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 (and taught location if relevant):	NPTC				
EXTERNAL EXAMINER NAME:	Gaurav				
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR :	UWTSD				
MODULE TITLE:	Usability Engineering				
MODULE CODE:	ACCA6017		**MODULE LEVEL: (4, 5 6 or 7)**	6	
COMPONENT NO. (e.g. 1):	1		**COMPONENT WEIGHTING** (e.g. 50% of the module):	100%	
ASSESSMENT PERIOD ✓	☑ Semester 2	☐ Semester 1 *Re-sit*	☑ Semester 2	☐ Semester 2 *Re-sit*	*Other, please state*
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT: ✓	☑ Coursework	☐ Examination	☐ Practical		
LANGUAGE OF ASSESSMENT:	English		**TRANSLATION PROVIDED:**	~~*Yes*~~/*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.

Universal Student Number (ID)	1st Marker mark	Moderator/2nd Marker	Moderator/3rd Marker	Agreed Mark	Comment
2220029 CC	63	62		63	Marks agreed
2220041 TF	68	68		68	
2220023 DJ	66	67		66	Marks agreed
2220040 LL	58	58		58	
2220035 CM	55	57		55	Marks agreed
2220584 ER	71	72		71	Marks agreed
2223318 JS	62	62		62	
2220027 RW	59	59		59	
2003590 TW	66	66		66	

	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?	✓		
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** None *This box will expand as you type*			
8	**How was agreement between markers reached?** Discussion and negotiation *This box will expand as you type*			

	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** *This box will expand as you type*			
8	**How was agreement between markers reached?** *This box will expand as you type*			

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** *This box will expand as you type*			

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?	y		
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?	y		
3	Is feedback constructive?	y		
4	Is the feedback linked to the assessment criteria?	y		
5	Is the feedback consistent across the sample?	y		
6	Is there mention of improvement to referencing and consideration of unfair practice, where relevant?	y		
7	**Actions to complete** Good feedback from students *This box will expand as you type*			

Signed (internal moderator): John Williams	Date: 03-01-2022
Signed (Partnership Team Leader): John Williams	Date: 03-01-2022
Signed (External Examiner):	Date:

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

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, Faculties 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