.2.2. UCC will publish the programmes AIT sheet, and any changes must be formally requested via the AIT change request process. Changes should only be made in exceptional circumstances during the academic year.

3.3   Publication of Assessment Details
3.3.1   Details of module assessments should be published in a UCC module guide which should be available for students (on Moodle) during the first taught session of a module. The module guide should follow the UCC house style and assessment details should be drawn from the submitted AIT sheets.

3.3.2   All module guides, and assignment briefs, must be internally verified prior to publication. This should be recorded on the appropriate University Centre Colchester Internal Verification form (Module Guide) (Appendix E and F). Where the Internal Verification form is used it should be uploaded and attached to the assessment, and be made visible to the External Examiner, through the My Courses section of ATS2.

3.3.3   Where assessments are being used for the first time it is recommended that these are submitted to the External Examiner for approval prior to them being IV'd and entered onto the AIT sheet.

3.3.4   UCC Academic Services should be copied into any such correspondence.

3.4   Reasonable Adjustments
3.4.1   Students with specific learning support requirements may be eligible for their work to be marked in line with University Centre Colchester's Dyslexia Marking Policy. Eligible students will be identified by the UCC Accessibility Officer and will be identifiable on the ATS2 marking page by a pink sheet icon next to their name. The Dyslexia Marking Policy can be found within Reasonable Adjustment Code of Practice or a copy can be obtained by emailing uccsupport@colchester.ac.uk

3.5   Late Submissions on Work
3.5.1   Full arrangements for the late submission of course work can be found in the UCC Assessment Policy. For University of Essex students in 2022/23, students can submit their first attempt at an assessment up to one week after their stated deadline. Work submitted within this 'late submission period' should be marked as normal, but will then be automatically capped to zero. Submissions more than one week late should not be accepted or marked.

3.5.2   Details of how a student can request for the cap to be removed can be found in the UCC Extenuating Circumstances policy.

3.6   Plagiarism Concerns
3.6.1   All coursework should be submitted through ATS2. ATS2 has an inbuilt plagiarism detection system called Unoriginal (formally known as URKUND). Details of, and access to, the plagiarism report will appear next to all assignments. Where there are concerns that plagiarism or another academic offence may have taken place markers should refer to the UCC Academic Offence Policy.

3.7   Assessment of Performance-based Coursework (including oral presentations)
3.7.1   Performance-based assessment with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner should be subject to the normal policy for essays/assignments, but only where the permanent output relates directly to the assessment criteria. For example, a presentation where output such as a PowerPoint document is submitted would still count as performance-based coursework with non-permanent output, unless an assessed learning outcome focuses on academic content rather than presentation skills.

3.7.2   Performance-based assessment with a non-permanent output worth up to and including 40% of a module may be single marked. Where this type of assessment contributes to more than 40% of a module, work must be either double-marked, team marked, video/audio recorded or attended by the external examiner based on 100% coverage of the whole cohort.

3.8   Assessment of Group Work
3.8.1   Group work with a permanent output should be subject to the normal Internal Verification process for essays/assignments.

3.8.2   Group work with a non-permanent output should be subject to the policy for the assessment of performance-based coursework.

3.8.3   Assignment criteria should make clear how marks are awarded for teamwork and individual performance. This balance should be considered carefully when such assignments are being designed.

3.8.4   The maximum amount that a joint mark (where a single group mark is derived from people working together in a group) can contribute to a single module is 25%. In exceptional circumstances only, and with specific approval from the University of Essex, the mark can be higher.

3.9   Marks for Participation
3.9.1   Marks for participation may contribute no more than 5 percent of the overall mark of a module and the marks should relate to a module learning outcome.

3.10   Marking or moderation of the work of students who are partners or close relatives
3.10.1 Staff should not mark or moderate (including second or double marking) the work of partners or close relatives. In the case of a query, the Dean of Higher Education should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.

3.10.2 Staff should ensure that they declare any relationship with partners or close relatives in line with college policy.

3.11   Moderating/second marking/ double marking where the first marker is a partner or close relative
3.11.1 Staff should not act as moderator or second marker where their partner or close relative is the first marker. In the case of a query, the Dean of Higher Education should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.

3.12   Marking Turnaround
3.12.1 It is the UCC requirement that both marking and internal verification be completed, and marks released, within 20 working days of the assessment submission date. Marking will be required to be completed within 15 working days which will allow at least 5 working days of the marking turnaround period for internal verification processes to be undertaken.

3.13   Feedback
3.13.1 Marks and feedback should be entered into the official UCC feedback sheets and contain both feedback and feedforward.

4   Internal Verification Policy
4.1   Arrangements for Internal Verification
4.1.1   The Internal Verification arrangements for undergraduate and taught postgraduate University Centre Colchester courses can be found in Appendix A.

4.1.2   For each module, programme leaders, in conjunction with module tutors, shall identify one or more colleague(s) to act as an Internal Verifier. It is acceptable, and often normal, that the marking and the internal verification is shared amongst the programme team.

4.1.3   If an individual programme believes it is not possible to comply with an aspect of University Centre Colchester's Internal Verification policy, then the programme team must apply for an exemption to this aspect and propose an acceptable alternative arrangement for approval by the Head of School and Dean of Higher Education.

4.1.4   All work marked by new members of teaching staff should be subjected to internal verification. It is for the Head of School to determine how long full internal verification of work needs to apply for a new member of staff.

4.1.5   Internal verification should take place before the work is returned to students so

that any queries regarding the standard and/or consistency of marking can be resolved at the time.

4.2 Selection of work for Internal Verification

4.2.1 When a selection of work is required for either moderation, second marking or double marking the initial marker should select a sample of work that contains all 'fails' and an indicative range of other grades.

4.2.2 An independent check on all marks calculations must be made where a marking schedule is used. Marking schedules must be sent with draft exams to the External Examiner for comments and approval.

4.3 Recording of Internal Verification

4.3.1 Internal Verifiers shall record the process of internal verification either within ATS2 or on the University Centre Colchester Internal Verification form (Assessment Decisions) (Appendix G and H). Where the Internal Verification form is used it should be uploaded and attached to the assessment, and be made visible to the External Examiner, through the My Courses section of ATS2.

4.3.2 Schools are required to keep a full record of both individual and agreed marks for all work which is second or double marked.

4.4 Roles of the Internal Verifier

4.4.1 When moderating the Internal Verifier considers whether the assignments have been marked at an appropriate standard; i.e. in line with the college-wide grade descriptors.

4.4.2 The purpose of moderation is to ensure that the grading of assignments is generally appropriate for the level. This often involves discussion between the two parties. The Internal Verifier should liaise with the first marker if he or she believes that the marks are not at the correct standard, with a view to the first marker reviewing and adjusting the marking. (Examples of the type of adjustments that might be suggested by the Internal Verifier include: an overall increase of the grades by 5%; or a graduated reduction of the marks by 5% for those awarded marks above 70% to a 1% reduction on marks between 40-50%).

