

# DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

## Policy Statement on Assessment – BSc programme

This statement applies to the BSc degree awarded by the Department of Psychology. It states how the processes of assessment and feedback are operated by the Department within the University Ordinances, Regulations and guidelines, and is intended for use by students, academic and administrative staff, post-graduates who teach (GTAs), external examiners and the University Teaching Committee. The policy is available to staff for reference on the Staff Wiki: <https://wiki.york.ac.uk/display/PsyStaffDocs/Teaching+and+Supervision> and to students on the Student Wiki: <https://wiki.york.ac.uk/display/PsyStudentDocs/Welcome> and via the VLE. This document should be read in conjunction with advice found within the Departmental Student Handbook, and for further detail the University rules on assessment. Assessment & Feedback in the Department of Psychology is overseen by the Chair of the Board of Studies, in concert with the Chair of the Board of Examiners and the Director of Teaching and Learning.

### Contents:

1. Overview of different types of assessment
2. Marking procedures
3. Mark scales
4. MCQ mark scaling
5. Grade descriptors
6. Provision of feedback
7. The process by which marks for modules or assessments outside the Department of Psychology are weighted and aggregated
8. Processes used for determining Degree classifications
9. Board of Examiners
10. Examination procedures
11. Progression requirements
12. Guidance in the event of failure
13. Mitigating circumstances
14. The University's appeal procedure
15. Academic misconduct

### 1. Overview of different types of assessment

Assessment is based upon the principle that students should be encouraged to demonstrate the range, detail and depth of the material they have learnt. As such the Department of Psychology employs a broad range of assessment types in order to facilitate these goals: Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs), practical reports, coursework essays, data analysis assignments essays within exams, group mini-project presentations, a literature survey, and a research project report.

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.  
New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

This diverse range of assessment is used in order to offer all students the opportunity to demonstrate their strengths whilst none are disadvantaged by reliance on a single method. In addition, these diverse methods have been designed to enable assessment of breadth of understanding and scientific knowledge (e.g. via MCQs) though to highly focused assessments of in-depth knowledge and understanding (e.g. via the Literature Survey). As the 3-year degree programme unfolds, the type of assessment progresses from broader methods though to more focused methods as the scientific content of the course becomes deeper and more specialized. These formats also prepare students for the future when they may have to access fundamental scientific knowledge, prepare reports, work in teams or give a presentation. Being flexible and acquiring transferable skills is part of the process of assessment as well as the process of learning.

Types of assessment used:

**Multiple Choice Question (MCQ) exams:** Assess knowledge and understanding of a wide variety of the material covered in lectures, tutorials and reading.

**RM VLE data analysis assignments:** Assess understanding of data and data analysis techniques.

**Coursework essays:** Assess understanding and evaluation of topics in more depth. Develop writing and critical evaluation skills

**Coursework practical reports:** Assess understanding of experimental design and the analysis and interpretation of data

**Mini-project poster presentation (group work):** Assess presentation skills, independence, creativity, ethics, data collection and analysis skills. Develop team work skills.

**Exam essays:** Assess understanding and evaluation of a topic in depth. Develops writing and critical evaluation skills under time pressure.

**Literature survey:** Assess understanding and evaluation of a specialized topic in depth. Develop writing and critical evaluation skills.

**Research project report:** Assess understanding of the research process including experimental design, analysis and interpretation of data, as well as the understanding, evaluation and communication of in depth specialized knowledge.

Assessment is either “formative” or “summative”

Formative assessments have a developmental purpose. They are designed to help students learn more effectively by giving them feedback on their performance and on how it can be improved. The mark does not contribute to the final degree.

Summative assessments are used to indicate the extent of a learner’s success in meeting the assessment criteria. In the first year summative assessments count towards progression and these marks are used in the allocation of students to their 3<sup>rd</sup> year advanced module choices. In the second and third years, summative assessments count towards the final degree classification.

