**LTC11D107**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Title:** | **Policy on Internal Moderation and Double Marking** |
| Author: | Sara Connolly |
| Date: | 12 July 2012 |
| Circulation: | Learning and Teaching Committee- 25 July 2012 |
| Agenda: | LTC11A007 |
| Version: | Final |
| Status: | Open |

**Issue**

A report from the Working Group on Internal Moderation, with regard to a revised policy on Internal Moderation and Double Marking.

This group was instigated by the Academic Director of Taught Programmes and tasked with reviewing the University's existing internal moderation processes and regulations with a view to producing recommendations for a revised set of processes/regulations for LTC to consider. The recommendations are for changes to the internal moderation process in 2013/14 and they will, if approved, sit alongside the New Academic Model and will feature within both the CoP on Assessment, and the regulations relating to the NAM.

**Recommendation**

LTC members are asked to consider the recommendations contained in the report from the Working Group.

**Resource Implications**

There will be changed procedures with changes demands placed on academic and administrative colleagues.

**Risk Implications**

The recommendations contained will have a 'risk' element for the University in the sense that decisions about policy/processes will have an impact on practice and thus outcomes for students. However, the aim of the recommendations of the Working Group are to produce a simpler, more streamlined moderation process that ensures that staff and students can have faith in the marks awarded to students and the maintenance of academic standards across the institution.

**Equality and Diversity**

It is not envisaged that any of the recommendations contained in the report will impact on groups with protected characteristics.

**Timing of decisions**

The report from the Director of Taught Programmes contains recommendations that need to be 'signed-off' by LTC.

**Further Information**

Contact: Dr Adam longcroft, Academic Director of Taught Programmes, UEA  01603 592261 a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk
Contact: Dr Sara Connolly, telephone 01603 593410, email: sara.connolly@uea.ac.uk for enquiries about the content of the paper

**Background**
A working group was set up by the Academic Director of Taught Programmes to review the University policy on Internal Moderation and Double Marking.  The group consisted of:
Chair: Sara Connolly (NBS)
FMH rep: Sandra Gibson (MED)
SSF rep: Helena Gillespie (ADLT, SSF)
HUM rep: Sanna Inthorn (ADTL, HUM)
SCI rep: Helen James (BIO)
LTS rep: John Tully
Julia Jones (LTS) in support

The group met on 3 occasions and consulted Teaching Directors, Chairs of Examiners and other interested parties.

**Discussion**
The report from the Academic Director for Taught Programmes draws attention to a number of policy recommendations that LTC is asked to consider/approve.

**A Copy of the terms of reference provided by the ADTP to the members of the Working Group on Internal Moderation & Double-marking.**

**The Brief:**
Simplify and find a means of articulating clearly the University requirement around double marking (what is it, when is it needed, to what extent) and moderation (what is it, how is it performed, by whom) with minimal room for variant practices (only where required by external PSRB) [Jon Sharp]

**Background:**
The University, via the Academic Director of Taught Programmes, is working towards a new Code of Practice on Assessment. In order to develop this new code, there are areas where current practices need to be reviewed and simplified, both to reduce complexity and cost, and to ensure more consistent practices within the University. One area of practice that needs to be examined is that relating to double-marking and internal moderation (internal verification). The University's published policy on double-marking is arguably unnecessarily vague, permissive and confusing, allowing, as it does, considerable variance but with no real justification or purpose. The same can be said of the policy on internal moderation – as a result the latter operates quite differently in different Faculties, which again leave the University vulnerable to complaints, challenges and appeals. The ADTP and LTS are keen to see internal moderation functioning in future as the formal process by which marks are confirmed, thus making Module Boards redundant. However, for this to happen, a consistent and robust (and simple) Internal Moderation process needs to be agreed.

**Terms of reference:**
The working group is tasked with exploring how the University's  requirements around <u>double marking</u> (what is it, when is it needed, to what extent?) and <u>internal moderation</u> (what is it, how is it performed, by whom?) can be simplified and clearly articulated, with minimal room for variant practices (only where required by external PSRBs).