4.4.3 When second marking, Internal Verifiers mark students' work and have access to the original marker's notes and grades, therefore scrutinizing the first marker's work.

4.4.4 When double marking the Internal Verifier blind double marks students' work (i.e. does not have access to the first marker's grades and/or comments).

4.4.5 A record of all discussions between markers and internal verifiers must be kept for audit purposes (see 4.3.1).

4.5 Following Internal Verification

4.5.1 If discrepancies in marks are suspected when completing internal verification the internal verifier should undertake a risk based approach. An example of this approach would be internally verifying a further 10% or 4 scripts (whichever is greater) until either the internal verifier is satisfied with the accuracy of marking or the entire cohort has been internally verified.

4.5.2 When second and double marking has taken place the first marker and the internal verifier are required to confirm agreement on the final mark. An agreed mark should not be merely based upon splitting the difference between the two original marks.

4.5.3 Where the two internal markers are unable to reach agreement, the school should

make every effort to resolve the matter internally, for example by involving a third person to arbitrate or, if necessary, to act as a third marker. Work should only be sent to an External Examiner, who will be asked to arbitrate, in exceptional circumstances. The External must be given access to written comments from internal markers on the piece(s) of work involved. The School should then make every effort to agree a mark by reference to comments from the three markers (not purely by averaging). In instances where a mark is not agreed upon after involving a third marker Schools should seek further guidance and advice from the Dean of Higher Education.

4.5.4   Internal verification must take place before the work is returned to students.

4.6   Internal Verification for Resubmitted Work
4.6.1   Teaching staff are only required to undertake Internal Verification on resubmitted work if the initial marker grades the assessment a fail. The internal verifier should follow the appropriate level of internal verification as outlined in Appendix A.

5   Student access to examination feedback
5.1   A student who requests access to their examination script, or who wishes to know the marks received for individual questions, may apply to the department which is responsible for that module. The department should either:

- permit the student to see their examination script in the presence of a relevant member of the academic staff (normally one of the staff responsible for teaching the module); or

- supply the student with a copy (or a summary) of the examiners' comments on the student's performance in the examination, including marks for individual questions.

[Note: The second of these options will normally be appropriate when markers have not written their comments on the examination script itself.]

5.2   Requests of this type should normally be received within four weeks of the publication of the examination marks.

5.3   When the assessment for a module comprises, or includes, a piece of work other than an examination which is not returned to the student until after the mark has been confirmed by the Board of Examiners (for example a project or dissertation), the department should ensure that feedback on the work is available to students who require it after their marks have been made available.

5.4   Where an undergraduate student has not passed a module(s) and is undertaking reassessment over the summer they should have access to feedback on the elements being reassessed. Where they are resitting an exam, they should be provided with written feedback on the exam, or other piece of work for which feedback has not already been provided, within two weeks of the publication of the results by the Board of Examiners. Feedback may take the form of feedback on candidates' overall performance in the exam/piece of assessed work and/or individual feedback on the candidate's exam script/assessed work. The feedback should be sent to the student by the department.

6   Requests from students to have their work re-marked
6.1   Students have the right to request that a piece of work is re-marked if they disagree with the original mark in the following circumstance:

1. **Procedural and/or administrative error is suspected**

2. **Coursework which is moderated**
   Where coursework has been single marked with a sample being moderated students may only request a re-mark under this criteria if:

   o The work had a permanent output; **and**

   o The work was not initially included in the sample for moderation; **and**

   o Where the work is of a physical nature it has not already been returned to the student.

6.2 In all cases for a re-mark to be considered the student must:

- Meet with the initial marker (or suitable nominee appointed by the Head of School) to obtain further feedback on the reason for the initial mark before making a formal request for a re-mark; **and**

- Complete and submit the form (Appendix B) with the signature of the first marker (or nominee, see above) confirming that the meeting has taken place, no later than two weeks of term time from the date of the initial feedback to students.

6.3 Forms should be submitted to UCC Academic Services either in person in room HE103 or by email to uccacademicservices@colchester.ac.uk Forms must be accompanied by a detailed rationale, outlining evidence-based factual information which supports the request.

6.4 Upon receipt the form will be passed to the Schools' gatekeeper to review the request, ensure it meets the criteria for re-marking, and authorize or decline the request. Students must be aware that marks can decrease, increase or remain the same after the re-marking.

6.5 If a request for a re-mark is approved, work will be either second or double-marked and marks must be agreed (see section 4).

6.6 Where there are exceptional circumstances that prevent the second or double-markers from agreeing the marks, the work will be marked by two new markers who will agree their marks (see section 4).

6.7 **Other Circumstances**
There may be exceptional circumstances where approval is given for a piece of work to be re-marked which falls outside those defined in 6.1. Where this is the case, the procedures set out in 6.2 apply.

6.8 **Examinations**
Students may only request a re-mark of examination scripts if procedural and/or administrative error is suspected.

6.9 **Appealing a Request for a Remark**
Where a request for a remark is unsuccessful a student may only appeal this outcome under either:

a) Perception of bias has taken place;
b) Procedural irregularities.

The appeal should be submitted to uccacademic@colchester.ac.uk within five working days of the date of the correspondent which outlined the unsuccessful request. Any appeal will be considered by the Dean of Higher Education or their nominee.

7 The Use of Internal and External Staff for Marking

7.1 Examination Marking by PGCE students

7.1.1 It is generally desirable that examinations should be marked by a member of teaching staff who has been approved by University Centre Colchester staff procedures. Where it is necessary for graduate students to undertake this role, the following policy applies:

- A PGCE student should be used to mark examinations only when the individual has taught the whole or a significant part of the module.

- Permission to use a graduate student for marking must be sought in advance from the Dean of Higher Education, on the basis of a case made by the Head of School indicating the training and monitoring arrangements proposed.

7.2 Coursework marking by PGCE students

7.2.1 It is generally desirable that coursework should be marked by teaching staff. Where it is necessary for PGCE students to undertake this role, the following policy applies:

- A PGCE student should be employed to mark coursework only when the individual has taught/demonstrated a relevant part of the module in the current or previous academic year(s) or the Dean of Higher Education has accepted a case made by the Head of School on the competency of the PGCE student.

7.3 The Role of the External Examiner

7.3.1 Unless the External Examiner has been specifically sent work to arbitrate on a dispute between internal markers, the External Examiner's role will be as a moderator. Externals should not act as second markers. In moderating student work the External Examiner is providing an independent overview of the standards in, and consistency of approaches to, assessment. As such, the External Examiner's primary concern is with the overall marking standard and consistency rather than with marks obtained by individual students. The External Examiner should not alter the marks of any individual student.

