University of East Anglia

ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS

Policy on Internal Moderation and Double Marking for UEA Validated Programmes

Policy for Partners

2023/24

Document owner: Academic Partnerships
Document type: Policy
Approval by: UEA Learning and Teaching Committee
Version number: 2.0
Due for review: 2023/24
Related documents:

Version log

Date	Version no.	Summary of changes	Updated by	Approved by
April 2023	2.0	Addition of assessment design and development moderation the principles, use and purpose of assessment briefs, refinement of action to be taken when moderator identifies concerns and change to confirm that late submissions do not need to be moderated	Academic Partnerships	Associate PVC-Partnerships and Apprenticeships

Table of Contents

Policy on Internal Moderation and Double Marking for UEA Validated Programmes

1. Assessment Design and Development Moderation

1.1.   The Assessment Design and Development stage of moderation focuses on the nature and description of all summative assessment tasks prior to their release to students. The central goal of Assessment-Moderation is to ensure that all module assessment tasks are transparent, valid, rigorous and as equitable as possible for all students.

1.2.   The degree of scrutiny required for Assessment-Moderation is left at the discretion of the Teaching and Academic teams. Factors such as the level of experience of the Module Organiser, whether the assessment task is new or where similar tasks have received negative feedback in previous years (including comments by the External Examiner) are likely to influence the degree of scrutiny, requiring more rigorous moderation than longer-standing assessment tasks where there are only minor modifications year-on-year.

1.3.   The moderator(s) involved in Assessment-Moderation, wherever possible, should not be part of the Teaching team in order to provide suitable external scrutiny.

1.4.   The moderator(s) involved in Assessment-Moderation should possess sufficient discipline knowledge and experience to be able to offer appropriate and constructive comments on the proposed assessments.

1.5.   It is recognised that in some cases where there is insufficient subject knowledge outside of the Teaching team, it may provide difficult for the institution to provide moderators who able to properly judge the subject content of the assessment task. The moderator(s) should, however, be of sufficient experience to be able to meaningfully explore with the Teaching team broad context issues if not all specifics. In some cases, it may be possible to ask the relevant External Examiner for their comments. It is intended that Assessment-Moderation should scrutinise more than subject specific discipline content.

1.6.   Assessment-Moderation should be guided by the precepts of the institution's policy on assessment design.

1.7.   Once this stage of Assessment-Moderation has been satisfactorily completed, the assessment task(s) may be made available to the students.

2. Assignment Briefs

2.1.   In order that Assessment-Moderation can proceed appropriately, the Module Organiser will need to provide a written description of the assignment task. Such descriptions will be referred to as 'assignment briefs'. The assignment brief will eventually be released to the students as the core information point specifying the assessment task at the start of the module.

2.2.   An assignment brief simultaneously fulfils a number of different functions:

- it is the primary document for Assessment-Moderation
- it provides an important aid for moderation by outlining the precise nature of the assignment task and the assessment criteria
- it provides a useful brief for teaching staff when discussing assessment performance and feedback with students
- it is the core document provided to students specifying the details of the assignment's requirements and expectations, learning outcomes and marking criteria.

2.3.   It is recognised that assignment briefs will take different forms depending on the particular assessment task and the nature of the subject discipline.

2.4.   It is crucial part of Assessment-Moderation that the assignment brief is scrutinised from the perspective of the student regarding its content and communicative clarity.

2.5.   The Module Organiser will ensure that students are provided with an assignment brief for all elements of summative assessment associated with a module. This should normally be provided at the start of the module.

3. Moderation of Assessed Work

3.1.   Moderation is important in assuring that examiners apply marking criteria consistently, and that there is a shared understanding of the academic standards students are expected to achieve.

3.2.   It is essential that marked coursework and exam scripts are properly scrutinised to ensure that staff, students, external reviewers, external partners and stakeholders (and the wider public) can have faith and confidence in the marks awarded and the awards conferred on students.

3.3.   Moderation is not second marking – the moderator is not assigning marks to the scripts reviewed. The aims of moderation are to:

- provide a reliable check that assessment has been marked in accordance with the aims and learning outcomes of the assignment, and according to marking criteria
- ensure that teaching and marking standards have been applied consistently within and across modules and programmes
- ensure equality and thus fairness of treatment for students.

