



# Non-Anonymous Marking Strategies

**Prepared by:** Academic Lead: Assessment

**Date:** November 2020

**Distributed to:** ARU Students' Union

## 1. Aim

- 1.1. Provide an elaboration of the strategies to manage non-anonymous assessment, as in place at ARU and collated from Benchmark universities. This information was originally provided in papers submitted to the ARU Assessment Review.

## 2. Background

- 2.1. Across the Higher Education sector, where an assessment task cannot be marked anonymously, the broad position is that the relevant Module Team<sup>1</sup> should ensure that there is a sufficient measure of independence during marking and/or moderation, and that assessment processes are fair, and are seen to be fair.
- 2.2. At ARU, we generally require Double Marking where anonymity cannot be maintained (see the table below). However, some 'variants' to this are referred to (for example, where presentations are being assessed).
- 2.3. In other cases where a student cannot be assessed anonymously, such as practice or work based placements, the ARU Senate Code of Practice on the Assessment of Students broadly advises that "...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".
- 2.4. In essence, what we are doing here is looking at strategies that are used across the sector to demonstrate the integrity of the assessment process, and asking which of these you would be happy for us to use at ARU?

## 3. Strategies

#	Strategy	Elaboration / Example
1	Clearly explaining to students which assessment tasks will not be marked anonymously	Many assessments will be marked anonymously – e.g. an exam or an essay. Where it cannot, this should be made clear to students in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Or Department / School etc.

		assessment description / brief so that they know the assessment is not anonymous and why?
2	Clarifying what measures are being employed to ensure fairness in the assessment process	Once a Marking & Moderation strategy is agreed, this should be described to students so that they understand clearly how they are being assessed.
3	Constructing relevant Intended Learning Outcomes	The course and module learning outcomes identify what is expected to be learned. This helps to see the assessment in context, and often will help explain why an assessment cannot be undertaken anonymously.
4	Providing detailed and robust assessment briefs / descriptions	Clearly describing the assessment task is important anyway. As with learning outcomes, understanding this can help clarify why an assessment cannot be assessed anonymously.
5	Using clear and transparent marking criteria (e.g. including rubrics)	This naturally follows on from the 3 & 4. What will be learned, what task will you undertake to show that this has been learned, and then what criteria will be used to assess the performance of that task?
6	Submitting proposed assessment tasks to verification / validation processes	Having a committee or group oversee the Marking & Moderation strategy provides confidence that it has been independently considered and approved.
7	Having assessment teams engage in standardisation / calibration processes to ensure a common and shared understanding exists	It is natural for different markers to have different interests and perspectives. Standardisation / calibration is a process that helps the marking team to 'be on the same page' in terms of what the assessment is and what the criteria are. In essence, what is a good piece of work and why?
	<b><i>Employing a suitable marking / moderation strategy – e.g.</i></b>	-
8	Single Marker with simultaneous student Peer Marking	One academic marks all work allocated to them – students in the group mark each other's work using the same criteria as the academic
9	Single Marker with simultaneous student Self-Assessment	One academic marks all work allocated to them – students in the group mark their own work using the same criteria as the academic
10	Sampled Moderation	One academic marks all work allocated to them – another academic (the internal moderator) reviews and moderates a defined <b>sample</b> of student work (e.g. a minimum of eight items or 10%, whichever is greater, and including

		the range of marks awarded by the marker). The internal moderator has access to the assessment criteria / marking scheme, 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 <b>purpose</b> of Internal Moderation is to check the consistent application by the first marker of the assessment criteria and marking standards for the assessment task.
11	Cohort Moderation (100% sample)	One academic marks all work allocated to them – another academic (the internal moderator) reviews and moderates <b>all work</b> assessed by the first marker. The <b>purpose</b> of Cohort Moderation is the same as Sampled Moderation, in that it is checking the consistent application of university standards.
12	Sampled Double Marking (Seen or Unseen)	Double Marking is sometimes known as “Second Marking”. One academic marks <b>all work</b> allocated to them – another academic (the second marker) independently marks a defined <b>sample</b> of student work allocated to the first marker. As with Moderation processes, both markers have access to the assessment criteria and marking scheme for the assessment task. In <b>Seen</b> Double Marking, the second marker knows the mark awarded by the first marker, in <b>Unseen</b> Double Marking, they do not. The <b>purpose</b> of the Double Marking process is to independently assess and agree a mark for each sampled student.
13	Cohort Double Marking (Seen or Unseen - 100% sample)	In Cohort Double Marking one academic marks <b>all work</b> allocated to them – another academic (the second marker) also independently marks <b>all work</b> submitted or undertaken by the students. In <b>Seen</b> Double Marking, the second marker knows the mark awarded by the first marker, in <b>Unseen</b> Double Marking, they do not. As above, the <b>purpose</b> of the Double Marking process is to independently assess and agree a mark for each student.
14	Recording of assessment task for subsequent Moderation or Double Marking at a later stage	Where the moderator or second marker cannot be present during the assessment, the task or performance is recorded so that they can view and

		moderate or mark (as appropriate) at a later time.
15	Panel / Team Marking	This may involve 3 or more assessors involved in the marking of the assessment task. It is common for this approach to be used in creative disciplines when assessing the performance of an assessment task. It might include university staff and external specialists as part of the marking panel (e.g. a subject or discipline expert from practice). The process can be useful to obtain consensus from different markers. The Panel/Team could undertake Sampled or Cohort Marking (see 12 & 13).
16	Panel / Team Moderation	Again, this may involve 3 or more individuals moderating work that has been assessed by the markers. It might include university staff and external specialists as part of the marking panel (e.g. a subject or discipline expert from practice). The process can be useful to obtain consensus from different moderators. The Panel/Team could undertake Sampled or Cohort Moderation (see 10 & 11).
17	Involvement of External Examiner in the Marking & Moderation cycle (e.g. attending on the day)	The External Examiner reviews and Moderates the assessed student work for a module, during the process of assessment. Commonly this would be limited to a defined <b>sample</b> of assessed work, but this could also include <b>all work</b> , if that was the agreed Marking & Moderation strategy.
18	Involvement of External Specialist in the Marking process (e.g. practice based representative / employer).	As noted in 15 & 16, it can be very effective to include people outside of the university, who are specialists in the subject or discipline. This could be practising health care professionals for a health-related course, lawyers or Judges for a legal course, or practising musicians, producers or artistic directors for performing arts courses. Their involvement underpins the authenticity of the assessment, enhances the credibility of the process, and keeps it in touch with work-based expectations.