UC Policy Library

Marking Assistance by Students and Contract Staff Principles and Guidelines

Last Modified   December 2017
Review Date   June 2020
Approval Authority Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Contact Officer   Academic Registrar, Head of Academic Services Group – Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Introduction

The University expects that normally internal examiners are continuing members of staff of this University. There are situations, however, when internal examiners may be assisted in their task by people who are not continuing members of staff.

This document acknowledges that Programme Convenors may use students or non-continuing staff to assist with marking of student work where appropriate. Situations where this might be justified include, for example, where there are very large classes, where teaching and marking are considered part of the student-tutor's academic apprenticeship, or where a staff member is taken ill or leaves.

Please note that there are situations where it is not appropriate to have marking assistance.

Principles

The rules regarding assessment are laid out in the *Regulations of the University (University Regulations website)*. The following principles apply to the marking of all student work except theses:

1. Ideally, all assessment should be marked by the official examiner, but it is acknowledged that there are situations where this is not possible. Approval for another person to be employed to mark assessment items must be gained from the relevant Head of Department/School or Programme Convenor.

2. Where a non-continuing staff member, or a student-tutor, is employed to mark an assessment, the final responsibility for that assessment remains with the official examiner.

---

3. All assessments must be moderated by the official examiner or another member of the continuing staff with relevant knowledge and expertise. Any marker who is not an official examiner must be appropriately trained, supervised and moderated in accordance with the guidelines in this document to ensure consistency.

4. Any student who considers that the marking of an item of assessment has been affected by bias or inappropriate practice may apply to the Head of Department/School for reassessment. Where the work was marked originally by a person other than the official examiner, then the first step in any review should be a re-assessment by the official examiner.

Guidelines

Colleges are responsible for developing their own guidelines on the use of students or contract staff to mark items of assessment in their particular disciplines. The following guidelines have been distilled from examples of good practice in various University departments/schools:

- Markers must be appropriately qualified and if they are students then they should be at least two years ahead of the students being assessed.

- Where work is assessed by peers as in-class work then the assessment must be moderated by the examiner.

- Prior to marking a given piece of assessment, all markers for that work should meet with the examiner to review the marking schedule and to ensure consistent instructions are received.

- Markers should receive training which ensures they are familiar with the objectives of the course and any specific expectations for that discipline or course.

- Markers should be advised of the examiner's expectations of feedback given in formative assessment.

- Ideally, all the assessment of a single question should be allocated to the same marker.

- The examiner must take all reasonable steps to ensure marking consistency, including providing markers with an explicit and detailed marking schedule and a model answer or points to be included in a model answer.

- The examiner must moderate all assessment or marking, including that of any continuing staff who might be marking the same piece of work. This should include checking and verifying a sample of each marker's work.

- A debriefing should be conducted at the conclusion of the assessment to identify any problems and issues experienced either by the examiner or by the markers, and to develop solutions for future occasions.

It is noted that a professional body may have specific expectations which are not addressed in this document.

Related Documents and Information

Regulations

- [General Conditions for Credit Regulations (University Regulations website)](#)
- [Regulations of the University (University Regulations website)](#)

UC Website and Intranet

- [Academic Services homepage (University Academic Services website)](#)

Document History and Version Control Table			
Version	**Action**	**Approval Authority**	**Action Date**
For document history and versioning prior to 2013 contact ucpolicy@canterbury.ac.nz			
1.00	Converted document onto new template and document pushed out	Policy Unit	Oct 2013
1.01	Document review date pushed out.	Policy Unit	Mar 2014
1.02	A/A changed from Chair, Academic Board to DVC(A&I).	Policy Unit	Mar 2014
1.03	Hyperlinks updated.	Policy Unit	Aug 2014
1.04	Review date pushed out.	Policy Unit	Sep 2014
1.05	Contact Officer updated.	Policy Unit	Apr 2015
1.06	'Faculty' references changed to 'College' to reflect College-Faculty merger; scheduled review date moved to June 2016 to align with regulations review.	DVC(A)	Jun 2016
2.00	Major review following regulations review. Approval Authority changed to DVC from DVC(A) and Contact Officer changed from the Office of the DVC(A) to the Office of the AVC(A).	AVC(A)	Dec 2017

This document remains in force until it is updated.