3.4.   Moderation should be constructive and developmental. Besides being an element of assurance of standards and quality, it may also provide peer support and staff development for academic staff.

3.5.   Moderation can take place in a number of ways and two major ways of dealing with moderation have been identified as set out below. The directions below represent a minimum requirement and teaching teams are free to carry out additional moderation if they wish.

3.6.   All marking takes place <u>before</u> moderation, i.e., each submission is considered and a mark is awarded based on the marking criteria by the identified marker(s), prior to a sample being selected for moderation.

4. Blind Double Marking

4.1.   Definition: Two examiners/assessors mark the assignment independently, unaware of the other mark. Through discussion the two agree a single mark.

4.2.   Blind double marking should be used for supervised projects or dissertations worth at least 40 credits.

4.3.   Blind double marking should take place where an assignment is the sole summative assessment for a module worth at least 40 credits.

4.4.   Summative presentations/oral examinations which are worth more than 10% of the module assessment weighting should be double marked (by means of two markers attending the presentation/oral examination) or recorded[1] for purposes of moderation and/or remarking as necessary.

4.5.   Where a station/item for an assessment by an Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) or Objective Structured Practical Examination (OSPE) is double marked (i.e. two assessors are present at the station), further moderation is not required.

---

[1] Please note students must consent to any recording

4.6.   Where a station/item for an assessment by an Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) or Objective Structured Practical Examination (OSPE) is assessed by a single marker, a suitable moderation process should be in place. For example:
- identified individuals appointed to oversee and observe the assessment practice across a sample of stations and assessors
- video or sound recording[1] of a sample of stations for later review
- post-assessment analysis of assessor behaviour using relevant data.

4.7.   Summative assessment of Work-based learning (practice assessment), where student performance is measured in the workplace, assessor behaviour will be triangulated using a range of methods of data capture.

4.8.   Copies of each submission are marked blind by two or more independent markers. If markers disagree, they can alter marks on an individual submission. If the markers cannot agree, an appropriate third party will adjudicate.

4.9.   The adjudicator should be an appropriate office holder within the institution, for example:
- Head of HE or equivalent

4.10.   Adjudication duties may be shared so that the same person does not have to oversee every case within a module. The adjudicator considers the 'case', rather than the script. The adjudicator should consider the marks and comments of the two markers and take advice from a third party as needed to determine the final mark for the assignment.

4.11.   The method by which an agreed mark is arrived at should be recorded and should be transparent.

4.12.   Where work has been double marked as set out above further moderation is not required.

4.13.   Where work has been double marked as set out above a student is not eligible to apply for a remark or to appeal the mark. However a student may be eligible to submit an appeal relating to the assignment on other grounds, for example, inadequate supervision of a project.

5. Internal Moderation

5.1.   The module organiser shall be responsible for ensuring that moderation is carried out.

5.2.   Assessed work (including reassessed work) at levels 3 (Foundation year level), 4, 5, 6 and 7 that has not been double marked should be moderated (i.e. should have the marking process checked) by means of reviewing samples as follows:
- at least one item of assessment for each module

- all assignments which contributes at least 30% to the overall module mark
- if there are a large number of markers in the pool (4 or more) then moderation should be required regardless of the percentage weighting of the assessment item
- assessment tasks marked by new or less experienced markers (i.e. those with less than 2 years' experience of marking in HE setting)
- where concerns or issues have been raised through quality assurance processes or professional body requirements. Issues may include, but are not restricted to:
  - ➢ high failure rates or otherwise poor performance
  - ➢ an unusual distribution of marks, e.g. a large number of extreme marks
  - ➢ concerns raised by student evaluation
  - ➢ concerns raised by External Examiners

5.3.   For any given assignment, where no sample of work is selected for moderation, the assignment is deemed to be single marked, but where a sample of work is reviewed, the assignment is deemed to be moderated.

5.4.   The sample of work taken for moderation will take account of the following:
- submissions across the full range of marks
- all submissions with a fail mark
- submissions marked by each marker
- for modules with 10 students or fewer, all submissions should be moderated
- for modules with more than 10 students, at least 10% of all work submitted or 10 submissions, whichever is the higher number (Appendix 1).

5.5.   The internal moderator should be an experienced marker (i.e. have at least 2 years' experience of marking work at HE level, or other relevant experience or training).