## 2. Marking procedures

Marking procedures are dependent upon the progression stage, and the type of assessment. The following marking procedures are used:

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.  
New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

**Core Modules (years 1/2): MCQ closed exams, RM VLE tests**

- Marking is anonymous
- MCQ exams are marked by computer. The University's scaling algorithm is used to adjust the raw marks (see below).
- RM VLE tests are marked by computer

**Core Modules (years 1/2): Practicals/Essays**

- Marking is anonymous
- Practicals and essays are marked using a system of moderated marking
- Marking is performed by a team of GTAs and one or more faculty members (typically the Module Organiser) working in the same room and consulting each other in cases where questions about how to interpret and apply the marking guidelines arise. In this way consistent procedures are applied to a piece of work, with members of faculty overseeing all marking procedures, and taking responsibility for marking standards and all moderation of provisional marks
- Details of the process of moderated marking ("table marking") are as follows. Faculty meet with GTAs to discuss marking criteria, then they each mark a sample of scripts and agree marks for these and iron out any discrepancies in how criteria are applied. GTAs then mark all scripts together (table marking) over 3 or 4 sessions, with faculty on call to provide support. Faculty then moderate the marked scripts by checking a representative 10% sample of all scripts spanning a range of marks within the 1st, 2.1, 2.2 and 3rd class boundaries. In addition, all scripts awarded a fail are marked by faculty. Significant errors in marking identified by faculty at this stage will result in the complete set of work being remarked

**Core Modules (years 1/2): Mini-projects**

- The group poster presentation is marked by a faculty member

**Advanced Modules (year 3): closed exams**

- Marking is anonymous
- Exam essays double marked by the module organizer and another member of faculty

**Literature Surveys (year 3): coursework**

- Marking is anonymous
- Literature Survey blind double marked by the supervisor and another member of faculty.

**Project (year 3)**

- Marking is anonymous
- Project reports are blind double marked by the supervisor and another member of faculty.

*Double marking procedures*

Third year summative essay exams are double marked internally. The module leader will normally first mark the work and complete the mark-sheet. This will be passed on to the second marker who will also read and mark the work and comment on the mark-sheet.

*Blind double marking procedures*

Literature surveys and project reports are marked by two members of staff, one of whom is normally the supervisor. Markers do not have sight of each other's comments until the process of agreeing the mark.

*Differences between first and second markers (double, and blind double marking)*

The final internal mark is usually agreed by consultation between the two markers, but when no agreement can be reached, the piece of work and the comments of the two internal markers are considered by a third marker (usually the Chair of the Board of Examiners or Chair of Board of Studies).

*Combining marks within individual modules*

Where marks are combined within a module the percentage for each piece of work is given on the relevant module assessment page.

*External Examiners*

The Department appoints two external examiners. Their role is to ensure that assessment policies and procedures are fair and fairly operated, and the principles of clarity, equity, consistency and openness are observed, that assessment methods are appropriate, that the structure and content of programmes of study are appropriate, and to ensure comparability of standards with other similar institutions. External examiners receive and approve drafts of all summative assessments, scrutinise all submitted summative work and take part in the Board of Examiners. Their comments are considered as part of the University's Annual Programme Review process and are considered by University Teaching Committee.

*Recording marks*

Formative and summative marks are recorded on e-vision and are available for students and Academic staff and supervisors to access. Students may not appeal against a mark.

### **3. Mark scales**

All marks awarded within the Department of Psychology are on the University mark scale 0-100. Marks formally communicated to students entered into final spreadsheets and used for academic transcripts are on the University 0-100 scale.

### **4. MCQ mark scaling**

The marks from each MCQ exam are scaled according to the University's procedures described in Appendix K of the Guide to Assessment, Standards, Marking and Feedback <https://www.york.ac.uk/media/abouttheuniversity/supportservices/academicregistry/registryservices/guide/Guide%202012-13.pdf>

The purpose of scaling is to ensure that all MCQ exams are appropriately calibrated to the University Marking Scale, and thereby to guarantee equivalence of weighting across different Modules.

## 5. Grade descriptors

The following grade descriptors are used for all non-computer marking. The marking criteria are modelled on the benchmark statement for Psychology published by the QAA.

