



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 Sir Gar				
EXTERNAL EXAMINER NAME:	Dr Alison Griffiths				
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR :	Robert Davies				
MODULE TITLE:	Major Project				
MODULE CODE:	SGEE6003		MODULE LEVEL:	6	
COMPONENT NO. (e.g. 1 of 2):	2 of 4		COMPONENT WEIGHTING (e.g. 50% of the module):	10	
ASSESSMENT PERIOD	☒ Semester 1	☐ Semester 1 <i>Re-sit</i>	☐ Semester 2	☐ Semester 2 <i>Re-sit</i>	<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.					
Universal Student Number (ID)	1 st Marker mark	Moderator/ 2 nd Marker	Moderator/ 3 rd Marker	Agreed Mark	Comment
1202933	76	78		77	Mark agreed by discussion
1402807	64	59		62	Mark agreed by discussion
					See appended second marking sheets

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 <i>This box will expand as you type</i>			
8	How was agreement between markers reached? Verbal discussion, see appended second marking sheets <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 (second marker): 	Date: 23/05/2019
Signed (Partnership Team Leader):	Date:
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

SGEE6003 Major Project

DOUBLE MARKING SHEET AND COMBINED STUDENT FEEDBACK

Presentation 1 – Project Definition, Research and Quality Planning

2018-2019

Agreed mark

77%

Student Name: **Liesel Mari Williams**

Student Number **1202933**

Generic Assessment Criteria	Marks available	1st Marker (RD)	2nd Marker (MH)	Agreed Mark
1. Engagement with Literature Skills.				
Section 1: Engagement in research, for project background (/5) Good evidence presented. Project background was determined by an educational need at Coleg Sir Gar. Project background was determined by an educational need at Coleg Sir Gar.	5	3	3	3
Section 5: Engagement in research, for review of solutions (/5) Some evidence presented from a range of sources. Limited research was evident from the presentation in terms of quotations, however research was evident from the content. Limited research was evident from the presentation in terms of quotations, however research was evident from the content.	5	3	3	3
Total	10	6	6	6
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills				
Section 1: Project background (/5) Good explanation given as to the need for such a system for use in education. There exists a requirement for a bespoke training aid to facilitate the teaching of motors, the project is intended to provide that solution. Good explanation given as to the need for such a system for use in education. There exists a requirement for a bespoke training aid to facilitate the teaching of motors, the project is intended to provide that solution.	5	4	4	4
Section 3: Project risks, health and safety etc (/5) Covered by SIL rating but no evidence that a SIL assessment has been carried out. Risks explained in relation to the safe torque off, e-stops and guarding. All aspects of H&S were covered including the use of a Plexiglas cabinet to house the moving parts and power supply interlocks. PUWER, risk and electrical safety assessments would be carried out. Most aspects of H&S were covered including the use of a Plexiglas cabinet to house the moving parts and power supply interlocks. PUWER, risk and electrical safety assessments would be carried out. SIL rating given but no evidence that a SIL assessment has been carried out. Risks explained in relation to the safe torque off, e-stops and guarding.	5	4	5	4.5
Response to questions 1, 4, 7 and 8 (/10) Clear answers given for each question. An opportunity exists that the finished product could have commercial value. It would be a risk not to engage with IP and protect the design.	10	8	7	7.5

Clear answers given for each question. However, an opportunity exists that the finished product could have commercial value. It would be a risk not to engage with IP and protect the design.				
Total	20	16	16	16
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills				
Section 1: Problem Definition and constraints (/10) Clear explanations given of the problem and the reason for the project. Constraints given including safety. It wasn't clear how much of the final product was to be sub-contracted and how this would be controlled. Clear explanations given of the problem and the reason for the project. Constraints given including safety. It wasn't clear how much of the final product was to be sub-contracted and how this would be controlled.	10	7	6	6.5
Section 2: Functional Design Specification (/10) Detailed with screens that showed the end product. A graphic of the final product was a little non-descript. It wasn't clear if this would run several different motors in order for a comparison in performance to be made or if it was for a single motor type. Detailed with screens that showed the end product. However, a graphic of the final product was a little non-descript. It wasn't clear if this would run several different motors in order for a comparison in performance to be made or if it was for a single motor type.	10	8	7	7.5
Section 4: Test planning (/10) Very detailed testing table with manual and automatic sections for each screen/mode of operation. A detailed test plan of how the 4 quadrants perform was described. Very detailed testing table with manual and automatic sections for each screen/mode of operation including a detailed test plan of how the 4 quadrants would perform.	10	7	8	8
Response to questions 2 and 6 (/5) Very good answers given showing that these issues have been considered. Environmental impact was explained through the use of a programmed hibernation mode and the use of a power reduction technique within PROFINET called PROFlenergy. Very good answers given showing that these issues have been considered. Environmental impact was explained through the use of a programmed hibernation mode and the use of a power reduction technique within PROFINET called PROFlenergy.	5	4	5	4.5
Total	35	26	26	26.5
4. