

**POLICY FOR THE VERIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT AND STANDARDISATION AND
MODERATION OF MARKING**

1 INTRODUCTION

This policy applies to all taught modules delivered at the University¹, except where there are specific exceptions due to Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements. The policy sets out the University's approach to verification of assessment tasks and the standardisation and moderation of marking. The policy should be read in conjunction with the operational guidance provided in Annex 2.

Verification, standardisation and moderation are the key processes by which the University maintains academic standards by assuring the appropriateness of assessment, and the accuracy of marking and grading decisions. This policy ensures alignment with the QAA's UK Quality Code (Chapter B6 Assessment of Students and Recognition of Prior Learning and Chapter B7 External Examining).

See also the following Annexes to this Document:

Annex 1 Collaborative Partners and Policy for the Verification of Assessment and Standardisation and Moderation

Annex 2 Operational Guidance to support implementation of the Policy for the Verification of Assessment and Standardisation and Moderation of Marking

2 DEFINITIONS

Verification ensures that the form and content of assessment tasks and briefs are appropriate, fair and valid in terms of standards, will effectively assess the achievement of learning outcomes and present an appropriate level of challenge to students.

Marking involves the academic judgement of students' submitted assessments against predetermined criteria and the provision of a mark (percentage, grade band or pass/fail grade).

Standardisation activities are employed to ensure the consistency of marking in modules where there are multiple markers.

Moderation is employed to ensure that academic standards are appropriate, that marking is regulated within agreed norms or against predetermined marking criteria across a module/course. It also ensures that the assessment outcomes for students are fair and reliable. It is undertaken internally and externally. Moderation can be undertaken by

¹ Details relating to modules delivered by collaborative partners are provided in Annex 1

reviewing a sample of student work, or by second marking. Second marking results in a single, agreed mark.

Moderation by reviewing a sample of student work - The role of the moderator is to check that first marking has been carried out correctly, that mark schemes have been properly applied, and that the total mark is arithmetically correct for a sample of student work.

Second marking is where a second mark is allocated to a piece of work by a second internal marker. This is a thorough second marking of student work and may be carried out blind (where the second marker does not have access to the marks and comments of the first marker) or sighted (where the second marker can view the marks and comments of the first marker). Second marking of the whole cohort is sometimes referred to as 'double marking'. Second marking results in a single, agreed mark.

External moderation is a check / audit of a sample of marked work by an appointed external examiner

3 POLICY STATEMENTS

The following statements apply to student assessment that will receive a percentage mark, pass/fail mark or grade band.

- 1 All assessment tasks must be verified internally before being published to students.
- 2 New or substantially changed assessment tasks that contribute to the classification of an award must be verified by an external examiner.
- 3 All student work must be first marked by an appropriately experienced member of staff.
- 4 Where there are multiple markers on a module, a standardisation exercise should be undertaken to ensure consistency between markers.
- 5 All first-sit assessed student work must be internally moderated. This may be limited to the review of a representative sample across the marking range, or it may involve second marking the work of the whole cohort.
- 6 The Module Leader will ensure that internal moderation across all markers on the module takes place.
- 7 The Module Leader will ensure that internal moderation across all student cohorts on the module takes place.
- 8 All first-sit assessed student work that contributes to the classification of an award must be externally moderated.
- 9 Assessed work, feedback and provisional marks may be returned to students prior to external moderation being completed. All marks are subject to confirmation by the relevant Assessment Board. The 'subject to confirmation by the Assessment Board' status of marks must be made clear to students.

- 10 Referral and deferral work submitted by students does not need to be externally moderated unless there is a PSRB requirement to do so.
- 11 All failed referrals must be internally moderated.
- 12 Prior to the Departmental Assessment Board, the provisional statistical grade profiles of modules, individually and by level for each subject/course, must be reviewed in order to identify any issues relating to the performance of the students and/or standards of marking.
- 13 Any recommendations for changes to marks, e.g. scaling, must be documented and presented to the Departmental Assessment Board with support from the External Examiner.
- 14 There must be clear, transparent and documented evidence that internal and external moderation of assessed student work has taken place.
- 15 The requirements set out in the 'Collaborative Partners' annex to this policy must be met for modules delivered by collaborative partners (see **Annex 1**).

Policy Guidance: Detailed operational guidance to support the implementation of this Policy Statement is provided in **Annex 2**.

COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS AND POLICY FOR THE VERIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT AND STANDARDISATION AND MODERATION OF MARKING

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This policy applies to all taught modules delivered at the University's collaborative partners² and sets out the University's approach to verification of assessment tasks and the standardisation and moderation of marking. It should be read in conjunction with the requirements set out in the University's policy for verification, standardisation and moderation.
- 1.2 For the purposes of this paper collaborative partners are defined as publicly or privately funded educational organisations either in the UK, EU HEA or worldwide. The policy also applies to companies where the University has accredited and recognises assessed work undertaken by employees for SHU credit.
- 1.3 The 'collaborative annex' to the main Moderation policy does not apply to NHS partnerships, local government, social work or other health-related organisations (i.e. non-HE providers) where the assessment of clinical practice is used as part of the overall assessment regime of a professionally accredited ('licence to practice') award. In such cases the normal University policy on moderation applies as the University and its staff will retain full control over the marking of academic work.
- 1.4 This policy ensures alignment with the QAA's UK Quality Code (Chapter B6 Assessment of Students and Recognition of Prior Learning and Chapter B7 External Examining).

2 DEFINITIONS

- 2.1. **Verification** ensures that the form and content of assessment tasks and briefs are appropriate, fair and valid in terms of standards, will effectively assess the achievement of learning outcomes and present an appropriate level of challenge to students.
- 2.2. **Marking** involves the academic judgement of students' submitted assessments against predetermined criteria and the provision of a mark (percentage, grade band or pass/fail grade).
- 2.3. **Standardisation** activities are employed to ensure the consistency of marking in modules where there are multiple markers.
- 2.4. **Moderation** is employed to ensure that academic standards are appropriate, that marking is regulated within agreed norms or against predetermined marking criteria across a module/course. It also ensures that the assessment outcomes for

² See main Policy Statement covering modules delivered at and by the University.

students are fair and reliable. It is undertaken internally and externally. Moderation can be undertaken by reviewing a sample of student work, or by second marking. Second marking results in a single, agreed mark.

- 2.5. **Moderation by reviewing a sample of student work** - The role of the moderator is to check that first marking has been carried out correctly, that mark schemes have been properly applied, and that the total mark is arithmetically correct for a sample of student work.
- 2.6. **Moderation 'Events'** - In these events a group of assessors from the collaborative partner and the University will all independently mark a sample of pieces of student work. The work is then shared and markers will compare and discuss the outcomes in order to establish that all assessors (partner staff and University staff) have clarity regarding the University's expectations for what constitutes a 'good' piece of work and to ensure that all markers are applying the agreed criteria consistently. This type of activity can be used in addition to other types of standardisation / moderation.
- 2.7. **Second marking** is where a second mark is allocated to a piece of work by a second internal marker. This is a thorough second marking of student work and may be carried out blind (where the second marker does not have access to the marks and comments of the first marker) or sighted (where the second marker can view the marks and comments of the first marker). Second marking of the whole cohort is sometimes referred to as 'double marking'. Second marking results in a single, agreed mark.
- 2.8. **External moderation** is a check / audit of a sample of marked work by an appointed external examiner.

