

IPC Marking and Moderation Policy (June 2015)

This policy incorporates the University Regulations, Faculty Policy and expands on these when necessary.

Introduction (ref section A3.6.1 of the University Regulations)

i. Higher education institutions are expected to have in place transparent and fair systems for marking and moderation (UK Quality Code, chapter B6). The University needs to be assured that robust, effective and consistent internal moderation processes are being applied in all Departments across all Faculties. The details of these processes are likely to vary according to local circumstances and professional body requirements, but all Faculties should work to common definitions and minimum requirements.

Definitions (ref section A3.6.2)

i. Internal moderation of assessed work is the process of ensuring that assessment criteria are applied consistently by examiners, that students are being treated fairly through the assessment process, and that there is a shared understanding of the academic standards students are expected to achieve. Moderation is the process of ensuring that the marks awarded for an assessment task across a module are within reasonable limits, in the context of the criteria against which students' work is being assessed.

ii. Moderation is limited to sampling and second marking a representative number of pieces of assessed work across the marking range from a cohort of students.

iii. Second marking is the process in which a second allocation of marks is given to each piece of work by a second internal examiner. This process may either be carried out blind (where the second examiner does not have access to the marks and comments of the first marker) or sighted (where the second examiner can view the marks and comments of the first marker, and adds their own).

Principles (ref section A3.6.3)

i. All assessed work submitted for the award of University credit must be subject to a process of internal moderation, consistent with the moderation policy. This applies to all modes of assessment in all delivery locations.

ii. The process by which marks for assessed work will be allocated, including details of the internal moderation process to which it will be subject, should be clearly communicated to students along with the criteria for assessment.

iii. Evidence that an internal moderation process has taken place must be available for scrutiny by external examiners and other interested parties.

Timing (ref section A3.6.4)

- i. Moderation of coursework marks should be completed within an appropriate timescale in order to allow for the timely return of agreed marks and feedback to students under the terms of the Assessment Compact. IPC expects that normally feedback will be returned to students within 5 weeks of first submission.
- ii. The internal moderation process must be completed prior to the upload of marks onto the system for Examination Committees.
- iii. Assessed work that has been through the internal moderation process may be returned to students prior to the Examination Committee on condition that the feedback sheet clearly informs them that the mark given remains subject to confirmation.

Procedures (ref section A3.6.5)

First marking

- i. Completed assessments should be first marked by appropriately experienced members of the IPC assessment team. Evidence of marking and an indication of how the marks have been allocated should be shown on the assessment template.
- ii. All assessments by inexperienced members of the IPC assessment team will be double marked by an experienced member of the team until the Course Director is satisfied with the level of assessment.

Second marking

- iii. The internal moderator for the module/cohort (a member of academic staff other than the first marker/s) should then sighted second mark a sample of completed assessments. Samples should:
 - be representative of every cohort and every mode of study;
 - be drawn from, and reflect, the full range of marks, and must include all refer/fail grades;
 - be of an appropriate size with respect to the size of the cohort – usually a minimum of a square root sample per cohort is second marked;
 - include all components of the assessment for the module.
- iv. If there is clear evidence from the sample selected that there are serious discrepancies in the marks being awarded, the Course Director should arrange for all the assignments affected (either within a specified grade band, or the whole cohort) to be re-marked.
- v. If there is disagreement between first and second markers and a final mark for a piece of work cannot be assigned, a third marker will review the student work and the marks and comments from the first and second markers, and then make a decision about the final mark.
- vi. Students should be provided with a single mark on their assessed work, as agreed by the internal examiners, and the feedback given on their performance

in the assignment must be consistent with the final assigned mark. In some cases this will require some re-writing of the feedback from the first marker before the work is returned to the student.

vii Normally in IPC second marking of coursework will entail one second marker seeing the marks and comments of the first marker. However, from time to time the Course Director will arrange for a sample of assessments to be blind second marked by all members of the assessment team.

Reporting

viii. The Course Director is responsible for reviewing the conduct and outcomes, and should draw any matters requiring attention to the Faculty Academic Enhancement and Standards Committee.

External moderation (ref section A3.6.6)

i. Where a sampling approach to internal moderation is adopted, the sample of work that is moderated may be the same sample sent to the External Examiner. If the sample that is sent to the external examiner does not include any of the work that has been sampled through the internal moderation process (for example, where a random sample is selected from across the grade bands), they should be provided with additional information about the internal moderation process that has been followed. In all circumstances, for each module there should be a clear statement to the External Examiner about the basis of moderation, and any amendments that have been made to either part or all of the profile.

ii. The role of the External Examiner is described in section A3.5 of the Regulations.