Guidelines for marking essays/literature surveys

<b>Class</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Marking guidelines</b>
<b>First</b>		1) <i>Narrative is both logical and coherent</i> 2) <i>Deep understanding of appropriate sources</i> 3) <i>Material well-selected and highly relevant, going beyond basic or 'core' materials</i> 4) <i>Strong evidence of original critical reflection and an analytical approach</i>
Excellent First	100	Assignment reaches an exceptional level of achievement that significantly exceeds the standards described by the above statements
Good First	90	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements
Solid First	80	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low First	75	Assignment mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Upper Second</b>		1) <i>Narrative is mostly logical and coherent</i> 2) <i>Good understanding of appropriate sources</i> 3) <i>Material well-selected and relevant for the most part</i> 4) <i>Some evidence of original critical reflection and an analytical approach</i>
Good 2.1	68	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for a first class mark
Solid 2.1	65	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low 2.1	62	Assignment mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Lower Second</b>		1) <i>Broadly logical and coherent narrative, but showing signs of structure breaking down</i> 2) <i>Clear understanding of appropriate sources, but somewhat superficial in scope</i> 3) <i>Material broadly relevant, but with evidence of irrelevant text</i> 4) <i>Superficial evidence of original critical reflection and an analytical approach</i>
Good 2.2	58	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for an upper second class mark
Solid 2.2	55	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low 2.2	52	Assignment mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Third</b>		1) <i>Narrative suffers from illogical or incoherent passages</i> 2) <i>Limited understanding of appropriate sources</i> 3) <i>Material relevant in parts, but irrelevant text also present throughout</i> 4) <i>Evidence of original critical reflection is lacking</i>
Good Third	48	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for a second class mark
Solid Third	45	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low Third	42	Assignment falls below the standards described by the above statements
<b>Fail</b>		1) <i>A minimally logical narrative, with incoherent structure throughout</i> 2) <i>No evidence that appropriate sources were understood</i> 3) <i>Material is almost entirely irrelevant to the topic</i>
High Marginal Fail	38	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for a pass mark
Low Marginal Fail	32	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Outright Fail	10	Assignment falls below the standards described by the above statements
<b>Zero Marks</b>	0	1) <i>No psychology-related content.</i>

## Guidelines for marking practical/project work

<b>Class</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Marking guidelines</b>
<b>First</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Narrative and hypotheses are both logical and coherent</li> <li>2) Description of methods and design are comprehensive and would allow for replication</li> <li>3) Analyses use suitable techniques and results are reported in appropriate detail</li> <li>4) Systematic use of appropriate evidence to support claims</li> <li>5) Strong evidence of original critical reflection and an analytical approach</li> </ul>
Excellent First	100	Assignment reaches an exceptional level of achievement that significantly exceeds the standards described by the above statements
Good First	90	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements
Solid First	80	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low First	75	Assignment mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Upper Second</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Narrative and hypotheses are mostly logical and coherent</li> <li>2) Description of methods and design are mostly comprehensive and would, with minor exceptions, allow for replication</li> <li>3) Analyses use suitable techniques, but with some minor errors in their application and/or reporting of results</li> <li>4) Clear use of appropriate evidence to support claims</li> <li>5) Some evidence of original critical reflection and an analytical approach</li> </ul>
Good 2.1	68	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for a first class mark
Solid 2.1	65	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low 2.1	62	Assignment mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Lower Second</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Broadly logical and coherent narrative and hypotheses, but showing signs of structure breaking down</li> <li>2) Description of methods and design contain key details but miss some important aspects; only partial replication would be possible</li> <li>3) Analyses use suitable techniques but with some significant errors in their application and/or reporting of results</li> <li>4) Appropriate evidence used to support claims, but patchy in places</li> <li>5) Limited evidence of original critical reflection and an analytical approach</li> </ul>
Good 2.2	58	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for an upper second class mark
Solid 2.2	55	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low 2.2	52	Assignment mostly meets the standards described by the above statements
<b>Third</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Narrative and hypotheses suffer from illogical or incoherent passages</li> <li>2) Description of methods and design miss a number of important aspects; would not allow for replication</li> <li>3) Analyses use suitable techniques but with some substantial errors in their application and/or reporting of results</li> <li>4) Some appropriate evidence used to support claims, but missing in several places</li> <li>5) Weak evidence of original critical reflection or an analytical approach</li> </ul>
Good Third	48	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for a second class mark
Solid Third	45	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Low Third	42	Assignment falls below the standards described by the above statements
<b>Fail</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Minimally logical hypotheses, and an incoherent narrative</li> <li>2) Methods and design are poorly described</li> <li>3) Analyses are omitted or largely inappropriate</li> <li>4) Material is almost entirely irrelevant to the topic</li> </ul>
High Marginal Fail	38	Assignment exceeds the standards described by the above statements but does not meet the standards for a pass mark
Low Marginal Fail	32	Assignment is well described by the above statements
Outright Fail	10	Assignment falls below the standards described by the above statements
<b>Zero Marks</b>	0	1) No psychology-related content.