5.6.   In some circumstances, because the institution does not have the relevant subject expertise, it may not be possible to double mark or moderate assignments internally. In such cases, the institution should make a case to UEA Academic Partnerships for the assignment to be reviewed externally. The external moderator/assessor must have the relevant expertise and be approved by the UEA Associate Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Academic Partnerships and Apprenticeships. The marked work should be returned to the students but the marks are provisional. Copies of the work and the distribution of marks will be sent to the external moderator for review.

5.7.   The moderator will check the application of marking criteria (The UEA Senate Scale/s or bespoke criteria relating to the exercise, specifically devised/set by the tutor) by each marker and consider the overall distribution of marks and complete a Moderator's report.

5.8.   If the moderator identifies significant inconsistencies or concerns in relation the application of the marking criteria, or the calibration of the marking either within a marker or between markers in a team they can recommend:
- remarking or scaled adjustment to all submissions

- remarking or scaled adjustment of all the work marked by an individual marker if part of a marking team,
- remarking or scaled adjustment to specific sections of all submissions (for example, where a problem is identified relating to one question on an examination paper)

Any adjustments of this kind must be recorded on the Moderator's report.

Moderator's cannot recommend adjustments to individual submissions (except where a pass is felt by the moderator to be a fail and there are implications for a student's fitness to practice).

5.9.   If the concerns relate to one submission only or to particular parts of the distribution or where there is disagreement between the moderator and the marker, an appropriate third party will adjudicate.

5.10. The adjudicator should be an appropriate office holder within the institution, for example:
- Head of HE or equivalent

5.11. The adjudicator should consider the Moderator's report and may consult the External Examiners. The adjudicator shall be responsible for making the final judgement.

5.12. Internal moderation must be completed before marked work is returned to the students.

5.13. Where work has been single marked or moderated as set out above a student may be eligible to apply for a remark or to appeal the mark.

6. Examinations

6.1.   The course team must choose how to manage the marking process regarding examinations by adopting A or B below:
    A. Blind double mark scripts where a sufficient marking resource is available
    B. Moderate a sample of scripts in line with the Moderation Policy

6.2.   The course team should communicate to students the method pertaining to the exam(s) in question.

7. External Examiners

7.1.   An external examiner has the right to see the assessed work of all students on any of the modules/programmes for which they are responsible. However, course teams will normally make available a sample of assessed work, sufficient to ensure that an

external examiner can reach a judgement on the appropriateness of marking and other academic standards.

8. Module Assessment Board

8.1.   All marks are provisional until these have been confirmed by the Board of Examiners or appropriate sub-group at a Module Assessment Board.

8.2.   The Board of Examiners or appropriate sub-group shall receive the marks presented for each module, and contributing components, which is being assessed and for which it is responsible.

8.3.   It is the role of the Board of Examiners or appropriate sub-group to confirm that internal and external moderation has been completed and that the marking standards for the module are appropriate.

9. Review of Assessment and Moderation

9.1.   The institution shall review its assessment strategy, and review and analyse information relating to module assessment, with a view of:
  - ensuring a coherent approach (i.e. avoiding bunching of deadlines, an appropriate mix of assignments, meeting programme as well as module level learning objectives);
  - identifying and addressing (via adjustments in assignment types or changed marking criteria) any anomalous module marks or variations in marking levels across programmes that might result in inequalities in the treatment of students; and
  - ensuring that the assessment strategy ensures that the programme meets external expectations (QAA benchmarks, professional body requirements).
This review should form part of the institution's Quality Assurance processes and be reported during annual monitoring.

9.2.   The institution may use its existing structures to support this review process (i.e., Boards of Examiners, HE Committee, annual monitoring) or they may convene a dedicated 'Assessment Group', the composition of which should reflect the structure/diversity of the subjects and programmes offered by the institution.

Appendix 1: Sample Size for Moderation

At least 10% of all work, or 10 submissions, whichever is the higher number, must be moderated. The sample size must be 10% of the expected total number of pieces of work, not 10% of those pieces submitted by the deadline. Late pieces of work do not need to be moderated unless the total is significant, then the course team should consider if a sample is moderated.

This policy applies to UEA validated Awards at the following institutions:

City College Norwich

East Sussex College Group

INTO

Mountview Academy of Theatre Arts

SMB Group (Brooksby Melton College)

South Essex College

The Royal Marsden School

West Suffolk College