Some questions:
1)  How much variance currently exists in terms of double-marking? Are each of the 5 different versions allowed for by the University all being employed?
2)  Is there value in agreeing a definition of double-marking which is that of blind double marking (i.e. two markers independently mark script and then agree final mark).
3)  Would there be value in limiting use of blind double marking to just dissertations, exam scripts and projects? These would not then need to be subjected to Internal Moderation. Why should dissertations/projects be double-marked anyway? If we achieve a robust system of Internal Moderation, can they be single marked?
4)  Must we keep double-marking for exam scripts? If so, how should double-marking operate? Ideally it should be used consistently across the University so students can have faith in their exam marks regardless of which School they are studying with...?
5)  What might be implications of having <u>all</u> other coursework submissions single-marked, but with consistent/robust internal moderation process as means of checking marking levels/consistency etc and confirming marks?
6)  How much variance exists in terms of the way that internal moderation/verification operates? Why does this variance exist? Does it have a sound basis – if so what are the implications for achieving a consistent/simple approach across the University?
7)  Can we abandon use of term Internal Verification altogether and its role as a form of double-marking, and use just Internal Moderation instead as the standard method by which marks are confirmed?
8)  What purpose should Internal Moderation serve? Should it primarily be a matter of quality assurance (i.e. just to confirm marks and veracity of mark range, marking levels etc) or should it be a

quality enhancement process and feed into wider QE processes, by giving internal moderators an opportunity to provide feedback on module design module assessment strategy, quality/quantity/value of the written feedback provided to students, etc?

9) Should we place any restrictions on staff able to undertake Internal Moderation? (e.g. should probationary staff, or staff with less than 2 years experience, be able to act as internal moderators?) Must moderation be carried out by a member of academic staff, or could it (in some cases) be delegated to an appropriate trained (paid) external assessor? (e.g. if there is only one expert on Japanese language in a school, who would moderate the module on 'An Introduction to Japanese'?).

10) Do PSRBs place requirements on Schools regarding marking or internal moderation procedures? How restrictive/prescriptive are these requirements? How can these requirements be taken into consideration in any future policy on double-marking or internal moderation?

11) How should 'samples' of scripts for internal moderation purposes be established? Can a simple, consistent, requirement (e.g. % proportion of scripts) be agreed and employed across all 4 faculties? In large cohorts, should a 'cap' on number of scripts included in a sample, be established? Who should 'choose' the sample? Academic module leaders, or LTS staff in HUBS? Or should the 'sample' be totally random (arguably fairer)?

12) Are there instances of practice in other HEI's which might usefully inform our future policy/practices in relation to both double-marking and internal moderation?

**Report from the Internal Moderation Working Group**

## Marking and Moderation Definitions and Procedure

*Submission*

Any item of summative assessment – coursework or examination.

*Marking*

Each submission is considered and a mark is awarded based on the marking criteria.

*Double marking*

Copies of each submission are marked 'blind' or 'unseen' by two or more independent markers. If markers disagree, they can change/alter marks on an individual submission. If the markers cannot agree, the submission will be sent to an appropriate third party who will adjudicate. Unless a discrepancy is identified work which has been double marked is not moderated.

Where a submission has not been double marked, a sample is moderated under the following circumstances:

- a submission contributes at least 30% to the overall module mark,
- where concerns or issues are raised through other QA processes.

If none of the above apply, moderation is not a requirement but may be undertaken if appropriate.

*Moderation*

Moderator looks at a sample of submissions, checks application of marking criteria by each marker and considers the overall distribution of marks.

The Module organiser identifies a suitable sample in order for the moderator to ensure consistent application of marking criteria and that consistent marking standards are applied across markers.

The Module Organiser will decide on the size and content of the sample for moderation. In compiling the sample the Module Organiser will take account of the following: (1) submissions across the full range of marks, including fails, (2) submissions marked by each marker, (3) the minimum size of the sample, which should be at least 10% of all work submitted or 10 submissions.

If the moderator identifies significant inconsistencies or an anomalous distribution of marks, they can suggest remarking or a suitable adjustment of marks:

- for all of the work marked, but not individual submissions;
- for the all of the work marked by individual markers, but not individual submissions;
- for sections within a submission for all submissions.

---

**Comment [SC1]:** Need to tie this in with the revised procedures on re-marking and appeals. We'd suggest that a re-mark cannot be requested where work has been double marked but can be requested when the work has been moderated.

**Comment [SC2]:** Guidelines to cover when this might be suitable for supervised projects or dissertations or where each marker is responsible for assessing different aspect of criteria. Also to note that double marking may reduce demand for re-marks.

**Comment [SC3]:** Guidelines to cover who might be 'appropriate' - Teaching Director, Chair of Exam Board, Assessment co-ordinator or another subject specialist.

