

LTC12D120

Title: **UEA Policy on Moderation & Double Marking**
Author: Dr Adam Longcroft (Academic Director of Taught Programmes)
Date: For LTC meeting of 15 May 2013
Circulation: *Learning & Teaching Committee – 15 May 2013*
Agenda: LTC12A005
Version: Final
Status: Open

OPEN

Issue

The ADTP has proposed a series of recommendations that provide additional clarity on the Policy on Moderation and Double Marking at UEA. The Policy was discussed at LTC in March 2013. Concerns were raised in relation to a number of areas. These are addressed in the ADTP's report.

Recommendation

The ADTP proposes 15 separate recommendations that provide additional clarity on key aspects of the Moderation Policy. LTC is asked to consider them for formal approval.

Resource Implications

The Policy on Double Marking & Moderation will have resource implications:

- 1) In some Schools the Policy will drive an increase in the number of assessment items that are moderated. This will require additional staff time in the moderation process – e.g. in Schools where team marking is common place on large modules. The Policy specifies circumstances where team marking should trigger moderation.
- 2) However, in some Schools where a high proportion of assessment items are currently double-marked, decisions may be taken to extend the use of moderation, resulting in a possible reduction of staff time (on the premise that moderation of a sample requires less time than being a second marker, looking at a much larger of scripts).
- 3) The Policy allows students to request a re-mark on any script not subject to blind double marking, (e.g. including coursework scripts and exam scripts which have been subject to moderation). This could lead to an increase in the number of such requests and an increase in staff time (in HUBS and Schools) required to deal with them.
- 4) However, an increase in re-marked scripts could result in a reduction in the number of formal Academic Appeals.

Risk Implications

The Policy is intended to ensure a more consistent use of double marking and moderation across the University. This should ensure more equal and equitable treatment of students across Faculties, which would leave the University less vulnerable to appeals/complaints focusing on unequal treatment. However, in some Schools the Policy may result in an increase in staff time spent on double marking or moderation. However, LTC may feel that this is a price worth paying in order to ensure more consistent standards in marking and assessment within the institution.

Equality and Diversity

It is not envisaged that the Policy or the ADTPs recommendations will have significant equality/diversity implications.

Timing of decisions

LTC is asked to approve the ADTP's recommendations for implementation on all Programmes and all Stages (Years) from Sept 2013.

Further Information

Contact: Dr Adam Longcroft, Academic Director of Taught Programmes, UEA 01603 592261
a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk

Background

Practices with regard to double-marking and moderation are currently subject to considerable variation between Schools and Faculties. The University's scores on Assessment in the SES and NSS lag behind those in other areas of the student experience. A more consistent and more transparent set of regulations governing Double Marking and Moderation is an important step towards addressing this. Feedback from students illustrates that they are often unclear about the manner in which marks are arrived at and the mechanisms in place to verify them – the Policy also addresses these concerns by specifying in clear language the processes that underpin the award of marks and their confirmation within the University.

Discussion

LTC is invited to consider the ADTP's recommendations in relation to the Policy document contained in Appendix A.

UEA Policy on Moderation & Double Marking

A copy of the paper produced by the Moderation & Double-marking Working Group was considered at the March meeting of TPPG and LTC. It is attached as **Appendix A** for ease of reference.

Following discussion at LTC in March and further consideration by the ADTP and senior LTS staff, and TPPG on 2/5/13, this paper sets out some principles and recommendations that LTC is asked to discuss and approve.

1) The future role of Module Boards

The Moderation Working Group has suggested removing Module Boards in favour of an end of year Review of Assessment and Moderation meeting in Schools. The proposals caused some concern at LTC in March since there does need to be an opportunity to consider module marks across programmes and to address any anomalies that might come to light. The end of year Annual Review of Assessment meeting would come too late to facilitate this. Consideration needs to be given, therefore, to the question of how anomalies and instances of erratic marks can be most effectively identified and addressed within the NAM. By the time that marks are presented to Module Boards marks have already been moderated and returned to students. Individual marks cannot be changed at Module Boards, and scaling (upwards) can only occur via a concession from the ADTP. Such requests are exceptionally rare. Module Boards therefore simply confirm marks in most cases which have effectively already been 'confirmed' via the moderation/double-marking process.

The relatively limited function of Module Boards has led some colleagues to question whether they are needed at all as we move to the NAM. When Schools were consulted on this question in Autumn 2011, there were varied responses (see below) with some Schools in favour, and some not.

