Please note that Schools are responsible for moderation arrangements both in the UK and at branch campuses.

'**Moderation**' refers to the arrangements that are put in place to assure the proper application of the assessment criteria, including consistency of marking. The moderation process will typically consist of various steps, including a form of second marking (see below for the different types), possibly some sampling of student work,(t)7(u)-4wq2,N1O)EyPt5zaNLNTq2,N1O)EyP9OWS(BQT5wD4%TNA5q2,N1OEyF

double marking where each marker makes a separate judgement and in the event of disagreement a resolution is sought;

- **open marking** where the second marker is informed of the first marker's mark before commencing;
- **blind marking** where the second marker is not informed of the first marker's mark;

- **review marking** where the second marker/moderator reviews the accuracy and appropriateness of the marking, and brings any issues to the attention of the first marker.

Second marking can apply to the whole cohort (full second marking) or to a sample selected according to defined criteria (sampled second marking). Second marking is an area where practice between disciplines necessarily varies, reflecting differences in the type of assessment task and the submission media. An approach suitable for the discipline, assessment task and submission media is encouraged.

- sufficient First Class or Distinction candidates to illustrate the range from lowest First Class/Distinction mark given to highest
- any individual candidates the first marker finds significant difficulty in marking.

13.1.6 Where second-marking of a sample is not possible (notably those which take place in real time such as oral presentations, performance or field work activity), some other form of moderation should take place, subject to the two conditions of being sufficient for and commensurate with the assessment task. Alternative moderation arrangements which might be considered include:

- Recording (video or audio) and moderating a sample of the recordings;
- Assessors' notes (and possibly photographs) which explain how the marking criteria were applied and moderating a sample of the notes;
- Co-operative staff development, where staff carry out sample assessments in pairs or groups to establish a shared understanding of the criteria and the standards to apply;
- Comparison with peer assessment, where the staff assessment is compared (for example, by rank order) with peer assessment. (It should be noted that University policy requires that peer assessment per se is not to be used for a formal mark; the formal mark must be determined by an appropriate member of staff. What is suggested here is the use of peer assessment as one check on the reasonable accuracy of the marks of staff, not its use to produce an actual mark.)

13.1.7 For each assessment, the Module Convenor (in collaboration with the relevant Programme Director, where appropriate) shall propose suitable moderation arrangements to be approved by the School Director of Teaching and Learning who will report on moderation processes to the External Examiners. The External Examiners have the right to comment on and suggest changes to moderation arrangements.

13.1.8 If more than two markers are involved in marking an assessment, appropriate arrangements for moderation across the cadre of markers should be agreed in advance and a report on the outcomes and process provided to the relevant School Director of Teaching and Learning and made available to the External Examiner responsible for the module.

13.1.9 Statistical comparison of mark distributions for modules may be a useful tool in the moderation process but is not sufficient in itself.

13.1.10 Unless it is impracticable, the marking, selection of the sample and moderation arrangements should be made while the candidates remain anonymous.

13.1.11 Moderation is essentially an iterative process depending on the kind and degree of variation between marker and moderator. If there is no significant difference, the marks can be simply agreed. If there is systematic variation throughout the range, moderator and marker must negotiate an agreed shift in the marking and all the work remarked and re-moderated until no significant difference remains (a third marker may be called in to assist). If there is variation which is not systematic, the moderator and marker should discuss the differences and all the work re-marked and re-moderated in the light of the discussion. Where moderation is by double-marking of the full cohort, marker and moderator should negotiate an agreed mark for each individual instance of difference on a case by case basis (again a third marker may assist).

13.1.12 The outcome of moderation should normally be that a single, internally agreed mark for each module is recommended to the External Examiners.

13.1.13 The moderation arrangements must be adequately documented: a record must be kept in respect of each module indicating:

- the pieces of work which have been moderated internally and those which have been moderated externally
- how moderation was undertaken
- any action taken as a result of moderation
- the rationale for those actions

13.2.4 Anomalies in assessment which might lead to scaling include significant disruption to an examination (e.g. a fire alarm), a flaw in the design of an assessment (e.g. in hindsight, a question/assessment is recognised to be significantly more difficult than originally supposed), unforeseen disruption to the delivery of a module, and must be evidenced. Particular care should be taken in deciding that an assessment is flawed; supporting evidence may include statistical comparison with similar modules within year and across years, together with feedback from students, but evidence needs to be carefully evaluated by the Examiners and must be considered compelling.

13.2.5 Scaling is not used to achieve a set distribution of marks, where x% achieve a First Class mark, y% achieve a 2:1 mark, etc. The University does not mark on the basis of norm-referencing.

