

MODERATION OF MARKED ASSESSMENT

This form is used to ensure that marked assessments have been through an internal and external review process. This form should be completed for each assessment for a particular module.

PARTNER (and taught location if relevant):					
EXTERNAL EXAMINER NAME:	Adele Doran				
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR :	Graham Harvey				
MODULE TITLE:	Ecology of Adventure				
MODULE CODE:	BMOE4005		MODULE LEVEL:	Level 4	
COMPONENT NO. (e.g. 1 of 2):	1		COMPONENT WEIGHTING (e.g. 50% of the module):	50%	
ASSESSMENT PERIOD	☒ Semester 1	☐ Semester 1 Re-sit	☐ Semester 2	☐ Semester 2 Re-sit	<i>Other, please state</i>
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT:	☒ Coursework		☐ Examination		☐ Practical
LANGUAGE OF ASSESSMENT:	English		TRANSLATION PROVIDED:	No	
TURNITIN CHECK FOR UNFAIR PRACTICE:	Yes /				

Students listed in the sample below must be registered on a UWTSD award.

FOR COMPLETION BY INTERNAL MODERATOR					
After moderation I am able to agree the marks of the sample as shown below.					
Student Name	1 st Marker mark	Moderator/ 2 nd Marker	Moderator/3 rd Marker	Agreed Mark	Comment
Dylan Jones	10	12		10	References have been listed but not cited, although poorly formatted.
Lauren Reynolds	28	27		28	Not a single reference used to justify any marks against assessment criteria 1
Matthew Hilyer	46	46		46	Agreed
Lewis Ensor	54	54		54	Agreed
Isobel Francis	61	61		61	Agreed
Holly Walker	81	81		81	Agreed

INTERNAL MODERATOR (or second marker)		Please ✓		Comments
		YES	NO	
1	Has agreement on the marks been reached?	✓		
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?	✓		Summative and in text feedback comments identify areas for improvement
3	Is feedback constructive?	✓		Yes, with examples given where improvements are needed. Sometimes the summative feedback is lengthy and possibly too much information for the student to take on board.
4	Is the feedback linked to the appropriate category/ classification of the assessment criteria?	✓		In text comments are not always linked to the assessment criteria and this would help students understand their grading better.
5	Is the feedback consistent across the sample?	✓		Yes
6	Is there mention of improvement to referencing and consideration of unfair practice, where relevant?	✓		Yes
7	Actions to complete None <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			
8	How was agreement between markers reached? 1st marker completed marking prior to 2nd marker reviewing a representative sample of submissions, giving due consideration to the assessment specification and marking criteria given. Grading and feedback discussed before agreeing on marking. <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			

INTERNAL MODERATOR (or third marker, only where required, i.e. where the first two markers have been unable to reach a resolution)		Please ✓		Comments
		YES	NO	
1	Has agreement on the marks been reached?			
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?			
3	Is feedback constructive?			
4	Is the feedback linked to the appropriate category/ classification of the assessment criteria?			
5	Is the feedback consistent across the sample?			
6	Is there mention of improvement to referencing and consideration of unfair practice, where relevant?			
7	Actions to complete <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			
8	How was agreement between markers reached?			

	<i>This box will expand as you type</i>
--	---

FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION ONLY

PARTNERSHIP TEAM LEADER		Please ✓		Comments
		YES	NO	
1	Has appropriate internal moderation taken place?			
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?			
3	Is feedback constructive?			
4	Is the feedback linked to the appropriate category/ classification of the assessment criteria?			
5	Is the feedback consistent across the sample?			
6	Is there mention of improvement to referencing and consideration of unfair practice, where relevant?			
7	Actions to complete <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			

EXTERNAL EXAMINER REVIEW ONLY FOR THOSE MODULES / ASSESSMENT COMPONENTS detailed in the annual GA15 External Examiner Agreement

EXTERNAL EXAMINER		Please ✓		Comments
		YES	NO	
1	Has appropriate internal moderation taken place?			
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?			
3	Is feedback constructive?			
4	Is the feedback linked to the assessment criteria?			
5	Is the feedback consistent across the sample?			
6	Is there mention of improvement to referencing and consideration of unfair practice, where relevant?			
7	Actions to complete <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			

Signed (internal moderator): D Leonard	Date: 30.01.25
Signed (Partnership Team Leader):	Date:
Signed (External Examiner):	Date:

UWTSD PROVISION: please submit the completed document to the appropriate Programme Manager.

COLLABORATIVE PROVISION: please submit the completed document (or make available electronically) to the Partnership Team Leader. This must be in accord with specific arrangements for sharing electronic documents (e.g. via SharePoint or similar).

NOTES ON MODERATION

All assessments which contribute to a final award/degree classification must be subject to moderation. At their discretion, Institutes may use double-marking in place of moderation.

Where moderation is used, a Moderation of Marked Assessment report (Appendix GA28) should be completed.

A list of marks for all assessment components for all students in the module should accompany the Moderation Form.

A representative sample of at least six pieces of work should be identified for moderation and should include:

- examples of work in the first class category (or equivalent for other awards);
- examples of work in the fail category;
- examples of work from each classification;
- examples of work within 2% of a classification boundary (or equivalent for other awards);
- any work on which the marker wishes for a second opinion.

If the moderation process identifies concerns relating to the marking in one or more categories, all work in the identified category must be double-marked and any residual differences in marks awarded by two markers must be resolved by means of discussion and negotiation. If such resolution is not possible, the work must be marked by a third marker identified by the Chair of the relevant Progression/Award Board. The marks awarded by the third marker are final. The process by which a final mark is agreed must be carefully documented so that the external examiner is able to follow that process.

Where a module is delivered by a collaborative partnership institution, moderation is normally a two stage process, with internal moderation at the collaborative partnership institution followed by University moderation.

THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE IN WELSH