7.4 Exemptions to the University Centre Colchester's marking policy

7.4.1 If a School believes it is not possible to comply with any aspect of University Centre Colchester's marking policy, the School must apply for an exemption to this aspect and propose an acceptable alternative arrangement for approval by the Dean of Higher Education.

Appendix A: Internal Verification Policy for all Taught Students

Internal Verification of Assessment Marks Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students

Module Level and Credit Value	Assessment Weightings	Marking Protocol
All Modules *under* 30 Credits	All Assessment Weightings 100% or split assessment. (e.g. 70% Essay / 30% presentation)	Moderation[*] of a representative spread of marks based on the following formula: 10% or 4 in number, whichever is greater, *plus all fails.*
All Modules 30 credits and over	All split assessment (e.g. 70% Essay / 30% presentation)	Double Marking[**] of a representative spread of marks based on the following formula: 10% or 4 in number, whichever is greater, *plus all fails.*
	Single Assessment (e.g. 100% Written Dissertation)	Double Marking[**] of all submissions. .

Reconciling of Marks (for Single and Double Marking)
Where two sets of assessment marks are being given the marks must be agreed. An agreed mark should not be merely based upon splitting the difference between the two original marks.

Definitions:

[*]   *Moderation* is a process separate from that of marking and provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers, and is an approach which enables comparability across academic subjects. A moderator reviews a sample of the marked student work and liaises with the first marker if they believe that the marks were not at the correct level. A moderator would not change individual student marks for the work, but the first marker and moderator would agree whether marks should be reviewed across the particular piece of assessment, or module, which may lead to marks being adjusted. In the case of a major discrepancy, it might be necessary for all the work to be re-marked (by second marking or double marking).

[**]   *Double Marking* is where two markers produce independent sets of marks for an assessment, without access to each other's marks. Both marks must be reconciled. This takes place in consultation between both markers – see section 2 and 4 of this policy.

NB: There are exceptions to the marking requirements above, which are described in more detail in the Marking Policy for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Work. For example, where a member of staff is new to teaching full moderation of all marks given should be undertaken and where performance-based assessment with a non-permanent output worth up to and including 40% of a module may be single marked.

Appendix B: Form for requesting a re-mark of work

Name of Student:
Registration Number:
Title and code of module affected and a *brief* description of the piece of work, with date on which feedback was given to students, for which you are seeking re-marking.
Signature of first marker (or nominee by the Head of School) to confirm that a meeting to discuss the initial feedback has taken place. **Signed:** **Date:** **Print name:**
Brief description of the grounds for requesting a re-mark:
Declaration by student: I declare I have had a meeting with the initial marker (or nominee) to discuss the feedback on my work, and that I am still dissatisfied with the mark: and I request remarking of the work. I understand that marks can go up as well as down as a result of remarking. I further understand that the decision of the new marker is final relating to this piece of work (unless further procedural irregularity is suspected). **Signed:** **Date:**

University Centre
Colchester

UCC SCHOOL OF				Module Assignment Feedback	
COURSE:				LEVEL 4	
Student ID		First Marker		Module Moderator/ Second Marker	

Module Code		Module Title			Credits	

Assignment Details					
Assessment Weighting/s		Word count		Submission deadline	

Feedback Comments:

Feed Forward Advice:

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback form

Overall Grade		Marker's Signature		Date	

Module Learning Outcomes At the end of this module the student will be able to:	LO Achieved (Yes; No; N/A)
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback form

Grading Criteria (see highlighted areas)								Grade %
	0-19%	20-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85% +	/100
Knowledge Base	Significantly fails to address a conceptual base of knowledge. No awareness of ethical issues. No evidence of being able to discuss ethical issues in relation to personal beliefs.	Fails to provide an adequate factual and/or conceptual base of knowledge. Fails to demonstrate adequate awareness of ethical issues in current areas of study and is unable to discuss these issues in relation to personal beliefs and values in a satisfactory manner	Provides an adequate factual and/or conceptual base of knowledge, though there may be some misunderstanding of key concepts and principles. Where appropriate, demonstrates adequate awareness of ethical issues in current areas of study and is able to discuss these issues in relation to personal beliefs and values, in a manner that is broadly satisfactory.	Provides a firm factual and/or conceptual base of knowledge that is mostly accurate, with no serious omissions or inaccuracies. Demonstrates a sound grasp of relevant principles and concepts. Where appropriate, demonstrates a firm awareness of ethical issues in current areas of study and is able to discuss these issues in relation to personal beliefs and values, in a sound manner.	Provides a strong factual and/or conceptual base of knowledge. Demonstrates a strong grasp of relevant principles and concepts. Where appropriate, demonstrates a strong awareness of ethical issues in current areas of study and is able to discuss these issues in relation to personal beliefs and values, in a commendable manner.	Provides a rigorous and broad factual and/or conceptual base of knowledge. Demonstrates a rigorous and broad grasp of relevant principles and concepts. Where appropriate, demonstrates a very strong awareness of ethical issues in current areas of study and is able to discuss these issues in relation to personal beliefs and values, in a distinguished manner.	Evidences outstanding knowledge of the subject. Demonstrates excellent understanding of ethical issues within the current area of study. Outstanding ability to discuss the link between personal values and beliefs and current ethical issues.	
Analysis	Significantly fails to provide any analysis or synthesis within the submission.	Fails to provide any adequate analysis or synthesis.	Primarily descriptive and/or derivative, but provides occasional and broadly satisfactory analyses, with guidance, using given classifications or principles. Collects and categorises ideas and information occasionally and in a predictable and standard format.	Primarily standard in exposition, but provides some evidence of an ability to analyse, synthesise, evaluate and apply standard methods and techniques under guidance.	Provides clear evidence of strong and commendable analysis and synthesis.	Provides clear evidence of very strong and distinguished analysis and synthesis.	Provides evidence of outstanding analysis and synthesis	

