Department of Graduate Studies
Procedures for developing and applying Component-specific Marking Criteria

1   Scope and audience

1.1   This document provides for the development and application of Component-specific Marking Criteria, including review and approval. It is for the attention of all staff involved in the assessment of a given programme, including External Examiners, the Head of Department, Programme Leader, Module Leaders, lecturers and markers (including second markers).

1.2   This document should be read in conjunction with the following supporting documents: Programme Design, Development and Approval Policy (Department of Graduate Studies; DGS); Teaching and Learning Strategy (DGS); the Handbook for Teaching and Assessment (DGS); and *The Frameworks for Higher Education Qualifications of UK Degree-Awarding Bodies* (2014; Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education).

1.3   Accessibility: If you need this document in a different format, please ask a member of staff.

2   Definitions

For the purpose of clarity, definitions are provided below for key terms used in this document:

Term	*Definition*
Assessment Brief	*Found in the Module Outline*: A description of the task students must complete as part of the assessment for the module, which is written in line with the requirements of the Assessment Specifications. Information about submission and/or examination will be included here.
Assessment Specifications	*Found in the Module Outline*: Details of how a module will be assessed, which contain information about the type of task (e.g. essay or question paper), including the weighting of the tasks relative to the overall modular mark and the target ILOs. These are validated by the Validation Panel.
Assessment title	A task set to assess performance with regard to the ILOs for the module. These may be, for example, essay titles, essay questions, presentation titles, written examinations.

Term	Definition
ILOs	*Intended Learning Outcomes*: The knowledge, skills and understanding that students

5.11 A third marker may be brought in where a first and second marker are unable to agree on a final mark. The first and second markers must make all reasonable attempts to reconcile the marks to avoid the need to appoint a third marker. Where appointed, t
the moderation discussion with reference to the marking criteria; as such, they will be given access to
. Where all reasonable attempts to resolve the moderation discussion fail, the third marker will have the discretion to award a final mark and provide feedback on the work in question. The final mark must not be