



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):	Coleg Sirgar		
EXTERNAL EXAMINER NAME:	Stephen Sigurnjak		
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR :	Chris Davies		
MODULE TITLE:	Mechanical Engineering		
MODULE CODE:	SGEE4017	MODULE LEVEL:	4
COMPONENT NO. (e.g. 1 of 2):	1 of 2	COMPONENT WEIGHTING (e.g. 50% of the module):	50%
ASSESSMENT PERIOD	Semester 1 (24/25)		
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT:	☐ Coursework	☐ 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.

FOR COMPLETION BY INTERNAL MODERATOR OR SECOND MARKER					
Universal Student Number (ID)	1 st Marker (Mark)	Moderator (Agree or Disagree)	2 nd Marker (Mark)	3 rd Marker (Mark)	Agreed Mark
Aled Davies	65	Agree			65
Claus Schilke	65	Agree			65
Osian Mills	57	Agree			57
Joshau Witney	56	Agree			56
Harrison Frederickson	46	Agree			46
Kieran Jones	45	Agree			45

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?	☒		
2	Does feedback identify opportunities for improved performance?	☒		Detailed constructive feedback provided to support opportunities for improvement.
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 <i>this box will expand as you type</i>			
8	How was agreement between markers reached? Moderation <i>this box will expand as you type</i>			

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

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

Signed (internal moderator/2 nd Marker): 	Date: 24.01.25
Signed (Third Marker):	Date:
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 in accord with the specific arrangements for the programme (e.g. upload to Teams site).

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