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# Introduction

* 1. Moderation is a standard feature of collaborative provision, a process that allows the University to assure itself that the standards of its awards are being maintained in those programmes delivered by partners, and that students seeking an award from the University are being assessed in a way that is directly comparable to students studying on campus. The process of moderation ensures consistency, fairness and rigour in the assessment of students, to ensure parity of standards and that the level of achievement of students reflects the required academic standards comparable to the University and nationally.
  2. This code details two moderation processes which are specific to collaborative provision; scrutiny of assessment tasks and the review of student output. The purpose of this code is to ensure that consistent moderation practices are adopted across the University, by providing faculties and partners with a process framework and to provide guidance for those involved in implementing and overseeing the moderation process.
  3. The moderation process carried out by the University is additional to the partners’ own internal marking and moderation processes and to the role carried out by the external examiner. Partners **must** ensure that their internal processes are rigorous and not reliant on the University moderation process, and that partners have their own policy on internal scrutiny of assessment tasks.
  4. This code applies to summative assessment tasks and student work on programmes delivered by partners (undergraduate and postgraduate) leading to University of Hull awards, including validated and franchised awards, for UK and international partners.

# General Information

* 1. Effective moderation depends on appropriate scheduling and management of the processes by the University and Partner Institution. The appointed University Academic Contact and Partner Institution Programme Contact(s) are central to planning the process of moderation and ensuring that the requirements of this code are met. In the moderation of non-comparable programmes, the External Academic Contact fulfils the role of the University Academic Contact. See Collaborative Provision Quality and Standards Handbook for further information on the role of Academic Contact.
  2. Responsibility is devolved to University faculties in determining the level of moderation required, in terms of the number of modules and assessment tasks to be moderated. Volume will depend on a number of criteria including: the length of time the partnership has been established; the length of time the programme has been running; the higher education experience of the lecturer at the partner institution; the level of the module and contribution to the overall degree classification. Information on minimum requirements for all partnerships, whether established or new is detailed below.

# Scrutiny of the Assessment Task

* 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).
  2. 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.
  3. Faculties can determine the number of assessment tasks to be moderated through discussion with the partner institution, based on2.2 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.
  4. A typical outcome of scrutiny of assessment task would be confirmation that 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.
  5. 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.

## Procedure for the Scrutiny of Assessment Tasks

* 1. The University Academic Contact and partner contacts **should** agree assessment tasks to be moderated for the forthcoming trimester or academic year, along with an appropriate submission timescale. The timescale **should** ensure that there is adequate time for assessment tasks to be reviewed and returned to the partner institution prior to release to students.
  2. Partner colleges **must** submit assessment task(s) to the University Academic Contact alongside or embedded within the module handbook.
  3. The University Academic Contact completes a report which is returned to the partner which details the outcome, and any actions as follows:

1. Approved. The assessment task is approved.
2. Approved subject to minor changes. The assessment task is approved subject to minor changes.
3. Not approved. The assessment task is not approved and revision/resubmission of the task is required.
   1. If external examiner comment is required, this can be sought alongside the comment from the Academic Contact or following approval. The faculty and partner college can decide who is responsible for submitting the report to the External Examiner.
   2. It is the responsibility of the faculty to track, monitor and record scrutiny of assessment tasks, to ensure that the process is timely, adheres to the minimum requirement listed above and to ensure records are kept to demonstrate activity in this area.

# 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 board.
  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:

1. At least 50% of the modules on an undergraduate programme,
2. 100% of modules of a masters programme.
   1. 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.
   2. 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 exhibitions.

## Procedure for the Review of Student Output

* 1. The University Academic Contact and partner agree modules to be moderated, along with an appropriate submission timescale, for the forthcoming trimester or academic year. The timescale **should** ensure that there is adequate time for student output to be reviewed prior to the holding of any module boards.
  2. The partner college makes available to the University Academic Contact, the student output for the module, including the module handbook, assessment task (if separate) first and second marking information and a mark grid displaying programme and module details and the marks by student (using registration number only.) Although the whole batch of work is made available (usually via the VLE), the University Academic Contact will only view a sample of these.
  3. The University Academic Contact completes a report which is returned to the partner, providing feedback on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the marking system. In some cases, normally where significant concerns have been identified, the Academic Contact may recommend alterations to marks by the module board. Any recommendation to the module board to alter marks **should** either be whole or part cohort adjustment, for example with a particular set of the mark range but would not normally involve adjustment of individual marks.
  4. If timescales allow, the partner **should** ensure that the University Academic Contact’s report is included in the student output sent to the external examiner for transparency.
  5. It is the responsibility of the faculty to track, monitor and record moderation of student assessment, to ensure that the process is timely, adheres to the minimum requirement listed above, and to ensure records are kept to demonstrate activity in this area. Faculties **should** ensure that data storage meets with current GDPR requirements.
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