Schools in favour of retaining module boards:

- AHP
- CMP
- MTH – could be a 'moderation meeting' with external representation. MTH is not in favour of current concession to scale upwards from DTP – Schools that need to do this should have agreed procedure with DTP and follow this without need for concessions.
- DEV - for exam board or similar group to look at distribution of marks in different modules each year. Useful to have a brief meeting to confirm marks across courses and modules, and compare stats etc.
- LAW
- SWP

Schools in favour of abandoning module boards:

- MED – we don't have them anyway
- ART – but would have to be careful checking. Sometimes errors are identified via Module Boards
- ENV- these seem redundant. A check still needs to be kept on mean and spread of marks for all modules, to detect outliers and feed back to module convenors for next year.

Undecided

- NSC

There is not, therefore, a consensus on this issue across Faculties. Whilst the 'powers' of Module Boards are relatively limited since marks are already effectively confirmed by moderation, as several

of the Schools have noted, they do provide a useful 'check' and provide a valuable 'oversight' across a programme which helps to monitor consistency etc.

Given the fact that no consensus exists, we might wish to exercise caution at this stage. Many changes will occur as a result of the NAM in terms of Algorithms, course structure, operation of reassessment (by item), module sizes, use of summative and formative assessment, weightings of years etc and there will also be a new UEA Learning & Teaching Strategy, a new CoP on Assessment, new regulations relating to extenuating circumstances, a new policy on Plagiarism & Collusion etc. Given the breadth of these changes, and the impact these will have on staff, it may be wise to retain some processes which are VERY familiar and which provide a useful QA purpose. There may be value, therefore in retaining Module Boards whilst we are seeing-out current students which will provide an opportunity for the new Moderation & Double Marking policy to become embedded, and for the Annual School Reviews of Assessment & Moderation, to develop in such a way that robust oversight can be established without the need for Module Boards. In the interim, we could look at whether we could confirm modules on SITS at an earlier stage, being mindful of what marks are visible/not visible on eVision, in an effort to speed up the admin processes at exam board time – they wouldn't be officially 'confirmed' though, regulatory-speaking, until the Board had confirmed them.

Recommendation 1:

Retain Module Boards whilst we are seeing-out current students under the old CCS regulations.

2) The 'threshold' for Moderation

The Working Group has proposed a 30% threshold – e.g. any item of assessment weighted at 30% or more of the module mark should be subject to moderation. SCI colleagues at TPPG expressed concern that this would add to staff workloads. At the March meeting of TPPG it was suggested that a compromise of 50% might be more appropriate. Subsequent to this meeting the ADTP investigated practice at 27 other HEIs (**See Appendix B**). The results of this investigation suggest that UEA would be highly idiosyncratic if it adopted a 50% threshold. Only one case where the ADTP has been able to identify clear regulations – at Loughborough – does a 50% threshold apply. All the other HEIs where regulations are specific on this issue either require all assessments to be moderated, or have a threshold of 10%, 20%, 25% or 30%. Given this, it is the view of the ADTP that the University should adhere to the **30%** threshold originally proposed by the Working Group on Moderation.

Recommendation 2:

The University should adhere to the Working Group's suggestion of a **30%** threshold.¹

Other recommendations:

Recommendation 3:

Schools should, as proposed by the Working Group, convene an **Annual Review of Assessment** and Moderation meeting. The function of the Annual Meeting should be to identify enhancements for the following academic year, and not to address any issues in-year.

Recommendation 4:

Although we are bringing in new regs for new students under the NAM, moderation does not really affect these Regs. We should therefore introduce the new moderation policy as a '**big bang**' in 2013/14 for all Stages both to avoid confusion and to clarify requirements sooner rather than later.

¹ Where Schools need a 'period of grace' to make the adjustments necessary to their assessment strategies, the ADTP should consider appropriate concessions.

Recommendation 5:

The Moderation policy as currently proposed covers non-‘honours’ levels 3 and 4 (in the new FHEQ parlance), and the proposal is **that we only look at fails** for these non-counting years.²

Recommendation 6:

That externals are routinely sent or provided with **‘moderated’ samples** – that is the sample of work which has been subject to moderation. If externals wish to see more work they are free to make such a request and it is expected that schools will comply with such requests.³

Recommendation 7:

As is in the case of a number of Universities, UEA should design and use a **standard Internal Moderation Form**. The form needs to take into account point 5.8.11 in the Moderation Policy – the final judgement of an adjudicator if 1st marker and moderator cannot agree.

Recommendation 8:

Point 5.7.4 on Presentations - ensure that **all class oral presentations are double-marked or taped**, regardless of their weighting, in order to avoid the re-mark issue. Those weighted at less than 30% are just as likely to be challenged by students and we don’t want to have to ask them to ‘do it again’ – which is often not feasible anyway. Giving Schools the option of making some of these formative is a constructive way forward.