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback form

Evaluation	Significant failings in evaluation and extremely limited or no application of knowledge.	Fails to provide any adequate evaluation and application	Provides occasional and broadly satisfactory evaluations using defined techniques and/or tutor guidance. Applies given tools and/or methods to a well-defined problem in a broadly satisfactory manner, and begins to appreciate the complexity of issues	Provides some sound evaluations using defined techniques and/or tutor guidance. Applies given tools and/or methods to a well-defined problem in a sound manner, and demonstrates a firm appreciation of the complexity of issues	Clear evidence of strong and commendable evaluation and application. Applies defined tools and/or methods to a structured problem in a strong manner, and demonstrates a commendable appreciation of the complexity of issues	Demonstrates a sustained and distinguished ability for evaluation and application. Develops authoritative arguments and judgements through application appropriate to the field of study and assessment task.	Demonstrates outstanding ability for evaluation and application. Demonstrates excellence in constructing arguments and making judgements.	
Group Working	Displays an unwillingness to work with others or does not participate to a minimum standard of a group (does not meet the requirements of the task, does not work with others)	Fails to display an adequate ability to work with others as a member of a group and meet obligations to others (for example, tutors, peers, and colleagues)	Works with others as a member of a group and meet obligations to others (for example, tutors, peers, and colleagues), in a manner that is broadly satisfactory.	Works with others as a member of a group and meet obligations to others (for example, tutors, peers, and colleagues), in a sound manner.	Works with others as a member of a group and meet obligations to others (for example, tutors, peers, and colleagues), in a strong and commendable manner.	Works with others as a member of a group and meet obligations to others (for example, tutors, peers, and colleagues), in a very strong and distinguished manner.	Demonstrates an outstanding approach to, and effectiveness in, working with others.	
Research	No evidence of engagement with a research ethos and inability to identify sources. Inability to reference in a recognisable format. Has not undertaken additional research task with extensive support.	Does not work within an appropriate ethos and/or fails to demonstrate an adequate ability to use and access learning resources. Fails to demonstrate an adequate ability to manage information (including referencing sources), collect appropriate data and undertake simple research tasks with external guidance.	Works within an appropriate ethos and can use and access learning resources in a manner that is broadly satisfactory. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and undertakes simple research tasks with external guidance, in a manner that is adequate but with some limitations	Works within an appropriate ethos and can use and access learning resources in a sound manner. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and undertakes standard research tasks with external guidance, in a sound manner.	Works within an appropriate ethos and can use and access learning resources in a commendable manner. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and undertakes structured research tasks with external guidance, in a commendable manner.	Works within an appropriate ethos and can use and access learning resources in a distinguished manner. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and undertakes structured research tasks with external guidance, in a distinguished manner.	Demonstrates an excellent approach to engaging with research ethos. Evidences outstanding ability to manage information and data. Undertakes structured research tasks with external guidance to produce an outstanding outcome.	
Self-Evaluation	No significant ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses even with support.	Fails to demonstrate an adequate ability to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses adequately, within criteria set by others.	Evaluates own strengths and weaknesses adequately, within criteria largely set by others.	Offers, with guidance, a firm evaluation of own strengths and weaknesses.	Provides consistent evidence of an assured capability in self-evaluation.	Provides evidence of a sustained and distinguished capability in self-evaluation.	Demonstrates evidence of outstanding ability for self-evaluation.	

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback form

Autonomy	No significant evidence of autonomy or willingness to take responsibility for own learning.	Fails to display adequate autonomy responsibility for own learning.	Displays responsibility for own learning with appropriate support and with limited autonomy. With respect to subject-specific skill, is able to act with limited autonomy, under direction or supervision, within defined guidelines.	Good evidence of an ability to take responsibility for own learning and operate with limited autonomy is predictable defined contexts.	Provides consistent evidence of an assured capability to work autonomously with guidance in varied structured contexts.	Provides evidence of a sustained and very strong ability to operate autonomously with guidance in varied structured contexts	Displays evidence of outstanding autonomous learning.	
Communication	Significant lapses in academic conventions that are reasonable expected in an academic of this level. Minimal attempts at presenting the work (written or verbal) in a satisfactory manner.	Fails to display satisfactory communication skills. Report practical procedures inadequately. Work is presented in a manner that is unsatisfactory.	Communicates in a broadly satisfactory manner in a format appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in an adequately clear and concise manner. Presents work adequately.	Communicates effectively in a format appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in a clear and concise manner. Presents work effectively.	Displays strong communication and presentation skills in a format appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in a commendable manner.	Communicates effectively, accurately and reliably in a format appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical procedures in a distinguished manner.	Demonstrates excellent presentations skills in a format applicable to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in an outstanding way.	
Problem Solving	Insufficient grasp of the problem and significant misunderstandings of the complexity of the issues within the disciplines.	Fails to display adequacy in the application of given tools and methods to a well-defined problem, and does not appreciate the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Applies given tools and/or methods adequately to a well-defined problem, and begins to appreciate the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates a sound competence in applying given tools and/or methods to a structured problem, and appreciates the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates a commendable competence in the application of skills to the solution of a defined problem. Display a strong appreciation of the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates a distinguished competence problem-solving. Makes use of a range of specialised skills in the development and evaluation of problem- solving strategies. Display a very strong appreciation of the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates an outstanding approach to problem solving. Displays an excellent appreciation of complex issues.	
Practical Skills	Significant gaps of knowledge in the application of practical skills.	Inadequate in the application of practical skills.	Applies practical skills adequately, under direction or supervision, within defined guidelines.	Applies practical skills firmly and soundly, under direction or supervision, within defined guidelines.	Applies practical skills commendably and in an assured manner, using effectively specified standard techniques in appropriate contexts.	Applies practical skills in a very assured and distinguished manner, using effectively specified discipline-related techniques in appropriate contexts.	Applies practical skills in highly distinguished manner.	

University Centre Colchester

UCC SCHOOL OF	Module Assignment Feedback
COURSE: BA (Hons)	**LEVEL 5**

Student ID		First Marker		Module Moderator/ Second Marker	

Module Code		Module Title		Credits	

Assignment Details					
Assessment Weighting/s		Word count		Submission deadline	

Feedback Comments:	Feed Forward Advice:

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

Overall Grade		Marker's Signature		Date	

Module Learning Outcomes At the end of this module the student will be able to:	LO Achieved (Yes; No; N/A)
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	

Grading Criteria (see all highlighted areas) %							Grade %
	0-19%	20-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85% +	/100

