# **Moderation of Assessment Tasks and Student Output**

***For completion by Partner Institution prior to submission to the Academic Contact***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner institution:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Programme of study:**  *Please give the* ***full title*** *of all programmes and variants covered by the report* | | |
|  | | |
| **Module title:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Module level and credit value:** | | |
|  | | |
| **Author of assessment**  *Please provide name/contact details for the author of the assessment at the partner institution* | | |
|  | | |
| **Academic Contact:**  *Please provide name, position and contact details* | | |
|  | | |
| **Module Specification Submitted**  *Please submit the module specification/handbook with assessment task* | | |
|  | | |
| **Evidence of approval in Partner Institution** | **YES** | **NO** |

# Scrutiny of Assessment Tasks

1. A **sample of new summative assessment tasks** must be approved by the University Academic Contact prior to the release to students. Assessment tasks are defined as: examination papers, assignment briefs, coursework questions and reassessment questions. All assessment tasks for a given module should be submitted for scrutiny at the same time to ensure that the full range of assessment for the module can be considered, (although it is acknowledged that reassessment tasks may need to be submitted at a later date).

Specific assignments which are negotiated with students are subject to the same approval but in these cases the approval may relate to the nature and broad focus of the task. Partners must clearly identify which tasks are to be negotiated with students and make this clear at the point of submission.

1. Faculties can **determine the number of assessment tasks to be moderated through discussion** with the partner institution, based on above. If practicable and necessary, faculties can request to approve all assessment tasks before they are released to students. Faculties must however, as a minimum, review assessment tasks on a rotational basis to ensure that each module’s assessment tasks are reviewed at least once in every three academic years.
2. A typical outcome of scrutiny of assessment task would be confirmation that the the task is appropriate and clear and that no amendments are required. In some cases, the University Academic Contact may request alterations prior to release to students, for example, the rewording of a question, revision of a question or task to better allow students to demonstrate learning outcomes, or clarification of format for an examination. However, there may be instances where the assessment task is not approved and a resubmission is required.
3. The module or programme external examiner is entitled to be consulted on all summative assessment tasks. The precise range of tasks which the external examiner wishes to see, and the timing of the consultation, must be discussed with the external examiner in advance.

***For completion by UoH Academic Contact***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Please indicate agreement/disagreement below:** | | | | | **YES** | **NO** | **N/A** | |
| Assessment is in line with size and weighting given in the module specification | | | | |  |  |  | |
| Assessment is appropriate for the level | | | | |  |  |  | |
| Assessment is relevant to the module requirements / programme competencies | | | | |  |  |  | |
| Assessment is clear and unambiguous | | | | |  |  |  | |
| The model answer / marking scheme, if provided, is appropriate  *NB: where necessary numeric questions should be worked through to ensure accuracy* | | | | |  |  |  | |
| Time requirements for each question are appropriate *(examinations only)* | | | | |  |  |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| **Comments on Assessment 1:**  *Please include the assessment title and percentage weighting and comment on the suitability of this assessment for meeting the programme competencies as well as its fit with module content and other assessments on the module* | | | | | | | | |
| **Assessment Title:**  **Percentage Weighting:**  **Comments:** | | | | | | | | |
| *Approved* |  | *Approved with amendments (no resubmission required)* |  | *Not approved (resubmission required)* | | | |  |
| **Comments on Assessment 2 (if needed):**  *Please include the assessment title and percentage weighting and comment on the suitability of this assessment for meeting the programme competencies as well as its fit with module content and other assessments on the module* | | | | | | | | |
|
| **Assessment Title:**  **Percentage Weighting:**  **Comments:** | | | | | | | | |
| *Approved* |  | *Approved with amendments (no resubmission required)* |  | *Not approved (resubmission required)* | | | |  |
| *Date completed: Signature:* | | | | | | | | |
| **Resubmitted assessments:** | | | | | | | | |
| *Assessment 1* | |  | | | | | | |
| *Approved* |  | *Approved with amendments (no resubmission required)* |  | *Not approved (resubmission required)* | | | |  |
| *Assessment 2* | |  | | | | | | |
| *Approved* |  | *Approved with amendments (no resubmission required)* |  | *Not approved (resubmission required)* | | | |  |
| *Date completed: Signature:* | | | | | | | | |

# Review of Student Output

1. Review of student output requires **a sample of student work to be moderated** by the University Academic Contact. Student output is defined as; completed examination scripts, coursework, assignments, reports, practical work, dissertations i.e. work by students that will contribute to the overall module mark. The review of student output complements that of the external examiner, checking that the standards are comparable to others in the sector.
2. Review of student output **does not involve detailed second marking**; moderation works at the macro level and does not relate to the output of an individual student (as second marking does). **Moderation involves a judgement of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the marking system**. The University Academic Contact, through dialogue and **sufficient sampling should confirm the effectiveness of the partner’s internal process**, and where it is not deemed to be effective, arrive at an agreed set of student marks. Review of student output can take place on a trimester basis or if preferred at the end of each academic year but prior to the module baord.
3. Faculties can determine the number of modules to be reviewed per programme in an academic year, based on the higher education experience of the partner. Where a programme or partnership is new, faculties must **as a minimum review:**
4. **At least 50% of the modules on an undergraduate programme**
5. **100% of modules of a masters programme.**

For established partnerships it is **recommended that student output is reviewed on a rotational basis** to ensure that output is reviewed for every module at least once in every three academic years.

Where it is not practicable to carry out the moderation as detailed in this code because of the nature of the task, faculties must consider alternative means to facilitate this process such as attending presentations, performances and exhibitiions.

***For completion by UoH Academic Contact***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment One: First Marker (partner institution):** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Assessment One: Second Marker / Moderator (partner institution):** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Assessment Two: First Marker (partner institution):** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Assessment Two: Second Marker / Moderator (partner institution):** | | | |
|  | | | |
| **Please indicate agreement/disagreement below:** | **YES** | **NO** | **N/A** |
| I have been able to access all relevant work for this module |  |  |  |
| The second marking / moderation process is clear |  |  |  |
| The student work is marked in line with, and is comparable to, work produced by students on UoH on-campus programmes |  |  |  |
| Marking is rigorous, fair, reliable and consistent |  |  |  |
| **Additional Comments:**  *Please comment, in the box below, on:*   * *spread and level of marks* * *appropriateness of comments any unusual patterns* * *disparity between different elements of the assessment* * *where there has been a discrepancy, it is clear how first and second marker have agreed the final grade* * *any other comments relating to the student work and marking on this module* | | | |
|  | | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Documents to be attached:** | **Y** | **N** |
| Assessment task |  |  |
| Evidence of second marking and judgements |  |  |
| Mark grid |  |  |
| Model answer / solution (if applicable) |  |  |