## 6. Provision of feedback

A full explanation of feedback policy is provided within the Department of Psychology Statement of Feedback available on the staff and student wikis and the VLE. Specific information relating to feedback on different modules is available via the VLE. Feedback is provided for all written assessed work, both formative and summative.

- Written feedback is always provided.
- For summative work, verbal feedback can be provided if requested.
- The University regulations state that feedback should be provided within 6 weeks of the assessment submission date, the Department of Psychology aims to provide feedback within 3 weeks.

## 7. The process by which marks for modules or assessments outside the Department of Psychology are weighted and aggregated

*Elective modules:* Psychology students are unable to take elective modules in other Departments.

*Study at a previous institution:* We don't accept students into the 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> year of the course. Students transferring in from other Universities/courses have to begin in year 1, regardless of what they have studied previously.

## 8. Processes used for determining Degree classifications

The University mark scale applied at undergraduate level (level 3/HE level 1 to level 6 (H)) is as follows:

First-class Honours 70-100

Upper second-class Honours 60-69

Lower second-class Honours 50-59

Third-class Honours 40-49

Fail 0-39

### Calculating the final mark

A preliminary calculation of each candidate's degree class is made on the basis of agreed internal marks and on the marks received verbally or in writing from the external examiner. At the meeting of the Board of Examiners all marks are reviewed and finalised. The first year is weighted 0%, the second year is weighted 40% and third year 60% of the degree:

### *Summative marks*

Every module is summatively assessed in order to obtain an indication of a student's success in meeting the assessment criteria used to gauge the intended learning outcomes of a module or programme. Credit will be awarded upon passing a module's assessment(s).

Each module carries one numerical mark rounded to the nearest integer on the University mark scale.

To progress from one stage to the next a student must achieve 120 credits as specified at the appropriate level(s) for the stage.

#### *Credit weighting*

Every stage of a programme generates, alongside the profile of module marks, a credit weighted total mark that is carried forward to degree classification, as appropriate, a process that occurs only if a student has met the progression requirements for each stage.

#### *Stage weighting*

The mechanism for calculating degree classifications is as follows:

- Stage (year) 1 marks are excluded from the classification calculation.
- For the bachelors programme, the mark, rounded to the nearest integer, is computed with the credit-weighted total marks for stages (years) 2 and 3 weighted in the ratio of 2:3 (i.e. 40% : 60%).

#### *Degree calculation*

- For the Psychology BSc programme, classification will be determined by the position of this mark on the University scale (see above) unless it lies in the borderline region, defined as the two points below a classification boundary.
- In borderline cases, the next higher classification will be awarded if, and only if, the mark, rounded to the nearest integer, with the credit-weighted total marks for stages 2 and 3 weighted in the ratio 1:1 OR 1:2 lies in a higher classification band. No further second order conditions will be applied.
- Final penalties arising from academic misconduct are subtracted at the point of degree classification; it is recognised that a student may meet the progression requirements for all stages but nonetheless fail the award for this reason.

#### *Starred firsts - First class degree with distinction*

A first class degree with distinction (starred first) may be awarded where the overall mark is 75% and above.

## **9. The Board of Examiners**

### *Remit*

The Undergraduate Board of Examiners is a sub-committee of the Board of Studies and meets once per year, at the end of the Summer Term. Every examination for a Degree, Diploma or Certificate of the University of York shall be conducted by Boards of Examiners, one for each subject, or in the case of combined degrees, for each group of subjects. Each Board of Examiners shall appoint a Chair. The members of the Board shall be jointly responsible for the setting and marking of papers.

### *Composition*

All teaching members of the Board of Studies are also members of the Board of Examiners, and are joined by the external examiners and any internal examiners who are not members of staff but who are nominated by the Department and approved by the Standing Committee on Assessment. The quorum for a Board of Examiners is a minimum of three for

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.

New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

undergraduate and taught postgraduate qualifications, at least one of whom must be an external and one an internal examiner. For joint programmes, the quorum must also include at least one representative of each department involved in offering the joint programme.

