Teaching staff in the Arts Faculty are encouraged to adopt these Marking Guidelines to uphold high standards, and achieve fairness, objectivity and consistency between markers, and across units, majors and disciplines. These guidelines are aligned to, and expand on, UWA policies (http://www.governance.uwa.edu.au/procedures/policies/policies-and-procedures?policy=UP07%2F23).

Assignments

Unit coordinators are advised to set a range of assignments that are typically of a diagnostic and formative nature during semester (quizzes, short answers, journal entries, first drafts…), and of a summative nature (essays, projects, in-class tests, examinations) towards or at the end of semester (see http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/resources/assessment; and online academic journal Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice).

Unit coordinators should endeavour to minimise the potential for students to submit work that is not their own. This can be done in a variety of ways, for instance by setting assignments that are experience-based, or deriving a not-negligible percentage of the final mark from works done in controlled conditions such as in-class tests and examinations.

Online submission of assignments via the LMS (not emails) facilitates best practice at all stages of the submission and marking process:

- Online submissions are recorded automatically, with no involvement from professional staff.
- Marking, feedback, and recording of grades on the LMS Grading book should all be done electronically as much as possible.
- Assignments can be returned to students online, with no printing at any stage wherever possible.

The Faculty is aiming to phase out paper submission for most units by 2016. Unit coordinators or Discipline Chairs will have to make a case to the Associate Dean-Education if they wish to deviate from this objective.

Marking

Marking is crucial to Teaching and Learning.


Marking must be valid, reliable, and explicit to both students and markers. With this aim in mind marking criteria or rubrics can be provided for each piece of assignment, be it an oral presentation, an essay, or a collaborative exercise.

Marking criteria or rubrics should be brief and expressed in a way that is clear to students, and should be closely aligned to unit outcomes. Marks are justified by referring to the criteria or rubrics. These can be supplemented by markers’ personalised comments.

For advice and examples on rubrics see: http://www.brown.edu/about/administration/sheridan-center/teaching-learning/assessing-student-learning/grading-criteria-rubrics

Once marks are divulged to students, they must not be altered without consultation with the Discipline Chair. The Unit outlines should provide information about the Marking appeal process and misconduct such as collusion and plagiarism.

Students must be informed if software like Turnitin is used to determine similarity with digital sources, which can bring out instances of plagiarism. Students should be allowed to use the software as a learning tool by submitting drafts on Turnitin.

As part of the learning process about proper referencing, students can be directed to this Students services’ page: [http://www.student.uwa.edu.au/learning/studysmarter/getsmart/plagiarism/faq](http://www.student.uwa.edu.au/learning/studysmarter/getsmart/plagiarism/faq).

To assist students in doing online research, the Source Educational Evaluation rubric (SEER) devised by Turnitin can be used in collaboration with students to evaluate digital sources in terms of authority, educational value, intent, originality, and quality. The evaluation form can be found at the end of the white paper “What’s wrong with Wikipedia”, [http://go.turnitin.com/whats-wrong-wikipedia-evaluating-sources-students](http://go.turnitin.com/whats-wrong-wikipedia-evaluating-sources-students).


**Grade distribution**

At UWA performance is graded according to the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HD (Higher Distinction)</td>
<td>80 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Distinction)</td>
<td>70 - 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR (Credit Pass)</td>
<td>60 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Pass)</td>
<td>50 - 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N+ (Fail)</td>
<td>45 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (Fail)</td>
<td>0 - 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HD** - High Distinction: An outstanding performance indicating that the student has produced outstanding work, and has demonstrated a high level of understanding of the assignment marking criteria.

**D** - Distinction: A superior performance indicating that the student has demonstrated superior ability from a number of perspectives relating to the marking criteria.

**CR** - Credit: A good performance indicating that the student has demonstrated the ability to think analytically and contextually about the assignment requirements.

**P** - Pass: An acceptable level of performance indicating that the student has addressed the assessment requirements and has demonstrated an acceptable understanding of the issues entailed.

**N+** - N-Fail: A performance below that normally required for a pass.

Disciplines must apply common definition of grades in their marking so that no significant variance occurs between markers, and marks are standardised across units and disciplines. It is UWA policy that the whole range of grades, and in particular the higher end of HD (up to 100%), be used.

---

1 Turnitin is the software used by the university to detect text matching with Internet resources. It is typically referred to as a checker for plagiarism. It offers two other functions, rubrics design and peer assessment. Turnitin will not detect plagiarism from printed-only resources.
In addition to addressing any marking discrepancies at disciplinary level, scaling is to be introduced in semester 2, 2015 to bring the Faculty into line with practice in other Faculties at UWA. For the last few years the Arts faculty average mark for Level 1 to 3 units has been higher than the university’s average (69% vs. 67%). Scaling will only apply to Level 1 units in all three Schools - with the exception of performance-based units in the Music School. Level 1 units are all sufficiently numerous in enrolments to make scaling effective and fair. The target mean for grades of all Level 1 units will be set at 65%, and reviewed at regular intervals.

