



Marking Projects

Alistair D N Edwards
email: alistair
<http://www-users.cs.york.ac.uk/~alistair/>



Motivation

To help new members of staff
To reduce variability in project marking



Programme

Briefing
Today
Practice marking
Today to 3 September
Resolution and discussion of the marking



On-line marking

Used for the first time Spring 2006

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/projects/markin/>



The marking process

Presentation

First- and second-marking



Presentations

A chance to give some credit for the work done

And to reassure who did the work!

Mini conferences

Marked by a *marking panel* plus one other

Contributes 5% to the mark

Supervisors (and others) welcome to attend

But not to participate!



Marking panels

Markers see and can compare similar projects
Undergraduate IT projects are aimed at the 'average
Computer Science lecturer'
MSc projects can be *advanced*
Assignment within a panel is *random*



Review:

Project specification documents

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/projects/Setting.html>


Mark characterizations

[http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/staff/procedures/project
marking.html](http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/staff/procedures/project_marking.html)




First- and second-marking

Markers mark *independently*
Agreements
Disagreements
Resolutions
Adjudications
Rankings
External examiners




Forms

- Supervision Report Form
- Marking Form
- Resolution form
- Adjudication form
- Feedback form



Supervision Report Form

Context for the second marker



Marking Form

Overall mark is not necessarily the mean of the section marks

Although gross deviations will be highlighted

Ethics

If there are ethical implications are they handled correctly?

If there are none, saying so is sufficient.



Resolution form

Resolution invoked if markers disagree by more than 8 marks

...or if the marks straddle a boundary

Distinction/pass (70%)

Pass/fail (50%)

The markers may agree on the mark
if not, send for adjudication (third marking)

In either case they must *explain*

Model resolution

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/projects/markings/modelResolution.html>



Adjudication form

Model adjudication form

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/projects/markings/modelAdjudicationform.html>

The adjudicator's mark will stand



Rankings

A list of all projects you have marked, ranked
by final mark

Point out any apparent anomalies

These will be brought to the attention of the
external examiners

NOT an invitation to re-open the marking



External examiners

Sent a selection of reports

Highest mark

Lowest mark (failures)

Contentious reports

May express an opinion in borderline cases

e.g. 'a bit harsh' or 'a bit generous'

May adjust



Feedback

Automatically generated from marking forms

Excluding *BoE-only* section

Revealed to students as soon as all marking complete



Feedback

Markers should check and edit

- remove anything personal
- remove any identifying references
- remove references to marks
(e.g. 'Feels like a 2-1 project')
- modify in the light of resolutions
- adjust to address the student?

Do it as soon as possible

<http://www.cs.york.ac.uk/projects/markings/modelFeedbackform.html>



Beware

Anything you have written on *any* of the forms (including the BoE-only section) may have to be shown to the student

⇒ Only write objective comments which you can support with evidence



Marking practice

Two real projects from previous years
Supervision Report and Presentation marks provided

First and second markers

No conferring

No looking at existing marks



At the next meeting

Consultation between 1st & 2nd markers

Resolution as necessary

Comparison with original markers

Discussion of all the projects and marking experiences



Questions?