13.2.6 It is expected that scaling would only be used in respect of assessments which have a prescriptive, detailed marking scheme which allows very limited scope for interpretation. Such assessments are likely to be quantitative in nature.

13.2.7 Where the marking scheme for a module allows the mark to reflect a holistic judgment on a piece of work (e.g. a marking scheme for an essay), the need for scaling would be highly unusual. There may, however, be circumstances where scaling might be appropriate, for example where there was a defect in the delivery of the module.

13.2.8 The Internal Examiners, in consultation with the External Examiners, are responsible for considering anomalies in assessments and determining whether and how scaling should be applied. In making such decisions, the Examiners must exercise their academic judgment following consideration of relevant statistical data (e.g. the mean and distribution of marks before and after the proposed scaling, the mean and distribution of marks for the module from previous years, and the mean and distribution of marks for other modules for the same cohort).

13.2.9 The approach adopted to scaling will depend on the issue being addressed.

13.2.10 Scaling can be applied at the level of a part of a question, a question, or an assessment. It cannot be applied at the level of a Part or a Final result, nor at the level of a Module when there is more than one item of assessment.

13.2.11

Ý Ò Ö Ò × Ð Ø Ï Ö Ø Í Î Û Ê Ý Ò Ø × Û Î Õ Ê Ý Ò Ø × Ý Ø Ê à Ê Ù Î Ò × Ð Ê Ù Û Ø Ð Û Î Ü Ü Ò Ø × Í Î Î Ò Ü Ò Ø × Ù

13.5.1 Marks must be agreed, following internal and external moderation, before awards or progression decisions are determined.

13.5.2 Normally, Semester 1 marks must be internally moderated by the Semester 1 Mark Entry Deadlines, which will commonly fall before the Easter vacation. Semester 2 marks must be internally (and preferably externally) moderated by the Semester 2 Mark Entry Deadlines. Semester 1 and Semester 2 Mark Entry Deadlines and arrangements for confirmation of marks following external moderation will be notified annually to all stakeholders.

13.5.3 This implies a two-stage external examining process – first the confirmation of all marks and then awarding. Given the flexible, modular structure of programmes, agreement of some marks may depend on external examiners outwith the programme. It is expected that, in such cases, module marks will, where possible, be moderated in advance of the period in which Programme Examiners' Meetings are held. In those instances where a student's marks have not been moderated, a final decision on the recommended award should be deferred. This imposes tight constraints on the moderation process.

Confirmation of moderation for <module code>

Marking and internal moderation must be in line with the Assessment Handbook.

The module convenor is responsible for completing this form for the module.

Please complete the form below:

For each assessment, the Module Convenor shall propose a suitable method of moderation to be approved by the Programme Director who will report on moderation processes to the External Examiners. The External Examiners have the right to comment on and suggest changes to moderation processes. If more than two markers are involved in marking an assessment, appropriate arrangements for moderation across the cadre of markers should be agreed in advance and a report on the outcomes and process provided to the relevant Programme Director and made available to the External Examiner responsible for the module.	
Were candidates anonymous during the marking, selection of the sample and moderating	
The mark sheet template has been used to clearly indicate the pieces of work which have been moderated internally and those which have been / will be moderated externally.	
Any action taken as a result of moderation	

Moderation of a sample of work

The sample should contain a meaningful proportion of the total candidates, but it is suggested that a minimum of eight candidates might in most cases be appropriate with

- a number of exemplars from each class which represents the distribution of the cohort across that band
- all failed candidates
- sufficient First Class or Distinction candidates to illustrate the range from lowest First Class/Distinction mark given to highest
- any individual candidates the first marker finds significant difficulty in marking.
- for classes smaller than 8, all scripts must be moderated

Unless it is impossible, the marking, selection of the sample and moderating should be made while the candidates remain anonymous. Where the agreed mark differs from the original one, the reason must be noted.

N.B. a record of which scripts were moderated, including fails, must be given below. For large classes please continue on a separate sheet.

MODERATION RECORDS

Student name OR Anonymous marking number	Mark proposed by marker

Exams Officer comment:

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

ASSESSED COURSEWORK MODERATION AND CONFIRMATION OF MARKS FORM

University regulations require that marking of assessed coursework is moderated and that this process is documented. It is the lecturer's responsibility to ensure that the moderation of marking does not interfere with the prompt return of work to students. Note that the role of the moderator is to check accuracy and consistency of marking, though if there are problems then the moderator can suggest an alternative mark scheme. All adjustments to marks need to be noted on this form, together with the reason for them. The Examinations Officer, on behalf of the Moderating Group will determine whether changes to the marking scheme are applied.

.

0 R G X O H « « « « « « « « «« « « « « « « « «