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

Knowledge Base	Draws on an extremely limited knowledge which is significantly below the required standard. A clear misunderstanding of key concepts and theories. No awareness of social and environmental of areas of study.	Fails to display an adequate knowledge of relevant theories, ideas, contexts and frameworks. Work contains an unacceptable level of misunderstanding of key concepts, principles and theories. Fails to demonstrate adequate awareness of the wider social and environmental implications of area(s) of study and is unable to debate these issues adequately.	Provides a broadly satisfactory, detailed knowledge of major theories of the discipline(s) and a broadly satisfactory awareness of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks. There may be some mis-understanding of key concepts, principles and theories. Where appropriate, demonstrates adequate awareness of the wider social and environmental implications of area(s) of study and is able to debate these issues in relation to more general ethical perspectives, in a manner that is broadly satisfactory.	Provides a firm and detailed knowledge of major theories of the discipline(s) and a sound awareness of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks, with no serious omissions or inaccuracies. Where appropriate, demonstrates a sound awareness of the wider social and environmental implications of area(s) of study and is able to debate these issues firmly in relation to more general ethical perspectives.	Provides a strong, detailed knowledge of major theories of the discipline(s) and an assured grasp of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks, with no serious omissions or inaccuracies. Where appropriate, demonstrates a commendable awareness of the wider social and environmental implications of area(s) of study and is able to debate these issues strongly in relation to more general ethical perspectives	Provides a rigorous, broad and detailed knowledge of major theories of the discipline(s) and a distinguished grasp of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks. Where appropriate, demonstrates a very strong awareness of the wider social and environmental implications of area(s) of study and is able to debate these issues strongly and competently in relation to more general ethical perspectives	Evidences outstanding knowledge of the subject and an excellent grasp of a variety of ideas, contexts and frameworks. Outstanding ability to discuss the societal and environmental link between personal values and beliefs and current ethical issues.	
Analysis and/or synthesis	Little or no awareness of analysis or synthesis of ideas, concepts and principles within the assessment.	Fails to provide an adequate level of analysis or synthesis.	Work may be rather descriptive, but provides a broadly satisfactory analysis of a range of information, with minimum guidance using classifications / principles and can adequately compare alternative methods and techniques for obtaining information. Can adequately reformat a range of ideas and information towards a given purpose.	Work may be rather standard and limited in theoretical grasp, but will be mostly accurate and display a sound ability to analyses and synthesise and apply standard methods and techniques with minimal guidance.	Provides clear evidence of strong and considered analysis and synthesis.	Demonstrates strong and sustained ability to analyses and syntheses in a considered manner.	Demonstrates and outstanding ability for analysis and synthesis.	

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

Evaluation and/or application	Little of no awareness of evaluation and application. Fails to identify key aspects of the problem and no made no attempts to resolve them.	Fails to provide an adequate level of evaluation and application.	Selects appropriate techniques of evaluation and provides broadly satisfactory evaluations of the relevance and significance of collected data. Identifies key elements of problems, and chooses appropriate methods for their resolution, in a manner that is considered and broadly satisfactory.	Provides some sound evaluations and applications using a variety of standard techniques. Demonstrates a firm appreciation of the complexity of issues	Clear evidence of strong and considered evaluation and application. Demonstrates a commendable appreciation of the complexity of issues	Demonstrates strong, sustained ability to evaluate in a considered manner. Develops authoritative arguments and judgements through application appropriate to the field of study and assessment task. Demonstrates a distinguished appreciation of the complexity of issues	Demonstrates outstanding ability for evaluation, identifying complex issues and the construction of effective arguments.	
Group Working	Minimal attempts at team / learning group work. Cannot respond when prompted and significant failings in ability to give and receive information	Fails to interact adequately within a team / learning group. Fails to display an adequate ability to give and receive information and ideas and, where appropriate, modify responses in an adequate manner	Interacts within a team / learning group in a manner that is broadly satisfactory. Gives and receives information and ideas and, where appropriate, modifies responses in an adequate manner	Interacts within a team / learning group in a competent manner. Gives and receives information and ideas and, where appropriate, modifies responses in a firm manner.	Interacts within a team / learning group in a commendable manner. Gives and receives information and idea and, where appropriate, modifies responses in a strong and commendable manner.	Interacts within a team / learning group in a very strong and distinguished manner. Gives and receives information and idea and, where appropriate, modifies responses in a very strong and distinguished manner.	Displays excellent team working skills, and produces outstanding responses to receiving information.	
Research	Insufficient use of discipline related resources. Clear failings in use of information, its presentation and no evidence of additional research tasks.	Fails to manage learning, uses discipline-related resources, and develop discipline-related working relationships in an adequate manner. Fails to demonstrate an adequate ability to manage information (including referencing sources), collect appropriate data and undertake simple research tasks.	Manages learning, uses discipline-related resources, and develops discipline-related working relationships in a manner that is broadly satisfactory, but with some limitations. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and develops appropriate research strategies, in a manner that is adequate but with some limitations.	Manages learning, uses discipline-related resources, and develops discipline-related working relationships in a sound manner. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and develops appropriate research strategies soundly.	Manages learning, uses discipline-related resources, and develops discipline-related working relationships in a strong and commendable manner. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and develops appropriate research strategies commendably.	Works using and accesses learning resources in a confident and distinguished manner. Manages information (including referencing sources), collects appropriate data from a range of sources and develops appropriate research strategies in a distinguished manner.	Displays outstanding ability to access and manage pertinent learning resources.	
Self-Evaluation	No evidence of self-evaluation. No evidence of consideration for original thought and opinions	Fails to evaluate own strengths and weaknesses adequately. Fails to challenge received opinion and develop own criteria and judgement adequately.	Evaluates own strengths and weaknesses adequately. Challenges received opinion and develops own criteria and judgement in a manner that is broadly satisfactory.	Evaluates own strengths and weaknesses firmly. Challenges received opinion and develops own criteria and judgement in a sound manner.	Provides consistent evidence of an assured capability in self-evaluation. Challenges received opinion and develops own criteria and judgement in a commendable manner.	Provides evidence of a sustained and distinguished capability in self-evaluation. Challenges received opinion and develops own criteria and judgement in a distinguished manner.	Provides evidence of outstanding ability for self-evaluation. Works with and questions opinions highly effectively, leading to formulating own criteria.	

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

Autonomy	Fails to meet the requirements of the task with clear omissions and where applicable no application of subject specific skills.	Fails to display adequate autonomy responsibility for own learning. Fails to display an adequate use of subject specific skills with direct supervision.	Takes adequate responsibility for own learning adequately and with minimum direction. With respect to subject-specific skill, is able to act with reduced need for supervision and direction, within defined guidelines and predicable contexts.	Good evidence of an ability to take firm responsibility for own learning, with some capability to challenge received opinion and form own judgements.	Provides consistent evidence of an ability to take firm responsibility for own learning, and a capability to challenge received opinion and form own judgements.	Provides clear evidence of a sustained and very strong capability to operate autonomously with minimal guidance.	Provides outstanding evidence of autonomous learning with minimal guidance	
Communication	Clear omissions of academic conventions at the required level. Work is significantly below the expected level of presentation.	Fails to display satisfactory communication skills. Report practical procedures inadequately. Work is presented in a manner that is unsatisfactory.	Communicates in a broadly satisfactory way, in a manner that is appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in an adequately clear and concise manner in a variety of formats. Presents work is manner that is broadly satisfactory.	Communicates competently in a manner appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in a clear and concise manner. Presents work effectively.	Displays strong communication and presentation skills in a format appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in a commendable manner.	Outputs are communicated effectively, accurately and reliably in a format appropriate to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in a distinguished manner.	Demonstrates excellent presentations skills in a format applicable to the discipline(s). Reports practical processes in an outstanding way	
Problem Solving	Clear inability to identify and investigate problems to resolution.	Fails to identify key areas of problems and choose appropriate tools / methods for their resolution.	Identifies key areas of problems and chooses appropriate tools / methods for their resolution in a manner that is broadly satisfactory.	Demonstrates a sound competence in applying given tools and/or methods to a structured problem, and appreciates the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates a commendable competence in applying relevant tools and/or methods to a defined problem. Display a strong appreciation of the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates a distinguished competence in problem-solving. Provides strong evidence of competence in applying specialised skills to plan, develop and evaluate problem-solving strategies. Display a very strong appreciation of the complexity of the issues in the discipline.	Demonstrates an outstanding approach to problem solving. Displays an excellent appreciation of complex issues.	
Application of Practical Skills	Significant failings in the ability to display the required level of skills or techniques.	Fails to operate satisfactorily in situations of varying complexity and predictability, where the application of a range of techniques is required.	Operates in a broadly satisfactory manner in situations of varying complexity and predictability requiring application of a wide range of techniques.	Applies practical skills firmly and soundly, and with increased autonomy.	Applies practical skills commendably and in an assured manner, using effectively a range of techniques in situations of varying complexity and predictability.	Applies practical skills in a very assured and distinguished manner, using a range of techniques highly effectively, in situations of varying complexity and predictability.	Applies practical skills in outstanding manner, and in situations of varying complexity and predictability.	