#### *Nomination of External Examiners*

Potential external examiners are nominated on the basis of their high academic standing and their understanding and experience of teaching and assessment in archaeological degree programmes. Nominations are submitted to the Exams Office on the standard form. Where a nominee is not a Professor, Reader or equivalent, evidence is provided as to their specific expertise and experience. Two external examiners are appointed and will share responsibility BSc programme. Appointments are normally made for a period of three years. Appointments may be extended for a further year subject to the approval of the SCA.

#### *Role, responsibilities, powers and extent of authority of external examiners*

The role of the external examiners is to:

- assess the fairness of the Department's examination policies and practices
- ensure the principles of clarity, equity, consistency and transparency
- ensure that the structure and content of the programmes of study are appropriate
- ensure that the assessment methods are appropriate
- ensure compatibility of procedures and standards with other institutions

The external examiners are asked to:

- comment and provide advice on programme content, balance and structure
- review, evaluate and moderate assessments and practices
- review and evaluate outcomes of assessment, to assist the calibration of academic standards
- ensure fairness and consistency as a member of the Board of Examiners
- submit a written report including comments on the assessment procedure and outcomes

#### *Anonymity*

With the exception of assessed mini-project presentations the anonymity of the candidates is preserved throughout the marking process. Anonymity is only removed at the Board of Examiners meeting **after** the degree classifications have been established at the Board of Examiners meeting.

#### *The use of evidence relating to medical or other mitigating circumstances*

The Department adheres to the University's policy and guidance when dealing with claims of mitigating circumstances. These are defined as problems which go beyond the normal difficulties experienced in life and which affect a student's academic performance adversely during the assessment period. All claims of mitigating circumstances, supported by appropriate evidence, are considered by the Department's Mitigating Circumstances Committee. Its recommendations are considered by the Board of Examiners.

#### *Notification of results*

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.  
New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

Final year results and degree classifications, once confirmed by the Board of Examiners, are available on e-vision.

In the case of final year results, a list of names of candidates who have passed, arranged in alphabetical order, shall be prepared by the Board of Examiners concerned and signed by the Chair and an External Examiner. The list shall then be forwarded to the Registrar and Secretary for publication and for submission to the Senate for ratification.

## 10. Examination procedures

*Guidance for students who seek special arrangements (eg. dyslexia, medical, disability or other reasons)*

The Department of Psychology is committed to facilitating a positive learning experience through the provision of pastoral care for all students, and endorses the [University Disability Statement](#).

This includes special consideration for individuals with can provide a positive assessment of dyslexia. Although the Department has no statutory requirements with regard to dyslexic students it would normally accommodate the needs of the student as recommended by the assessor in so far as this is practical and does not compromise academic standards or equity. The Department liaises with the Examinations Office to ensure that any recommended individual examination arrangements are also in place.

Students with other forms of disability may also submit evidence of individual needs and recommendations for action. Students should discuss these with the Department's Disability Officer so that reasonable adjustments can be made during teaching and that Examinations Office are aware of any individual arrangements which are required.

*Deadlines for submissions*

Deadlines are published on the Department's VLE

*Procedures for submitting assessments*

Work is handed in to the undergraduate or departmental administrator by noon on the given day unless stated otherwise. Students are asked to confirm submission by signing a register.

*Penalties for late submission & Assessed Seminar absenteeism*

The penalty for late submission, without valid mitigating circumstances, will be the deduction of 10% of the marks for the work for each day (or part of each day) that the work is late, up to a total of five days, including weekends and bank holidays. For example, if work is awarded a mark of 57 out of 100, and the work is up to one day late, the final mark is 47. After five days, the work is marked at zero.

*Extensions to deadlines*

The Mitigating Circumstances Committee can extend the deadline for the submission of an assessment. Full details of the procedure for mitigating circumstances can be found at: <https://www.york.ac.uk/staff/supporting-students/issues/academic/taught/mitigation/>

*Penalties concerning undergraduate coursework word lengths*

All assessment materials that are subject to a word-limit should include a statement as to the number of words included in the final submission. Falsely claiming the word-count of an assessment to be under the limit when it is in fact above the limit is a form of Academic Misconduct (deception) and will lead to severe penalties. The details of what parts of the text that the word count covers will be explained for separately for each particular assignment. A 10% margin is allowed before any penalty is incurred. If the word limit is exceeded by 10% or more then the work will be marked as normal, but the mark will be reduced by 10% of the available marks (i.e. in an assessment marked out of 100 the penalty would be 10 marks).