3 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

- 3.1 It is expected that partner organisations have in place their own approach to internal verification and standardisation / moderation (by their own staff) which is commensurate with the University's policy on moderation.
- 3.2 Partner arrangements will be reviewed by the University at partner approval, subsequent validations of new awards and at Collaborative Periodic Review. It will also be considered by the collaborative course leader at University and by the external examiner(s) appointed by the University.
- 3.3 Details of the specific verification, marking and standardisation / moderation procedures must be included in the relevant Operational Handbook for the provision.
- 3.4 The University will appoint external examiners to review, usually on a sample basis, assessed student work. External examiners are expected to visit the partner and meet with students at the partner location at least once in their 4 year tenure.
- 3.5 External examiners will be expected to see evidence of internal moderation by partner staff and will be asked to comment upon the effectiveness of this. External

Examiners do not routinely comment on Level 4 work unless such work substantively contributes to the award (e.g. Foundation Degree, HND/C, some diplomas and certificates).

- 3.6 Relevant University academic staff will **second mark** (see definitions above), student work at the partner. This is an integral part of assuring standards as a new course commences at a partner organisation and the scale of the second marking will, normally, reduce considerably after the first year of operation providing the outcomes of marking and other quality metrics (external examiner comments, statistical analysis of student achievement, student feedback, etc.) are in line with expectations. For further guidance on this issue, see below.

4 THE SCALE AND EXTENT OF SECOND MARKING

- 4.1 Second marking of student work by University academic staff at collaborative partners will normally take place at the highest level of study. For postgraduate courses and level 6 degree top-up awards this simply means all modules within such programmes.
- 4.2 For full 3 or 4 year degree courses, Foundation Degrees and other sub-degree provision the following applies:
- a) If the first intake is only at one level (either 4 or 5) then that is where second marking occurs.
 - b) In the second year of operation, second marking will follow the first cohort of students so that it always occurs at the highest level being delivered. For example, in the first year of operation of a new Foundation Degree, students enter only at the start of Level 4 and the second marking at the end of the year will be on the level 4 modules. In the second year of operation this first cohort will progress to level 5 and a new cohort will join level 4 - second marking will only occur at level 5. A second example sees a Foundation Degree commence with students joining at both level 4 and level 5 and in this case the second marking would be at level 5.
- 4.3 The scale of the sample for second marking is determined by whether a course is new and whether it has been running successfully for a period of time (referred to here as 'Steady State'). It is also influenced by the cohort size: there is no merit in setting such a large sample that it is simply not practical or economical to second mark it.
- 4.4 However, in certain specific instances where quality concerns arise, this will necessitate second marking for the entire cohort. In such cases this would be determined according to a risk assessment and a requirement for second marking.
- 4.5 The following table is indicative but should guide practice on the scale and extent of second marking, wherever practical.

Table 1: Indicative Sample Sizes for Second Marking, based on cohort size

Module cohort size	Year 1 of operation	Years 2 to 3 of operation	Year 4/ Steady State operation	Notes
1 to 20	100%	50%	25%	Giving a maximum of 20 pieces of work per assessment task reducing to 5 in year 4
21 to 50	40%	20%	12%	Giving a maximum of 20 pieces of work per assessment task reducing to 6 in year 4
More than 50	20%	10%	8%	Giving a minimum of 10 pieces of work (up to a maximum of 30 pieces of work) per assessment task reducing to 4 in year 4

- 4.6 The sample should reflect the full range of marks for that particular assessment component.
- 4.7 The mechanism for the second marking should be agreed by the relevant Department Board in discussion with the partner organisation³.
- 4.8 Moderation 'events' are seen as good practice and are recommended as one of the most efficient approaches to building a successful partnership between the course teams.
- 4.9 As shown in the table above, Year 4 represents a 'steady state' for a successful course and is the default expectation of the University.

5 WHEN ISSUES/CONCERNS ARE IDENTIFIED

- 5.1 Where the second marking reveals issues or concerns with the marking at the partner organisation, this must be addressed immediately and the Faculty and Academic Quality and Standards should be notified of the situation.
- 5.2 The same applies to any critical comments or feedback from external examiners about the standard of marking at the partner organisation. Any issues with marking standards at a partner organisation will be reviewed in detail and, where applicable, an action plan agreed with the partner to prevent recurrence. Where serious concerns are raised, second marking may be required across all levels of the cohort, with engagement from the external examiner and with the student marks being appropriately scaled prior to their ratification by the relevant Departmental Assessment Board (DAB).