University Centre
Colchester

UCC SCHOOL OF		Module Assignment Feedback
COURSE:		LEVEL 6

Student ID		First Marker		Module Moderator/ Second Marker	

Module Code		Module Title		Credits	

Assignment Details				
Assessment Weighting/s		Word count		Submission deadline	

Feedback Comments:

Feed Forward Advice:

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Overall Grade		Marker's Signature		Date	

Module Learning Outcomes At the end of this module the student will be able to:	LO Achieved (Yes; No; N/A)
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5	

Grading Criteria (see all highlighted areas)							Grade %
	0-19%	20-39%	40-49%	50-59%	60-69%	70-84%	85% +	/ 100

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Knowledge Base	The student has shown significant and consistent failings in key areas. The student has shown a clear lack of understanding of subject specific paradigms, concepts and principles.	The student's knowledge and understanding of the subject is inadequate, without the required breadth or depth, with deficiencies in key areas. The student has demonstrated inadequate understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, including their limitations and ambiguities.	The student has demonstrated a depth of knowledge and understanding in key aspects of their field of study, sufficient to deal with terminology, facts and concepts. The student has demonstrated an understanding of subject specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles.	The student has demonstrated a sound breadth and depth of subject knowledge and understanding, if sometimes balanced towards the descriptive rather than the critical or analytical. The student has consistently demonstrated an understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles as well as more specialised areas.	The student has demonstrated sophisticated breadth and depth of knowledge and understanding, showing a clear, critical insight. The student has demonstrated a thorough understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and a sound understanding of more specialised areas.	The student has shown exceptional knowledge and understanding, significantly beyond the threshold expectation of a graduate at this level and beyond what has been taught. The student has demonstrated an exceptional understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and in-depth knowledge, if not mastery of a range of specialised areas.	The student has shown outstanding, and publishable, knowledge and understanding, significantly beyond the threshold expectation of a graduate at this level and beyond what has been taught. The student has demonstrated an outstanding understanding of subject-specific theories, paradigms, concepts and principles, and in-depth knowledge, if not scholarly command of a range of specialised areas.	

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Analysis, evaluative and/or synthesis	The student has failed to make adequate use of set sources. They have significant failing in the ability to select and evaluate reading and research. There is no structure to the students arguments and no attempts to critically evaluate or analyse arguments. Work is purely descriptive in nature.	The student has displayed an over-reliance on set sources. They have not demonstrated an adequate ability to select and evaluate reading and research. The student's arguments and explanations are weak and/or poorly constructed, and they are not able to critically evaluate the arguments of others or consider alternative views.	The student has demonstrated the ability to select, evaluate and comment on reading, research and primary sources. The student has shown the ability to devise and sustain an argument, with some consideration of alternative views, and can explain often complex matters and ideas.	The student has selected, evaluated and commented on reading, research and primary sources, sometimes beyond the set range. The student has argued logically, with supporting evidence, and has demonstrated the ability to consider and evaluate a range of views and information. They have clearly and consistently explained complex matters and ideas.	The student has thoroughly selected, critically evaluated and commented on reading, research and primary sources, usually beyond the set range. The student has demonstrated the ability to make coherent, substantiated arguments, as well as the ability to consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a range of views and information. They have demonstrated a thorough, perceptive and thoughtful interpretation of complex matters and ideas.	The student has demonstrated an exceptional ability to select, consider, evaluate, comment on and synthesise a broad range of research, primary sources, views and information and integrate references. The student has made consistent, logical, coherently developed, and substantiated arguments, and demonstrated the ability to systematically consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a wide range of views and information. They have demonstrated sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation of complex matters and ideas.	The student has demonstrated an outstanding ability to select, consider, evaluate, comment on and synthesise a broad and highly pertinent range of research, primary sources, views and information and integrate references. The student has made consistent, logical, coherently developed, and substantiated arguments, and demonstrated the ability to systematically consider, critically evaluate and synthesise a wide range of views and information, leading to evidence-based own ideas. They have demonstrated sophisticated perception, critical insight and interpretation of complex matters and ideas.	
Group Working	The student has consistently not contributed to group discussions and/or project work at the required standard	The student has made infrequent contributions to group discussions and/or project work.	The student has demonstrated a capability of making useful contributions to group discussions and/or project work.	The student has consistently demonstrated the capability to make coherent and constructive contributions to group discussions and/or project work.	The student has demonstrated the capability to make strong, valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with an understanding of team and leadership roles	The student has demonstrated the capability to make clear, authoritative and valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with exceptional teamwork and leadership skills	The student has demonstrated the capability to make outstanding, authoritative and valuable contributions to group discussions and/or project work, with exceptional teamwork and leadership skills	