*Arrangements for assessments administered in the Department*

Details of all assessments are found on the 'Assessment and Feedback' pages of the VLE (Except for RM – details of RM assessments, including practical reports, can be found on the RM pages of the VLE)

*Steps taken to maintain confidentiality*

All summative work is submitted with, and identified by, the candidate's exam number, rather than their name. When summative work is submitted with a name attached the Departmental Secretary deletes the name and replaces it with the candidate's exam number. Anonymity cannot be maintained for the presentation-based assessments such as the mini-projects, and the subject of project reports may identify candidates to their supervisors but the reports are double blind marked. Markers do not have access to student marks by name until the final degree classifications are agreed by the Board of Examiners.

*Policy on the use of dictionaries and electronic devices*

Students are not normally permitted to use dictionaries in closed examinations. Students may only use calculators provided by the University in examinations: personal calculators are not permitted.

## **11. Progression requirements**

*Progression*

To progress from one year to the next a student must achieve 120 credits as detailed in the programme specifications. Credit values are as follows:

Year 1: Research Methods (20), Social, Personal and Abnormal Psychology (30), Development and Language (30), Brain and Behaviour (20), Perception and Cognition (20)  
 Year 2: Research Methods (20), Social, Personal and Abnormal Psychology (20), Development and Language (20), Brain and Behaviour (30), Perception and Cognition (30)  
 Year 3: Advanced Modules (20) x 4, Literature Survey (5), Research Project (15)

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.  
 New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

At each stage (year), if a student fails one or more modules (i.e. achieves a module mark below 40 in the stage s/he may still receive the credit for the failed module(s) and progress, provided that:

- s/he has failed no more than 40 credits
- no module marks are lower than 30, and
- the rounded, credit-weighted mean over all modules taken at the stage, including the failed module(s), is at least 40.

#### *Reassessment*

In stages 1 and 2, where a student fails modules and the progression requirement for the stage cannot be met by application of compensation rules, the student is entitled to reassessment in a maximum of 90 credits-worth of failed modules per stage, provided that they have no more than 50-credits-worth of outright fail marks in the stage (i.e. module marks less than 30).

In stage 3, where a student fails modules and the award requirements for the stage cannot be met by application of the compensation rules, the student is entitled to reassessment in a maximum of 40 credits-worth of failed modules.

All students may only be reassessed in a particular module on one occasion. The purpose of reassessment is to obtain enough credits for progression; it is not used to improve marks. The only circumstances in which a student may resit with a review to improving a mark is if they have had Mitigating Circumstances accepted for an exam (see below). The student may choose to resit the exam, however the mark could go down rather than up.

#### *Treatment of marks after reassessment*

The following conditions apply to the treatment of marks after reassessment:

- progression decisions following reassessment will be made using the better of the original and reassessment marks for each failed module;
- following progression, however, where the original credit-weighted mean did not meet the progression requirement, the credit-weighted total mark for the stage should be capped to the lowest value consistent with the mean mark criterion for that stage;
- following progression, where the original credit-weighted mean has already met the progression requirement, the original credit-weighted total mark for the stage should be allowed to stand.

Where a student is not permitted a reassessment opportunity, i.e. cannot meet the specified progression requirements through reassessments as defined above, and there are no mitigating circumstances s/he will be discontinued or in some cases s/he may be eligible for a lower volume award.

## **12. Guidance in the event of failure**

### *Failure to complete a module*

The student will be reassessed (see rules on progression above)

### *Failure to meet attendance requirements or submit formative work*

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.  
New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

Attendance will be monitored over the three years and students will be contacted if they are often found to be missing from classes. If a student fails to submit formative work, or fails to attend a presentation s/he is meant to be giving then they will receive a warning unless there are mitigating circumstances and the correct procedure has been carried out.

*Failure to complete or attend summative assessment or examination*

Where mitigating circumstances exist, the Mitigating Circumstances Committee (MCC) will consider granting for the assessment to be taken as if for the first time. Without mitigating circumstances the student will fail the assessment.