³ Academic Quality and Standards can assist in reaching agreement between the University and the partner organisation if required.

- 5.3 Where there are or have been issues the proportion of sampled second marking will remain in one of the first two columns of the table above, that is either at the proportion recommended for Year 1 of operation or for the proportion recommended for Years 2 to 3 of operation. The actual proportion will be determined by a robust 'risk assessment' of the problem(s) and the action plan in place. Once the relevant Department Board is convinced that the issue(s) has been fully resolved then the proportion of second marking can be returned to the 'Steady State' value shown in the table above. Such instances will be highlighted at Collaborative Periodic Review and will be fully investigated.

OPERATIONAL GUIDANCE TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICY FOR THE VERIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT AND STANDARDISATION AND MODERATION OF MARKING

1 INTRODUCTION

This document provides detailed guidance to support the operation of the University's Policy for the Verification of Assessment Tasks and the Standardisation and Moderation of Marking.

2 DEFINITIONS

- 2.1. **Verification** ensures that the form and content of assessment tasks and briefs are appropriate, fair and valid in terms of standards, will effectively assess the achievement of learning outcomes and present an appropriate level of challenge to students.
- 2.2. **Marking** involves the academic judgement of students' submitted assessments against predetermined criteria and the provision of a mark (percentage, grade band or pass/fail grade).
- 2.3. **Standardisation** activities are employed to ensure the consistency of marking in modules where there are multiple markers.
- 2.4. **Moderation** is employed to ensure that academic standards are appropriate, that marking is regulated within agreed norms or against predetermined marking criteria across a module/course. It also ensures that the assessment outcomes for students are fair and reliable. It is undertaken internally and externally. Moderation can be undertaken by reviewing a sample of student work, or by second marking.
- 2.5. **Moderation by reviewing a sample of student work** – The role of the moderator is to check that first marking has been carried out correctly, that mark schemes have been properly applied, and that the total mark is arithmetically correct for a sample of student work.
- 2.6. **Second marking** is where a second mark is allocated to a piece of work by a second internal marker. This is a thorough second marking of student work and may be carried out 'blind' (where the second marker does not have access to the marks and comments of the first marker) or 'sighted' (where the second marker can view the marks and comments of the first marker). Second marking of the whole cohort is sometimes referred to as double marking. Second marking results in a single, agreed mark.
- 2.7. **External moderation** is a review / audit of a sample of marked work by an appointed external examiner.

3 VERIFICATION OF ASSESSMENT TASKS

- 3.1 Assessment tasks must be verified internally before being published to students. This is to ensure assessment tasks are consistent, that tasks are appropriate to testing the module learning outcomes and that marking criteria and feedback strategies are clear and appropriate.
- 3.2 Verification is normally⁴ undertaken by a member of academic staff who does not have direct involvement with the assessment in question.
- 3.3 Local arrangements for verification will apply and will vary according to subject area and discipline.
- 3.4 External examiners must be consulted about the development of new and significantly modified assessment tasks to verify currency, standards and appropriateness.
- 3.5 New and substantially changed assessment tasks that contribute to the classification of an award must be verified by an external examiner.
- 3.6 Substantive assessment tasks such as final year dissertations or equivalent should be blind second marked.
- 3.7 A record should be maintained, overseen by the Department Assessment Board, to provide evidence that verification has been completed.