Recommendation 9:

The University should adhere to the requirement proposed by the Working Group that there should be **at least one moderated item of assessment for each module** (at all levels, including level 3 and level 4), so if there are four items of assessment, each worth 25%, then at least one needs to be moderated, even though it is weighted at less than the 30% threshold.

Recommendation 10:

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. This is important in order to ensure that ‘team’ marking achieves a consistent marking level and spread of marks.

Recommendation 11:

It is recommended that a student **should be able to request a remark irrespective** of whether their script was included in the sample moderated or not.

Recommendation 11:

Students who submit a request for a re-mark should do so within **10 days** of publication of their mark on eVision.

Recommendation 12:

If scripts have been blind double-marked, students **should not** have the right to request that their work is remarked. However, if they have concerns about the conduct of the marking process they

² It is important that some kind of moderation does apply to Levels 3 and 4 since Fail marks, whilst not contributing to classification, do affect student progression. Students in level 3 of the Foundation year trying to transfer to level 4/year 1 of a BSc in one of the Science Schools will need to reach a certain threshold to transfer successfully, and their work needs to be robustly moderated. Likewise, students who are going abroad or on Integrated Masters courses also need to meet relevant thresholds in the non-honours year.

³ There is little to be gained from externals seeing moderated and un-moderated samples of work – this would increase workloads in LTS and if a sample for moderation is a truly ‘representative’ one, why would we want to include other pieces for the sample sent to external? This would enhance the ‘random’ element of moderation, but with what real gains?

should be able to submit an Academic Complaint in which they should set-out the basis for their concerns.

Recommendation 13:

The following paragraph should be inserted into section 5.7 of the draft Moderation Policy⁴:

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

Where a station/item 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 of a sample of stations for later review.*
- *post assessment analysis of assessor behaviour using relevant data.*

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.

Recommendation 14:

It is recommended that Schools choose how to manage the marking process with regard to exams⁵ 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 draft Moderation Policy

Schools should communicate to students the method pertaining to the Exam(s) in question.

If Schools choose Option B - the implications of this need to be recognised – it would mean that students could ask for an exam script to be re-marked, and could appeal against an exam mark (if Appeal is received within the 10 day limit).

Recommendation 15:

Amend section 5.11.3 - Evidence might include significantly different marks from peers whose marks normally fall within a similar marking band. The guidance to students should clearly & strongly advise them to see the relevant marker or academic adviser to discuss mark before asking for a re-mark.

Recommendation 16:

LTS to create a flow chart for the moderation and re-mark process.

Adam Longcroft
Academic Director for Taught Programmes
3 May 2013

⁴ Note: Following discussion at TPPG, FMH colleagues (Rosie Doy and Sandra Gibson) are exploring how to maximise the number of stations which are double-marked, or recorded for review purposes, whilst also maximising the number of stations/assessments moderated by 'roving moderators'.

⁵ There is a common misconception that all examination scripts are double marked at UEA. However, this does not happen in all Schools. In reality we do not have the time and staff resources to double mark every examination script. The Working Group's proposal that we should moderate exams is therefore justifiable and wise.

Appendix A

Moderation & Double-marking

This version of the Moderation paper was considered at the last TPPG/LTC in March 2013

Introduction

These proposals relating to moderation and double marking will eventually form a sub-section of a new *Code of Practice on Assessment* which is in development. The proposals contained herein represent the work of the Internal Moderation and Double Marking Review Group chaired by Sara Connolly.

5 Moderation of Assessed Work

- 5.1 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.
- 5.2 It is essential that marked coursework and exam scripts are properly scrutinised in order 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.
- 5.3 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, programmes, Schools and Faculties across the whole University;
 - Ensure equality and thus fairness of treatment for students.
- 5.4 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.
- 5.5 Moderation can take place in a number of ways and at UEA two major ways of dealing with moderation have been identified as set out below. The directions below represent a minimum requirement and Schools are free to carry out additional moderation if they wish.
- 5.6 Marking takes place before moderation, i.e. each submission is considered and a mark is awarded based on the marking criteria.

5.7 Blind/unseen double marking

- 5.7.1 Definition: Two examiners/assessors mark the assignment independently and subsequently agree a mark.
- 5.7.2 Blind/unseen double marking should be used for supervised projects or dissertations worth at least 40 credits.
- 5.7.3 Blind/unseen double marking should also take place where an assignment is the sole summative assessment for a module worth at least 40 credits.
- 5.7.4 Presentations weighted at 30% or more of the overall module mark should be double marked (by means of two markers attending the presentation) or recorded for purposes of moderation and/or remarking as necessary.