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Research	Minimal evidence with significant failings of background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry.	The student has not produced sufficient evidence of background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study.	The student has conducted general background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques, with the ability to extract relevant points.	The student has conducted background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and can critically appraise academic sources.	The student has conducted thorough background investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study using established techniques accurately, and possesses a well-developed ability to critically appraise a wide range of sources	The student has conducted independent, extensive and appropriate investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study well beyond the usual range, together with critical evaluation, to advance work and/or direct arguments	The student has conducted independent, extensive, outstanding and appropriate investigation, analysis, research, enquiry and/or study well beyond the usual range, together with critical and scholarly evaluation, to advance work and/or direct arguments.	
Self-Evaluation	Minimal evidence of reflective practice and self-evaluation. No use of recognized model of reflection and/or self-evaluation.	Did not consistently demonstrate ability to reflect on their work.	Demonstrated some ability to reflect on their work.	Demonstrated an ability to reflect on their work.	Demonstrated an ability to reflect critically on their work.	Consistently demonstrated ability to reflect critically and independently on their work.	Consistently demonstrated an outstanding ability to reflect critically and independently on their work	
Autonomy in learning and subject specific skill use	Minimal attempts of initiative and significant failings of personal responsibility. With respect to subject-specific skills requires constant supervision and/or direction in order to complete the set task.	Did not consistently demonstrate adequate initiative and personal responsibility. With respect to subject-specific skills requires a high level of supervision and/or direction. The student has shown little or no real creativity.	Demonstrated initiative and exercised personal responsibility consistently. With respect to subject-specific skill, can act with an adequate degree of autonomy, under minimal supervision or direction, and within agreed guidelines. The student has produced some creative work.	Demonstrated initiative and personal responsibility. Good evidence of an ability to take firm responsibility for own learning, with some capability to challenge received opinion and form own judgements. The student has consistently demonstrated creativity.	Demonstrated good initiative and personal responsibility. Provides consistent and strong evidence of a commendable ability to take firm responsibility for own learning, challenge received opinion, and form own judgements. The student has shown a high level of creativity and originality throughout their work.	Demonstrated exceptional initiative and personal responsibility. Provides sustained and very strong evidence of a distinguished ability to take firm responsibility for own learning, challenge received opinion, and form own judgements. The student has demonstrated exceptional creative flair and originality.	Demonstrated outstanding initiative and personal responsibility, combined with the highest levels of originality of thought.	

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Communication: including presentation skills	There are significant failings in the presentation of the work. There is insufficient processing and interpretation of data.	The student has not presented their research findings clearly or effectively, and their gathering, processing and interpretation of data is unsatisfactory. The student is not able to sufficiently express ideas and convey clear meaning verbally, electronically and/or in writing, uses inaccurate terminology, with many errors in spelling, vocabulary and syntax. They have been unable to demonstrate consistently basic numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has presented their research findings, in several formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted data effectively. The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing, with clear expression and style. They have also demonstrated numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has consistently presented their research findings effectively and appropriately in many formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted data efficiently and effectively. The student can consistently and confidently communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions verbally, electronically and in writing. They show a clear, coherent, expressive style, with a range of vocabulary. They have consistently demonstrated strong numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has presented thorough research findings perceptively and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively. The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions with a high-degree of proficiency verbally, electronically and in writing. They have a clear, fluent and expressive style with appropriate vocabulary. They have a high standard of numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has presented research findings perceptively, convincingly and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively. The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to an accomplished level verbally, electronically and in writing. They have shown an accurate, fluent, sophisticated style. They possess exceptional numeracy and digital literacy skills.	The student has presented outstanding research findings perceptively, convincingly and appropriately in a wide range of formats, and has gathered, processed and interpreted to the highest standard a wide range of complex data efficiently and effectively. The student can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to an outstanding level verbally, electronically and in writing. They have shown an accurate, fluent, sophisticated, and potentially publishable style. They possess outstanding numeracy and digital literacy skills.	
Problem Solving	The student has shown minimal attempts at problem solving and/or decision making.	The student has shown a limited ability to solve problems and/or make decisions.	The student has demonstrated an ability to solve problems, applying a range of methods to do so, and the ability to make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has consistently solved complex problems, selecting and applying a range of appropriate methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has demonstrated thorough problem-solving skills, selecting and justifying their use of a wide-range of methods, and can make decisions in complex and unpredictable circumstances with a degree of autonomy.	The student has demonstrated a wide range of extremely well-developed problem-solving skills, as well as a strong aptitude for decision-making with a high degree of autonomy, in the most complex and unpredictable circumstances.	The student has demonstrated an outstanding range of extremely well-developed problem-solving skills, as well as a highly distinguished aptitude for decision-making with a high degree of autonomy, in the most complex and unpredictable circumstances.	

Appendix E: Example of Level 6 Feedback Form

Application of Practical Skills							
The students attempted practical tasks without a set procedural or mechanistic formula with multiple errors with no independence. Significant omissions of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most areas.	The student has attempted practical tasks/processes but followed a limited, procedural or mechanistic formula, and they contain errors, with little or no independence. The student has demonstrated a lack of technical, creative and/or artistic skills in most, or key, areas.	The student has completed practical tasks and/or processes accurately and with a degree of independence. The student has demonstrated technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has consistently completed practical tasks/processes mainly independently in an accurate, well-coordinated and proficient way. The student has consistently demonstrated well-developed technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has performed practical tasks and/or processes autonomously, with accuracy and coordination. The student has a thorough command of highly-developed relevant technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has autonomously completed practical tasks and/or processes with a high degree of accuracy, coordination and proficiency. The student has a full range of exceptional technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	The student has autonomously completed practical tasks and/or processes with an exceptional degree of accuracy, coordination and proficiency. The student has a full and sophisticated range of exceptional technical, creative and/or artistic skills.	

University Centre **Colchester**

UCC SCHOOL OF	MODULE GUIDE IV SHEET LEVEL 4

Programme:

Module Title:

Module Tutor:

Module Internal Verifier(s):

Module Start Date:

UCC Module Code		Credits		Date submitted for IV	

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Does the module guide:	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Contain the correct information concerning the module code, module level and module tutor etc?		
Contain an informative introduction/overview of the module?		
Include an accurate statement of the learning outcomes?		
Contain a summary of teaching and learning strategies?		
Contain a detailed scheme of work with a weekly plan?		
Include a list of the main text and supplementary texts?		
Contain correct information concerning the number of weeks and direct teaching time?		

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

Does the assignment information:	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Provide students with an opportunity to meet the learning outcomes of the module?		
Contain a scenario or case study that is clearly written and relevant? (Write 'n/a' if not appropriate.)		
Include clear instructions regarding assignment requirements?		
Indicate the word limit (written assignment) or duration (oral presentation or examination)?		
Clearly state the completion ('hand-in') date for the assignment/s?		
Avoid repeating an assignment instrument similar to one used within the previous three years?		
Indicate assessment criteria (and their relative weightings)?		
Match the submission information provided on the AIT sheet?		