4 TYPES OF INTERNAL STANDARDISATION AND MODERATION ACTIVITY

- 4.1 There will be some variation in standardisation / moderation practice reflecting disciplinary differences and conventions, differences in the assessment tasks and/or assessed materials. All approaches to standardisation / moderation must be reliable and fit for purpose.
- 4.2 **Standardisation of Marking** For example, a group of markers all independently mark a sample of pieces of student work and compare and discuss the outcomes in order to establish that all markers are applying the agreed criteria consistently. Following the activity, the markers continue to mark student work in the normal way. Marking standardisation exercises such as this can be used in addition to moderation/second marking– it is particularly useful as a means of assisting new staff to become familiar with marking standards and conventions
- 4.3 **Moderation by Review / Audit of a Sample** Moderation may be limited to the review / audit of a sample of a representative number of pieces of assessed work across the marking range from a cohort of students. The role of the moderator in this is to check that first marking has been carried out correctly,

⁴ Verification could also be undertaken as a team exercise in conjunction with the internal moderator.

that mark schemes have been properly applied, and that the total mark is arithmetically correct for a sample of student work.

- 4.4 **Second Marking** is where a second mark is allocated to a piece of work by a second internal marker. Second marking may either be carried out blind (where the second marker does not have access to the marks and comments of the first marker) or sighted (where the second marker can view the marks and comments of the first marker). In blind second marking both markers record their marks and feedback separately and then compare marks and resolve differences to produce an agreed mark and feedback.

5 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR INTERNAL STANDARDISATION / MODERATION OF MARKING

- 5.1 The University recognises the varying demands of different subject disciplines and the detailed operation of standardisation / moderation will therefore vary according to agreed local circumstances within individual departments/subject disciplines.
- 5.2 Departments are required to determine, manage and record the type of marking, standardisation and moderation that is in operation in all the modules within their academic portfolio.
- 5.3 Departments are also required to maintain a single formal published statement of standardisation / moderation procedures that is regularly reviewed. This statement should be published in order to inform students, external examiners and others about the arrangements for assuring the accuracy of marking and grading decisions as they relate to different types of assessment.
- 5.4 All first-sit assessed student work that will receive a percentage, pass/fail or grade⁵ must be internally moderated. This may be limited to the review of a representative sample across the marking range, or it may involve the second marking of the work of the whole cohort.
- 5.5 Internal moderation is normally undertaken, in collaboration with the module leader, by a member of academic staff with appropriate expertise in the discipline area.⁶
- 5.6 Where student work is moderated by sampling a representative sample of student work, incorporating a sample from all grading bands and all referred coursework where the student has failed to achieve the pass mark at the second attempt, will be reviewed by the internal moderator.⁷

⁵ i.e. the grade bands used in grade based assessment

⁶ In large modules this may be carried out by the module leader if there are a number of markers in a module team. Note this would require oversight of module leaders marking.

⁷ The internal moderator may view evidence captured, for example, on video, audio or screen-casting software

- 5.7 Along with viewing students' work, moderators are required to view the marks for the whole cohort, assessment briefs and marking criteria to ensure they have a holistic view of student assessment.
- 5.8 The internal moderator considers the appropriateness of the marking, feedback and use of assessment criteria, taking into account consistency, fairness, application of the agreed marking scheme and academic standards.
- 5.9 Where student work that has been second marked is also subject to moderation, the internal moderator will have sight of the marks allocated by the first and second marker and also any feedback or comments that have been made to students.
- 5.10 Internal moderators may identify minor inconsistencies, e.g. incorrect addition of marks, which require changes to be made. In these circumstances changes are made by the module leader on a recommendation from the moderator and must be documented.
- 5.11 The internal moderator should give a clear indication that moderation has occurred and the outcomes of internal moderation should be recorded in a brief internal moderation report. The moderation report should be made available to the external examiner(s).
- 5.12 Marking and standardisation/moderation must take place in sufficient time to allow for feedback to students, to ensure that students' work is made available to external examiners, and to support the efficient operation of the Department Assessment Boards.