- 5.7.5 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, an appropriate third party will adjudicate.
- 5.7.6 The adjudicator should be an appropriate office holder within the School, for example:
- Chair of the Board of Examiners
 - School Director of Learning and Teaching
 - Assessment coordinator/lead or equivalent position
- 5.7.7 Adjudication duties may be shared so that the same person does not have to oversee every case within a School or 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 in order to determine the final mark for the assignment.
- 5.7.8 Where work has been double marked as set out above further moderation is not required.
- 5.7.9 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 (though a student may be eligible to submit an appeal relating to the assignment on other grounds, for example, inadequate supervision of a project).

5.8 Internal moderation

- 5.8.1 The module organiser shall be responsible for ensuring that moderation is carried out.⁶
- 5.8.2 Assessed work at levels 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
 - Any assignment which contributes at least 30% to the overall module mark
 - Assessment tasks marked by new or less experienced markers (*Note from ADTP: 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
- 5.8.3 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.
- 5.8.4 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

⁶ In other circumstances a suitable alternative person shall be responsible (for example, in the Norwich Medical School this may be the assessment lead). Depending on circumstances, the module organiser or other responsible person may not be directly involved in the sampling or moderation process, but shall be responsible for ensuring that it is done.

- 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.
- 5.8.5 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).
- 5.8.6 In some circumstances, because the School does not have the 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 Faculty Associate Dean for Teaching and Learning for the assignment to be reviewed externally. Where approval has been granted by the Associate Dean, the School will appoint an external moderator/assessor with the relevant expertise. The marked work should be returned to the Hub/students but the marks are provisional. Copies of the work and the distribution of marks will be sent to the external moderator for review.
- 5.8.7 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.
- 5.8.8 If the moderator identifies significant inconsistencies (i.e. where there is a variation of 10% or more between the original mark and the mark the moderator would award in at least 10% of the moderated submissions or where there is a discrepancy in the means of the two markers which is greater than 5%.) or an anomalous distribution of marks, s/he can suggest remarking or a suitable adjustment of marks:
- for all submissions, i.e. not for 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 practise);
 - for all of the work marked by individual markers, but not individual submissions;
 - for sections within a submission for all submissions (for example, where a problem is identified relating to one question on an examination paper).
- Any adjustment of marks should be recorded on the Moderator's report.
- 5.8.9 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.
- 5.8.10 The adjudicator should be an appropriate office holder within the School, for example:
- Chair of the Board of Examiners
 - School Director of Learning and Teaching
 - Assessment coordinator/lead or equivalent position
- 5.8.11 The adjudicator should consider the Moderator's report and may consult the External Examiners. The adjudicator shall be responsible for making the final judgement.
- 5.8.12 Internal moderation must be completed before marked work is returned to the Hubs/students.
- 5.8.13 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, see 5.11 below.

5.9 External examiners and external moderation

- 5.9.1 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, Schools 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. *(Note from ADTP: if the moderation sample has been selected in accordance with the requirements set out in these proposals, then it would probably provide a suitable and appropriate sample for the external examiner to moderate. It would also negate the need for LTS staff to select a different sample, and thus produce considerable savings in terms of staff time).*

LINK TO EXTERNAL EXAMINERS' CODE OF PRACTICE

5.10 School review of assessment and moderation

5.10.1 Marks are considered to be confirmed following internal moderation. Marks cannot be adjusted (via scaling or adjustment of individual marks) once moderation is complete.

5.10.2 Schools shall review their assessment strategy, and review and analyse information relating to module assessment with a view to:

- 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
- ensuring that the assessment strategy ensures that the programme meets external expectations (QAA benchmarks, professional body requirements)

This review should form part of the School's Quality Assurance processes.

LINK TO MODULE REVIEW, COURSE REVIEW AND UPDATE

5.10.3 Schools may use their existing structures to support this review process (i.e. Exam Boards, Teaching Committees/Executives), or they may convene a dedicated 'Assessment Group', the composition of which should reflect the structure/diversity of the subjects and programmes offered by School.

5.10.4 The Assessment Group or an equivalent body shall receive and consider moderators' reports.

5.10.5 Once moderation is complete for all assignments within a module the Learning and Teaching Service (LTS) shall confirm the module marks in the Student Records System.

5.10.6 The Assessment Group or its equivalent would usually hold a main annual meeting immediately after the stage and Final Examination Boards. LTS staff will support and assist Schools in convening such reviews and will provide information that enables anomalies and variations to be identified and discussed.