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

Accessibility	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Is the Module Guide (and the assignment brief) accessible for all students? For example, is it available in a form that can be used by students with sight impairments?		
Is the Module Guide ready to be shared with students? *		
*If "No" is recorded then the Internal Verifier should recommend actions before the Module Guide is issued, the Internal Verifier should confirm that the action/s has been undertaken.		
General comments by the Internal Verifier:		
Actions (if needed) after Internal Verification confirmed		

Actions viewed and approved by Internal Verifier:	

Module Tutors signature		Internal Verifier(s) signature		IV completion date	

University Centre Colchester

UCC SCHOOL OF	MODULE GUIDE IV SHEET LEVEL 5
Programme:	
Module Title:	
Module Tutor:	
Module Internal Verifier(s):	
Module Start Date:	

UCC Module Code		Credits		Date submitted for IV	

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Does the module guide:	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Contain the correct information concerning the module code, module level and module tutor etc?		
Contain an informative introduction/overview of the module?		
Include an accurate statement of the learning outcomes?		
Contain a summary of teaching and learning strategies?		
Contain a detailed scheme of work with a weekly plan?		
Include a list of the main text and supplementary texts?		
Contain correct information concerning the number of weeks and direct teaching time?		

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Does the assignment information:	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Provide students with an opportunity to meet the learning outcomes of the module?		
Contain a scenario or case study that is clearly written and relevant? (Write 'n/a' if not appropriate.)		
Include clear instructions regarding assignment requirements?		
Indicate the word limit (written assignment) or duration (oral presentation or examination)?		
Clearly state the completion ('hand-in') date for the assignment/s?		
Avoid repeating an assignment instrument similar to one used within the previous three years?		
Indicate assessment criteria (and their relative weightings)?		
Match the submission information provided on the AIT sheet?		

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Accessibility	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Is the Module Guide (and the assignment brief) accessible for all students? For example, is it available in a form that can be used by students with sight impairments?		
Is the Module Guide ready to be shared with students?*		
*If "No" is recorded then the Internal Verifier should recommend actions before the Module Guide is issued, the Internal Verifier should confirm that the action/s has been undertaken.		
General comments by the Internal Verifier:		

Appendix H: Level 5 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Actions (if needed) after Internal Verification confirmed				
Actions viewed and approved by Internal Verifier:				
Module Tutors signature		**Internal Verifier(s) signature**		**IV completion date**

University Centre Colchester

UCC SCHOOL OF	MODULE GUIDE IV SHEET LEVEL 6
Programme:	
Module Title:	
Module Tutor:	
Module Internal Verifier(s):	
Module Start Date:	

UCC Module Code		Credits		Date submitted for IV	

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Does the module guide:	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Contain the correct information concerning the module code, module level and module tutor etc?		
Contain an informative introduction/overview of the module?		
Include an accurate statement of the learning outcomes?		
Contain a summary of teaching and learning strategies?		
Contain a detailed scheme of work with a weekly plan?		
Include a list of the main text and supplementary texts?		
Contain correct information concerning the number of weeks and direct teaching time?		

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Does the assignment information:	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Provide students with an opportunity to meet the learning outcomes of the module?		
Contain a scenario or case study that is clearly written and relevant? (Write 'n/a' if not appropriate.)		
Include clear instructions regarding assignment requirements?		
Indicate the word limit (written assignment) or duration (oral presentation or examination)?		
Clearly state the completion ('hand-in') date for the assignment/s?		
Avoid repeating an assignment instrument similar to one used within the previous three years?		
Indicate assessment criteria (and their relative weightings)?		
Match the submission information provided on the AIT sheet?		

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS		
Accessibility	Yes / No / NA	Comments
Is the Module Guide (and the assignment brief) accessible for all students? For example, is it available in a form that can be used by students with sight impairments?		
Is the Module Guide ready to be shared with students?*		
***If "No" is recorded then the Internal Verifier should recommend actions before the Module Guide is issued, the Internal Verifier should confirm that the action/s has been undertaken.**		
General comments by the Internal Verifier:		

Appendix I: Level 6 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Actions (if needed) after Internal Verification confirmed
Actions viewed and approved by Internal Verifier:

Module Tutors signature		Internal Verifier(s) signature		IV completion date	

University Centre Colchester

Internal verification of assessment decisions – Level 4

INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSESSMENT DECISIONS		
Programme title		
Assessor		**Internal Verifier**
Unit(s)		
Assignment title		
Student's name		**Student ID Number**

Grade awarded	**Referral**	**Pass**	**Merit**	**Distinction**

INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST		
Is the grade awarded justified by the assessor's comments on the student work?	Yes/No	
Has the work been assessed accurately?	Yes/No	
Is the feedback to the student: **Give details:** Constructive? Linked to relevant assessment criteria? Identifying opportunities for improved performance in future assignments?	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No	
Does the assessment decision need amending?	Yes/No	

		Date:	
Assessor signature		Date:	
Internal Verifier signature		Date:	
Programme Leader signature (if required)		Date:	

CONFIRM ACTION COMPLETED

Remedial action taken **Give details:**	
Assessor signature	Date:
Internal Verifier signature	Date:
Programme Leader signature (if required)	Date:

University Centre
Colchester

Internal verification of assessment decisions – Level 5

INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSESSMENT DECISIONS		
Programme title		
Assessor		**Internal Verifier**
Unit(s)		
Assignment title		
Student's name		**Student ID Number**

Grade awarded	**Referral**	**Pass**	**Merit**	**Distinction**

INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST		
Is the grade awarded justified by the assessor's comments on the student work?	Yes/No	
Has the work been assessed accurately?	Yes/No	
Is the feedback to the student: **Give details:** Constructive? Linked to relevant assessment criteria? Identifying opportunities for improved performance in future assignments?	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No	
Does the assessment decision need amending?	Yes/No	

Assessor signature		**Date:**	
Internal Verifier signature		**Date:**	
Programme Leader signature (if required)		**Date:**	

University Centre Colchester

CONFIRM ACTION COMPLETED			
Remedial action taken Give details:			
Assessor signature		Date:	
Internal Verifier signature		Date:	
Programme Leader signature (if required)		Date:	

University Centre Colchester

Internal verification of assessment decisions – Level 6

INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSESSMENT DECISIONS

Programme title			
Assessor		**Internal Verifier**	
Unit(s)			
Assignment title			
Student's name		**Student ID Number**	

Grade awarded	**Referral**	**Pass**	**Merit**	**Distinction**

INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST

Is the grade awarded justified by the assessor's comments on the student work?	Yes/No	
Has the work been assessed accurately?	Yes/No	
Is the feedback to the student: **Give details:** Constructive? Linked to relevant assessment criteria? Identifying opportunities for improved performance in future assignments?	Yes/No Yes/No Yes/No	
Does the assessment decision need amending?	Yes/No	

Assessor signature		**Date:**	
Internal Verifier signature		**Date:**	
Programme Leader signature (if required)		**Date:**	

University Centre
Colchester

CONFIRM ACTION COMPLETED			
Remedial action taken **Give details:**			
Assessor signature		Date:	
Internal Verifier signature		Date:	
Programme Leader signature (if required)		Date:	