



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:	Peter Alston		
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR:	Divya Chidambaram		
MODULE TITLE:	Introduction to Web and Database Concepts		
MODULE CODE:	ACCA4023	MODULE LEVEL: (eg 3, 4, 5, 6, 7)	4
COMPONENT NO(S): (eg. 1 and 2)	2	COMPONENT(S) WEIGHTING (e.g. 100% or 2 x 50%):	50% 50%
ASSESSMENT PERIOD	2024/5		
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	1 st Marker (Mark)	Moderator (Agree or Disagree)	2 nd Marker (Mark)	3rd Marker (Mark)	Agreed Final Mark
1	Shane Groves	59	59			59
2	Dafydd Pett	82	82			82
3	Drew McClennon	62	62			62
4	Rehan Joseph	90	90			90
5	Aaron Miles	40	40			40
6	Dylan Bell	40	40			40

COMPONENT 2 (WEIGHTING: %) (Note: delete if not applicable)**FOR COMPLETION BY INTERNAL MODERATOR OR SECOND MARKER****Sample of student work**

	Student Name	1 st Marker (Mark)	Moderator (Agree or Disagree)	2 nd Marker (Mark)	3 rd Marker (Mark)	Agreed Final Mark
1	Daniel Leone	94	94			94
2	Dylan Hocking	82	82			82
3	Jacob Davies	40	40			40
4	Leighton Bowd	67	67			67
5	Ethan Furbert	34	34			34
6	Elisedd Evans	62	62			62

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 ✓		Comments
		YES	NO	
1	Has agreement on the marks been reached?	✓		Yes
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?	✓		The feedback provided enables students to improve their work
3	Is feedback constructive?	✓		Yes, the feedback is appropriate.
4	Is the feedback linked to the appropriate category/ classification of the assessment criteria?	✓		Yes
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, mention of improving references is made where required
7	Actions to complete None. The feedback is appropriate and of a suitable standard. <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			
8	How was agreement between markers reached? Through Teams discussion. <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			
Signed (Internal Moderator):				Date: May 2025
M.E.Dacey				

THIRD MARKER

Only required when the first two markers have been unable to reach a resolution.

The table above must include all students enrolled on the module and new marks entered in 3rd Marker Column and on the Registry system.

1	Comments
2	Actions to complete

FOR COLLABORATIVE PROVISION ONLY

Note: Partner colleges have completed their own GA28 forms for their module delivery.

Please refer to partner college module box areas as required.

PARTNERSHIP TEAM LEADER		Please ✓ YES NO		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 <			

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?	X		
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?	X		Inline comments also included on student work, providing more nuanced points on elements of their work.
3	Is feedback constructive?	X		
4	Is the feedback linked to the assessment criteria?	X		
5	Is the feedback consistent across the sample?	X		
6	Is there mention of improvement to referencing and consideration of unfair practice, where relevant?	X		
7	Actions to complete <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			
Signed (External Examiner): 				Approved 2025.06.10 16:48:33 +01'00'
				Date: 10/06/2025

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