6 SAMPLE SIZE

- 6.1 The same sample of assessed student work should be used for the purposes of internal and external moderation.
- 6.2 The module leader is responsible for ensuring that the sample is representative of the different markers that contributed and different student cohorts that have taken the module.
- 6.3 The sample must include examples of low, middle and high work within each classification band. The sample should include all referred coursework where the student has failed to achieve the pass mark at the second attempt⁸. Where the cohort is lower than 15 in total, all student work should be included in the sample. This will normally comprise 3 pieces of work from each of the classification bands.
- 6.4 For large module cohorts which will produce more than 150 pieces of assessed student work, the sample size must comprise a **maximum** of 30 pieces of work

⁸ Noting the differing mark scheme dependent on the level of study

per assessment task produced by the overall cohort and should include a minimum of three pieces of work from each of the classification bands, as above. The sample should not include all the work from any of the classification bands unless the number in a band is three or fewer.

- 6.5 External examiners will have access to all student work submitted online. The minimum level of scrutiny should equate to the requirements for sampling provided above.

7 RESOLVING DIFFERENCES FOLLOWING INTERNAL MODULE STANDARDISATION / MODERATION

- 7.1 Any differences between markers that are identified through internal standardisation/moderation must be resolved through consultation between modules leaders and moderators.

- 7.2 When all the student work for a cohort has been second marked then individual marks may be changed through agreement between the two markers. Any changes must be documented.

- 7.3 In instances of internal disagreement between the first and second markers or the internal moderator, then a third internal marker should be used to resolve the situation.

- 7.4 If the student work has not all been second marked then changes to individual marks cannot be recommended by the internal moderator, unless changes are a result of minor error for example if the marks on the front of an exam script have not been added up correctly.

- 7.5 Internal moderators may recommend a re-mark of the entire cohort of student work for part or all of the assessment.

- 7.6 All marks for a cohort may be scaled, up or down, as a result of the internal and external moderation process. In such circumstances the proposal must be approved by the external examiner and confirmed at the Departmental Assessment Board. Further details are provided below.

8 SCALING OF MARKS

- 8.1. Scaling is the adjustment of marks carried out on an assessment task so that the marks can better reflect the achievement of the students. The purpose of scaling is to ratify anomalies in mark distribution that arise from unexpected circumstances.

- 8.2. Scaling of marks is a position of last resort once all other methods of moderation have been exhausted; therefore it is expected to only be done in exceptional circumstances. There is also no specific expectation that scaling should be done.

- 8.3. Outlined below are the key principles regarding the scaling of marks. These principles must be adhered to in any decision to scale marks.
- 8.3.1. Scaling should take place before marks are finalised, and only after all other moderation mechanisms have been ruled out.
- 8.3.2. If scaling is to take place it should be applied at task level only, not at module level.
- 8.3.3. Scaling should be applied fairly to all students taking the assessment, and must not unfairly benefit or disadvantage a subset of students (i.e. failures or high passes). Any scaling function applied to a set of marks must not reverse the rank-order of any pair of students at task level, nor place any student in a failure position at module level.
- 8.3.4. Scaling must not be applied to assessments for which a zero mark has been awarded for non-submission, or a capped mark for In Module Retrieval or as a result of an Academic Conduct Panel sanction.
- 8.3.5. Scaling should take place using an appropriate algorithm. The scaling method (i.e. simple addition or multiplication by a factor) is not prescribed.
- 8.3.6. The assessment design for for any module that has its marks scaled must be reviewed in order to reduce the chance that scaling will be necessary in subsequent years.
- 8.3.7. Decisions regarding scaling will be made at the review of reports meeting for recommendation to the Departmental Assessment Board.
- 8.3.8. The relevant external examiners must always be consulted about the process.
- 8.3.9. The raw marks, the rationale for scaling, the impact on marks, and proposed actions to ensure scaling is not necessary in future years, must be clearly presented to the Departmental Assessment Board for ratification. For ratification to be confirmed the proposal must be approved by the external examiner.

