Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

APPENDIX GA28

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:	N/A		
EXTERNAL EXAMINER NAME:	CATHERINE MENON		
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR:	PHIL ORGAN		
MODULE TITLE:	**PRE PRODUCTION**		
MODULE CODE:	ADGD7006	**MODULE LEVEL:**	5
COMPONENT NO(S):	1 & 2	**COMPONENT(S) WEIGHTING**	2 x 50%
ASSESSMENT PERIOD	2023/4		
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT:	☒ Coursework /Portfolio	☐ Examination	☐ Practical
LANGUAGE OF ASSESSMENT:	**ENGLISH**	**TRANSLATION PROVIDED:**	☐ Yes | ☐ No
TURNITIN CHECK FOR UNFAIR PRACTICE:	☒ Yes | ☐ No		

Agreed Marking Process (According to GA15)		
☒ Internal Moderation	☐ Second marking	☐ Blind double marking

Please see AQH 7.8(4) for Moderation Regulations and Process. Students listed below must be registered on a UWTSD award.

COMPONENT 1 (WEIGHTING: 50%)

FOR COMPLETION BY INTERNAL MODERATOR OR SECOND MARKER
Sample of student work

	Student Name	1st Marker (Mark)	Moderator (Agree / Disagree)	Agreed Final Mark
1	DANIEL BENALLICK	71	✓	71
2	IGOR GUIDOLIN	78	✓	78
3	HANNAH MAE-WILLIAMS	66	✓	66
4	JINGLONG WANG	70	✓	70
5	YUFEI WANG	66	✓	66
6	ZIYAN SUN	65	✓	65

COMPONENT 2 (WEIGHTING: 50%)

FOR COMPLETION BY INTERNAL MODERATOR OR SECOND MARKER
Sample of student work

	Student Name	1st Marker (Mark)	Moderator (Agree Disagree)	Agreed Final Mark
1	DANIEL BENALLICK	73	✓	73
2	IGOR GUIDOLIN	77	✓	77
3	HANNAH MAE-WILLIAMS	64	✓	64
4	JINGLONG WANG	66	✓	66
5	YUFEI WANG	66	✓	66
6	ZIYAN SUN	63	✓	63

If agreement has not been reached, this needs to be raised with the Programme Manager, as a third marker is required. If agreement has been reached, please explain how agreement has been reached and if there are changes to any marks. If changes have been made, all students on the module must be listed in the table above.

	INTERNAL MODERATOR (or second marker)	*Please ✓* YES	NO	**Comments**
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 /** NA			
8	**How was agreement between markers reached?** *Via academic rigour – a degree of consultation and review and exchange with prospective marks / sampling*			

Signed (Internal Moderator):	Date: May 2024

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

	EXTERNAL EXAMINER	*Please ✓* YES	NO	**Comments**
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**			

Signed (External Examiner):	Date:

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