The unscaled mean for these units has been around 68% in the last few years. Marks in our level 2 and 3 units tend, for perfectly valid reasons, to be higher than in Level 1 units, and will not be scaled. All Level 1 unit outlines will clearly mention that scaling will be applied so that students are aware of the possible variations between raw marks and final grades. In this way students will be assured of parity in Level 1 unit grading across faculties.

**Responsibility for marking quality**

Unit coordinators are responsible for all teaching, guiding and controlling the quality of assessing and marking practices. Their role is particularly central in team-taught units.

As a way to ensure markers’ consistency Discipline chairs/unit coordinators should pair up new members of staff and new tutors with more experienced colleagues to benefit from informal training about marking. Such training could be in the form of marking meetings, spot checks, marking moderation procedures, or evaluation of past marked assignments.

Where discursive assignments represent a high proportion of the final mark, and again with the view to train new or junior staff in marking accurately and reliably, Chairs/unit coordinators may assign a small proportion of assignments to be moderated or double-marked so as to test, and achieve, consistency in marking.

**Examination meetings**

Each Chair or Convenor must hold an examination meeting with unit coordinators and other teaching staff before finalising grades. If due to time constraints the meeting can’t be held face-to-face, communication can be done via other means (emails, skype…).

The meeting discusses mark distributions and scaling, and resolves any issue, e.g. discrepancies between markers or units, variance from the normal distribution in their discipline, use of the higher range of HDs, fluctuations from year to year, individual cases...

**Assignment Feedback**

Assignments should be marked and returned within two to three weeks from submission date and at least one week before the next assignment is due, and before examination, if any.

As a dialogic and relational process (see Stephen Merry *et al, Reconceptualising Feedback in Higher Education: Developing dialogue with students*, Routledge, 2013, Chapter 4) feedback is expected to be sufficient, clearly expressed, and constructive enough to enable students to improve their performance. Oral feedback such as in the classroom or oral presentations, should abide by the same principles.
The nature and volume of feedback on assignments vary according to the type of assignment. Typically feedback for formative assessment tends to be more substantial than for summative assessment.

Comment banks where comments are stored (such as Turnitin rubrics, Microsoft Word using the autocorrect function or macros) are a useful tool for repetitive marking and marking in team-taught units.

**Cut off points**

Admission to some degrees (Honours, Cycle II degrees) depends on achieving a minimum score in Level 3 units, usually set at 65%. Disciplines or Course coordinators are entitled to make a case for higher cut-off marks for admission purposes.

**Extension and late submission of assignments**

For the sake of equity and transparency, information about extension and late submission of assignments must be set out in the Unit Outlines (IUMS).

To apply for assignment extensions a student should submit a Special Consideration application to their Allocated Advising Student Office. Special consideration applications must be submitted no later than three University working days after the date on which the relevant work for assessment was due.

The penalty for late submissions *without special consideration* is at the discretion of Unit coordinators - from 2% per day to 100% if they don’t accept such late submissions. The policy must be clearly stated in the Unit Outlines.

Assignments will not be accepted after the end of the exam period unless a student has been granted an extension by their Allocated Advising Student Office.

**Further information:**

University Policy on Assessment:


Marking guidance


*Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*

Designing assessments:

“Formative assessment is assessment which assists in the formation of knowledge. It is oriented around learning, allows students to develop and practice skills and is, ideally, accompanied by extensive feedback which shows the student how to improve. Summative assessment is about certifying learning, and generally takes place at the end of a period of instruction – the end of semester exam is the quintessential example here.” [http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/resources/assessment](http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/resources/assessment)

Rubrics:

From the Business School

More information and samples to design and use rubrics

A tutorial to create rubrics: [http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/center-for-faculty-development/Documents/Tutorials/Rubrics/index.htm](http://www.ucdenver.edu/faculty_staff/faculty/center-for-faculty-development/Documents/Tutorials/Rubrics/index.htm)

Misconduct and plagiarism:

A clear explanation about referencing from StudySmarter:

UWA Policy on misconduct:

Turnitin
[http://turnitin.com/](http://turnitin.com/)

Turnitin Source Educational Evaluation Rubric:

Feedback

Stephen Merry *et al*, *Reconceptualising Feedback in Higher Education: Developing dialogue with students*, Routledge, 2013, Chapter 4 in particular.

Grades at UWA:

Student’s appeal against assessment

Comment bank