9 EXTERNAL MODERATION

- 9.1 External examiners are not required to moderate assessed work at levels which do not contribute to the calculation of the intended award (e.g. level 4 for honours degree students), unless there is a specific Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body requirement.
- 9.2 For Foundation Degrees and HNC or HND awards, external examiners are required to moderate assessed student work at level 4 as this contributes to the classification of these awards.

- 9.3 In all cases, external examiners have an advisory role in respect of all matters relating to the curriculum and assessment and may request to see all assessment instruments and student work, irrespective of level.
- 9.4 External moderation of student work normally takes place by making work available in advance to external examiners. External moderation may also be undertaken by the external examiner via an on-site moderation visit prior to the Assessment Board.
- 9.5 External examiners should be provided with all relevant information to inform the external moderation process. This will include a copy of the module descriptor and module handbook/assessment brief, marking criteria and, prior to the Assessment Board, a copy of the module marks and a summary of the module statistics.
- 9.6 The module leader should include a summary of the internal and external moderation process and any recommendations from the internal and external examiner in the annual module review.
- 9.7 For modules where there is more than one external examiner then arrangements should be made for both external examiners to review the same sample of work and for them to liaise on the outcomes of external moderation⁹.
- 9.8 External examiners should not be used as 'third markers' or to moderate disagreements between two internal markers. In instances of internal disagreement between the first and second markers or the internal moderator, then a third internal marker should be used to resolve the situation.
- 9.9 As the external examiner will only moderate a sample of work, even if the whole cohort has been second marked, no further changes to individual marks can be made. However in exceptional circumstances the external examiner may request that the entire cohort is re-marked.

10 RETURN OF FEEDBACK AND PROVISIONAL MARKS TO STUDENTS

- 10.1 Assessed work, feedback and provisional marks may be returned to students prior to external moderation being completed. As this will happen before marks have been confirmed by the relevant Assessment Board, students must be advised that marks are provisional and are subject to confirmation.

10 MODERATION OF REFERRED AND DEFERRED STUDENT WORK AND IN-MODULE RETRIEVAL

- 10.1 As all first-sit student work will have already been internally and externally moderated, and the same marking criteria employed for referrals and deferrals, it is not necessary to send referral and deferral work to external examiners.

⁹ This situation will become less common as the University moves to course based external examiners.

- 10.2 All failed referrals must be internally moderated.
- 10.3 Since internal moderation of student work will have been undertaken for the first submission, further internal moderation for in-module retrieval is not required.

11 COURSE LEVEL MODERATION

- 11.1 Prior to the Departmental Assessment Board the provisional statistical grade profiles of modules individually and by level for each subject/course should be considered at the review of reports meeting in order to identify any issues relating to the performance of the students and/or standards of marking.
- 11.2 Any recommendations for changes (e.g. scaling of the marks for a module) must be documented and presented to the Departmental Assessment Board with agreement from the external examiner. (see section 8 on Scaling).

12 EVIDENCE OF MODERATION

- 12.1 **Internal Moderation:** there must be clear and transparent evidence that internal moderation of assessed student work has taken place. Evidence of internal moderation should be provided to external examiners using a standard proforma along with a brief moderation report which summarises the process and its outcomes.
- 12.2 **External Moderation:** there must be clear and transparent evidence that external moderation of student work by one or more external examiners has taken place. External Examiners should receive confirmation that internal moderation has been completed, to be provided together with samples of students' work.
- 12.3 At the Departmental Assessment Board each course leader will confirm that modules have been internally and (where applicable) externally moderated, and delivered in accordance with the definitive document.
- 12.4 The External Examiner, through their annual report, will be asked to confirm that the moderation process has been followed and issues raised by the external have been satisfactorily resolved. This will be a standing item on the Departmental Assessment Board agenda.

Approved by the Academic Board, June 2016 (minute AB/16/40 refers).