*Failure to attend a closed examination*

Where mitigating circumstances exist, the MCC should consider granting for the assessment to be taken as if for the first time. If no mitigating circumstances are present then the student will be considered to have failed the module outright.

*Failure to pass re-sits*

A student must satisfy the requirements for each stage of his/her programme before progressing to the next stage (see above). If a student does not meet the stage requirements s/he will be required to leave the University; s/he may be eligible for a lower award.

*Failure to meet the requirements of the award*

A student must satisfy the requirements for each stage of his/her programme before progressing to the next stage. If a student does not meet the stage requirements s/he will be required to leave the University; s/he may be eligible for a lower award.

### 13. Mitigating circumstances

The full University policy on mitigating circumstances is available at:

<http://www.york.ac.uk/students/support/academic/>

*Circumstances prior to an assessment deadline*

If requesting an extension, students must submit the mitigating claim form to the Undergraduate Administrator **at least 3 days before** the submission deadline. Failure to submit a form will result in a late penalty being applied (10% of the marks a day for a maximum of 5 days).

*Mitigating circumstances affecting an assessment period (e.g. closed examinations, essays, assessed seminars)*

Where mitigating circumstances exist, the MCC will consider granting the assessment to be taken as if for the first time. Students must submit the mitigating claim form to the Administrator (Kelly Freebury).

*Not submitting a form on time*

In the event that mitigating circumstances prevent a student from submitting their claim at the appropriate time, s/he should submit their claim as soon as s/he is able to do so. The

evidence should show clearly why s/he was unable to submit the claim before the date of the assessment or the week following the assessment.

#### *Aegrotat degree*

There is the option to recommend to Special Cases Committee for the award of an undergraduate aegrotat degree where all of the following apply:

- The student is in his/her final year
- 300 credits have been completed successfully
- There is clear evidence that the student was achieving at honours level
- The mitigating circumstances are such that there is no or very little prospect that the student will be able to resume study in the foreseeable future

## **14. The University's appeal procedure**

The regulation relating to the appeal procedure can be found in the University Ordinances and Regulations (section 6.5):

<http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/ordreg/r6.htm>

## **15. Academic misconduct**

### *Regulation 5.4*

The regulation relating to the appeal procedure can be found in the University Ordinances and Regulations:

<http://www.york.ac.uk/admin/aso/ordreg/r5.htm>

All students must take part in the University's on-line Academic Integrity Tutorial on the VLE in their first year.

### *How students can become aware of the different types of academic misconduct, and advice given on how to avoid plagiarism*

Advice on how to avoid plagiarism and other aspects of academic misconduct is given during study skills sessions in the first term within the Research Methods module. All students complete the University online Academic Integrity tutorial, which assesses understanding of these issues. Information is also accessible in the Psychology student handbook.

### *Attendance during practicals*

Practical attendance is mandatory.

### *Group work and individual assessment*

Students need to be clear on the boundaries between group work and individual assessment. Guidance is given within module information but any queries should be directed at the Module Organiser.

### *Penalties for academic misconduct*

Updated 19.09.2013 by Nick Barraclough, Chair of the Board of Studies.  
New marking guidelines added 01.09.2016

Cases of misconduct are investigated by a subcommittee of the Board of Examiners which reports its findings to the Board of Studies which then makes a recommendation to the University's Special Cases Committee, to which the student may appeal. The penalties for academic misconduct depend on the seriousness of the offence. Students found guilty of academic misconduct may, for example, have their degree class reduced, or in extreme cases be asked to leave the University.

**BSc Course Structure**

	Autumn	Spring	Summer
<b>Year 1</b>	Research Methods in Psychology 1	20 credits 0%	
	Brain and Behaviour 1	20 credits 0%	
	Perception & Cognition 1	20 credits 0%	
	Development & Language 1	30 credits 0%	Mini-project
	Social, Personality & Abnormal Psych. 1	30 credits 0%	Mini-project
<b>Year 2</b>	Research Methods in Psychology 2	20 credits 6.67%	
	Development & Language 2	20 credits 6.67%	
	Social, Personality & Abnormal Psych. 2	20 credits 6.67%	
	Brain and Behaviour 2	30 credits 10%	Mini-project
	Perception & Cognition 2	30 credits 10%	Mini-project
<b>Year 3</b>	Literature Survey 10 credits 5%		
	Project 30 credits		15%
	Ad mod 1 20 credits 10%	Ad mod 3 20 credits 10%	
	Ad mod 2 20 credits 10%	Ad mod 4 20 credits 10%	

