Honours project marking feedback

Honours project are independently marked by two markers and, if there is not close agreement between their marks, a moderator. The marking forms require information to justify the mark given, including a justification of the ratings given on the individual marking criteria, a justification of the numerical mark given, and (from the supervisor) comments on mitigating factors and the extent of the student’s self-direction. The agreed mark form contains a justification of the agreed mark.

By law, this information is available to students if they demand to see it, and a handful of students do request it, but it is not otherwise provided to students as a matter of course. An exception is for students continuing from an MInf4 project to an MInf5 project, where the justification of the ratings on the marking criteria are forwarded.

In the interest of improving feedback, we could consider changing this policy and forward feedback to students following the Board of Examiners meeting. There are different ways in which this could be done, including at least the following:

1. ITO could automatically forward an unedited copy of all of the marking forms, or specific selected information from the marking forms, to the student
2. Somebody (the supervisor? the moderator, if there is one?) could be responsible for preparing a summary of feedback, based on the information in the marking forms, and this is what the ITO would forward to the student. This would often be a straightforward copy-and-paste from the markers’ forms, and it would be useful to have a feedback form that would make this easy.
3. We could do (1) for unmoderated projects and (2) for moderated projects.

The same question applies to MSc projects. I have not discussed this with the MSc project coordinator.
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