5.11 Student requests for a remark and student appeals

5.11.1 Where an assignment has been blind/unseen double marked (unseen), a student cannot request a remark or appeal the mark.

5.11.2 Where an assignment has been single marked (where no sample is reviewed) a student may request a remark (within the specified time scale).

5.11.3 Where an assignment has been moderated (where a sample has been reviewed, whether or not the student's submission was part of the moderation sample) a student may request a remark (within the specified timescale) but will need to provide justification (evidence is required):

- The mark is significantly at odds with the student's past marks
- The mark is not consistent with the feedback given
- Feedback suggests that part of the students submission has not been considered

- Marks are significantly different marks from those of peers whose marks normally fall within a similar mark band.

The University may then decide to offer a remark as a concession (NB there is no right of appeal against refusal to grant a concession).

Students are expected to discuss their mark with the relevant marker or with their academic advisor before asking for a re-mark.

5.11.4 Where an assignment has been double marked (either originally or as the result of a remark request) the student cannot appeal the mark.

LINK TO REGULATIONS ON REMARKS AND ACADEMIC APPEALS

Appendix B

The 'threshold' for Moderation and the Sample for Moderation in other HEIs

University	% Weighting threshold for moderation for individual assessments	Other comments
Salford	All assessments which form part of a module's assessment are subject to internal verification.	IV requirement only applies to levels 5, 6 and 7 (Masters), <u>not</u> level 4. Sample for moderation is minimum of 10 scripts, and norm of c.10% of cohort.
Wolverhampton	Not clear	10% sample is required for moderation. Minimum of 6 scripts in a small cohort.
Cardiff Metropolitan	Not clear	10% sample is required for moderation.
Birkbeck	30% threshold – work has to be second marked. If assessment is weighted at less than 30%, or is at level 4 or below, a 2 nd marker checks consistency of marks thru sampling (moderation).	
Loughborough	50% threshold for moderation.	
Cumbria	All assessments which form part of a module's assessment are subject to internal verification.	
Oxford Brookes	All assessments which form part of a module's assessment are subject to internal verification.	10% sample is required for moderation.
Manchester Metropolitan	Not clear	All fails, all above 68% and 10% sample in-between. <i>Sample probably around 20-30% in most cases.</i>
Kent	Not unclear	10% sample is required for moderation. Minimum of 6 scripts in a small cohort.
Anglia Ruskin	Not clear	25% sample is required for moderation.
Birmingham	Not clear	10% sample is required for moderation.
Sheffield Hallam	Not clear	10% sample is required for moderation.
Nottingham	All assessments which form part of a module's assessment are subject to internal verification.	Moderation can include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sampling of scripts • Additional marking of borderlines, first and fails • Additional marking where a disparity of marks exists between modules • Additional marking where there is disparity between different markers in a module.
Lancaster	25-30% threshold for double-marking or moderation	All exams moderated regardless of weighting
Exeter	All assessments which form part of a module's assessment are subject to double-marking or internal verification.	

Newcastle	<u>25%</u> threshold for double-marking or moderation	
Essex	Not clear	Students are not allowed to challenge marks once they have been moderated.
Sheffield	Left to departments to put in place appropriate moderation arrangements which reflect the nature of the assessment.	
Birmingham	<u>10%</u> threshold for double-marking or moderation	At least 60% of the assignments/assessments on a module should be moderated – i.e. if there are 5 equally weighted assessments of 20% weighting each, then three of these would be moderated.
Liverpool University	<u>20%</u> threshold for double-marking or moderation	Sample required for moderation is 25% or minimum of 10 scripts if cohort size is less than 40 students.
Leeds University	<u>20%</u> threshold for double-marking or moderation	
University of Derby	<u>All</u> assessments are moderated	Sample for moderation is square root of the total, min of 5 scripts. The sample should encompass all assessments within the module.
Glasgow University	Not clear	Sample should be 10% with a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 25 scripts. The sample to include all 'borderline' Fail marks.
Huddersfield University	Not clear	Sample should include 15% of the total number of scripts, or a minimum of 10 scripts.
Teesside University	Not clear	Sample to include: All marks above 70, all marginal Fails, and 10% sample in-between. For dissertations 10% of scripts are randomly chosen.
Warwick University	<u>All</u> assessments which contribute to Year 1 mark, or classification at the end of the course are moderated	Not clear
University of Bath	Not clear	Sample to include 10% of scripts, to include marks from key classification bands, all borderlines and all Fails. A minimum of 5 scripts