## **Policy Statement on Assessment– Taught Masters programmes**

This statement applies to all Masters programmes awarded by the Department of Psychology. This statement should be read in conjunction with the Policy Statement on Assessment – BSc programme, additional information relating specifically to Masters programmes are detailed below. Assessment & Feedback of Taught Masters programmes in the Department of Psychology is overseen by the Chair of the Postgraduate Studies Board, in concert with the Chair of the Board of Studies, Chair of the Postgraduate Board of Examiners and the Director of Teaching and Learning.

### **Postgraduate programmes**

MSc in Cognitive Neuroscience  
 MSc in Development, Disorders and Clinical Practice  
 MSc in Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience  
 MSc in Applied Forensic Psychology  
 Master of Research in Psychology

Varied forms of assessment are used across these different courses (coursework, reports, exams). MCQs are marked by computer. All modules on these courses are marked by staff (primarily faculty but with some contributions from teaching and research staff) and the majority of assessments are also second marked by faculty.

In line with Undergraduate marking, the type of marking used is determined by the weighting of the assessment towards the final degree mark:

- 15% + - blind double marked
- 5-14% - second marking (2nd marker has access to 1st marker's marks)
- 1-4% - moderated
- <1% - single marked

For second marking, the first marker marks all the scripts and, in the case of open assessments, provides feedback by writing comments on a feedback cover sheet and on the script. Markers write 2-4 comments per script page, avoiding detailed editing. Once all scripts are first marked, the first marker passes the annotated scripts, with feedback sheets and the mark spreadsheet to the second marker, who is then able to check each script and either confirm the mark or challenge it. The markers then meet to discuss and agree a final mark for all challenged cases, providing a brief comment on how the mark was agreed.

Moderated marking operates as undergraduate moderated marking (e.g. essays). Cohort feedback on the module as a whole (for both open and closed assessments) is also provided. This should include aspects such as the distribution of the marks, areas where

there was clear room for improvement, model essay answers where applicable, and responses to the student feedback on the module where available.

The table below shows the type of marking used and time in marking for all postgraduate assessments apart from the project.

<b>Module</b>	<b>Course</b>	<b>Assessment Type</b>	<b>Type of marking</b>	
<b>TPR</b>	CN, MRes, PhD	Précis	Moderated	Empirical projects in all MSc courses are blind double marked following the
<b>TPR</b>	CN, MRes, PhD	crit anal	Second	
<b>LP</b>	MRes	Lab Journal + review	Second	
<b>SO</b>	MRes	closed exam	Second	
<b>SO</b>	MRes	Essay	Second	
<b>FGS</b>	AFP	briefing paper	Second	
<b>BPN</b>	CN	Closed MCQ exam	Computer	
<b>DAAN</b>	CN	Practical report	Second	
<b>RDS</b>	MScs, PhD	MCQ, practical reports	Computer	
<b>LCI</b>	AFP	Open Essay	Second	
<b>FPP</b>	AFP	Closed exam	Second	
<b>RDNI</b>	CN	open essay	Second	
<b>TCN</b>	CN	open essay	Second	
<b>LP</b>	MRes	Lab Journal + review	Second	
<b>SO</b>	MRes	closed exam	Second	
<b>SO</b>	MRes	Essay	Second	
<b>TS</b>	MScs, PhD	Res. Description	Second	
<b>TS</b>	MScs, PhD	Précis	Second	
<b>TS</b>	MScs, PhD	VLE assessment	Computer	
<b>ARM</b>	AFP, MRES	RD Exercise	Second	
<b>ARM</b>	AFP, MRES	closed MCQ exam	Computer	
<b>TCN</b>	CN	closed MCQ exam	Computer	
<b>FMH</b>	AFP	Open Essay	Second	

undergraduate project procedure.

### **Timing of feedback**

The marking of MSc coursework can be more time-consuming than essay marking at undergraduate level, since a relatively small number of staff are required to double-mark assessments. We recently introduced changes designed to speed up the return of provisional marks to students and we aim to return all marks within 5 weeks.