**Comment [SC4]:** Guidelines to cover what this might mean - incorrect application of marking criteria or anomalous distribution of marks.

**Comment [SC5]:** Guidelines to cover these - through fail rates, student evaluation, external examiner, extreme marks, good honours ...

**Comment [SC6]:** Guidelines –to cover this QAA, Prof bodies, large modules (e.g. 40 or 60 credits), synoptic assessments ...

**Comment [SC7]:** We are assuming that this will be the responsibility of the Module Organiser and we understand this is a recommendation from ProcessFIX, this could be undertaken by a suitable nominee.

**Comment [SC8]:** Could or should this be the same sample that is sent to the external? Benefit in terms of process if it is the same sample but reduces rigour.

**Comment [SC9]:** Guidelines to cover what this might mean - incorrect application of marking criteria or anomalous distribution of marks. Interpretation may need to be tighter for particular professional bodies.

**Comment [SC10]:** Guidelines to cover this – where concerns relate to one submission only or to particular parts of the distribution (e.g. fails)

In the case of disagreement between the moderator and the module organiser, an appropriate third party will adjudicate.

Moderation is usually completed before marked work is returned to the Hubs/students.

*External review*

In some exceptional circumstances, because the School does not have sufficient relevant subject or language expertise, it may not be possible to double mark or moderate assignments internally.  In such cases, the school should make a case to the relevant Associate Dean for the assignment to be reviewed externally.

Where approval has been granted by the Associate Dean, the School appoints an external assessor with the relevant expertise, the marked work is returned to the Hubs/students but the marks are provisional.  Copies of the work and the distribution of marks are sent to the external assessor for review.

The external assessor can confirm the marks or suggest appropriate adjustment of marks:

- where the external reviewer sees all of the submissions, this is equivalent to double marking and adjustments may be made to individual marks;
- where the external reviewer sees a sample of the submissions, this is equivalent to moderation and the possible adjustments are as above.

In the case of disagreement between the external assessor and the module organiser, an appropriate third party will adjudicate.

# MODERATION FORM

FOR COURSEWORK AND EXAMINATIONS where the work is not double marked

**UEA**
University of East Anglia

| SECTION A: MODULE AND ASSESSMENT DETAILS *(to be completed by the module organiser)* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Module Code, Title | | Level | |
| Assignment Title/Number/Weight | | Number of markers (Please list names overleaf) | |
| Academic year | | Autumn ☐　　　Spring ☐　　　Year-long ☐ | |
| Module Organiser | | Module credits　10　20　30　40　60　90 | |
| Moderator's name | | Date sample passed to Moderator | |

| SECTION B: MODERATOR'S REPORT *(to be completed by the moderator)* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Do you agree that the marks awarded are appropriate? | | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |
| If you have answered **'No',** please indicate why. E.g. If you disagreed with the 1st markers judgement on any aspect of the marking for the module please provide evidence (e.g. descriptive statistics across markers) and any other details: | | | | | |
| Do you recommend that marks should be adjusted? | | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |
| Please indicate the recommended adjustment: | | | | | |
| Moderator's signature | | Date moderation completed | | | |

*Once completed, please return to the Module Organiser*

| SECTION C: MODULE ORGANISER'S RESPONSE *(to be completed by the module organiser)* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *(If applicable)* Do you agree to any adjustment suggested by the moderator? | | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |
| *(If applicable)* Please indicate the rationale for your decision: | | | | | |
| Module organiser's signature | | Date | | | |

*If the module organiser and the moderator are in agreement, please forward the marks to LTS; if not, please refer to the Adjudicator for a decision:*

| SECTION D: ADJUDICATOR'S DECISION *(to be completed by the Adjudicator if required)* | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Do you agree to any adjustment suggested by the moderator? | | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |
| Please indicate the rationale for your decision: | | | | | |
| Adjudicator's signature | | Date | | | |

*Once completed, please return this form to the Module Organiser, who should then forward the marks to LTS*

# MODERATION FORM CONTINUATION SHEET (MARKER LIST)
FOR COURSEWORK AND EXAMINATIONS where the work is not double marked

**UEA**
University of East Anglia

| MODULE, ASSESSMENT AND MARKER DETAILS *(to be completed by the module organiser)* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Module Code, Title | | Assignment Title / Number / Weight | |

| Marker No. | Marker's Name | Total number of students/scripts for this marker | Number of this marker's scripts moderated |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |

| | **Totals** | | |
|---|---|---|---|