



## **Assessment Policy**

### **Scope**

This Policy establishes mandatory principles that govern the four key stages of managing and processing summative assessments at Metanoia Institute: Assessment Briefs, Calibration, Marking, and Moderation. All processes must adhere to these standards. Please also refer to Metanoia's Assessment Guidance, which details how this policy should be carried out in practice. Assessment design is addressed separately in relevant strategy documents.

## **STAGE 1: Assessment Briefs**

An assessment brief is a formal document provided to students that outlines the requirements, criteria, and expectations for a specific assessment task. It serves as a guide to help students understand what is expected of them and how they will be evaluated.

### **Principles**

Our assessments briefs are transparent and clear. This increases shared language and expectations between staff and students around assessments. It also maximises the chance of success for individual students in each assessment.

### **Policy expectations**

- All summative assessments must have a formal, written assessment brief
- Briefs must be clear, transparent, and accessible, outlining the requirements, criteria, and expectations of the task
- Assessment briefs must be reviewed annually based on staff and student feedback
- All student queries regarding assessment briefs must be answered by the Module Leader to ensure consistent messaging
- Full assessment briefs must be published in the Module Handbook; in some circumstances the Assessment brief may include other virtual materials that cannot easily be added to the Module Handbook, in this case, this must be discussed and approved in advance with the Director of Education

All Assessment briefs must be approved by the Director of Education before being presented to students.

## **STAGE 2: Calibration**

Calibration activities are those designed and implemented to maximise consistency in marker grades, creating robust internal consistency and validity of grades. Calibration activities predominantly take place before marking begins, but can also be take place during the marking process to support further alignment of grading outcomes.

### **Principles:**

We have Guidance that details expected approaches to calibration at Metanoia. All summative submission marking must include calibration activity as per this guidance. Calibration is a formative and collegiate process for all markers regardless of their prior experience and should be facilitated by the Module Leader of the assessed piece being marked. Our calibration activities are designed to impact alignment between markers for both the assessment piece being marked, and for the marking of assessed pieces in the future.

### **Policy expectations**

- Calibration is a required step in the assessment process and must occur for all summative marking
- Calibration is to be facilitated by the Module Leader and involves all markers
- Calibration must be undertaken prior to marking and, during marking to ensure consistency
- All summative assessments are subject to our second marking process in which a minimum of 10% (or 4 scripts, whichever is greater) are reviewed
- All fail and borderline fail assessments must be second marked
- Blind second marking must be used for all research based and final year assessments (second marking is not routinely blind for all other summative assessments)
- Calibration activities and outcomes must be documented transparently

### **STAGE 3: Marking and Feedback**

Marking refers to the process of evaluating a student's academic work. This includes essays, presentations, projects, professional conversations, research VIVAs or any other form of summative assessment. This will include either the assigning of a grade or a pass/fail result. The goal of marking is to assess how well a student has met the learning objectives of a course or module, at the academic level of that module.

#### **Principles:**

We have Guidance that details expected approaches to marking at Metanoia. All students submitting to a particular summative assessment must be assessed using the same criteria and standards. In most cases this will be through a rubric that has been pre-approved through our governance systems.

#### **Policy expectations**

- Marking must be fair, inclusive, transparent, reliable, valid, constructive, and uphold academic integrity
- All markers must use standardised marking criteria or rubrics
- Feedback to students must be honest, fair, compassionate, accessible and formative
- Use of technology in marking or feedback (e.g., Turnitin, Moodle, plagiarism checking, AI) must be transparent
- Student marks and feedback should be handled with appropriate privacy and professionalism

### **STAGE 4: Moderation**

Moderation is a quality assurance process that reviews and checks the consistency and fairness of the marking and the quality of the feedback. The purpose of moderation is to ensure

that marking is consistent, accurate, and aligned with academic standards and module benchmarks. The focus is to check the outcomes of the marking process.

Moderation is carried out both internally (by colleagues within the institution) and externally (by an external examiner). Moderation takes place after marking has been completed and – wherever possible – before the grades are released.

## **Principles**

To enable robust Quality Assurance, moderation (both internal and external) must follow clear processes. Insight gained during moderation should influence annual reviews at all three levels: the assessment (and associated management of it); the module; the programme.

## **Policy expectations**

- All summative assessments must undergo moderation, both internally and externally
- Internal moderation must be conducted by a colleague uninvolved in initial marking
- External moderation must be conducted by an approved External Examiner
- Moderation outcomes must be documented transparently

## **STAGE 5: Grade and Feedback release to students**

- Mark and feedback release dates (and mechanisms) must be published to students at the same time as submission dates
- In most cases, release dates are exactly 20 working days after submission dates
- In most cases, release times are 3pm
- Release dates must be approved by an Associate Director of Education at the same time as submission dates are approved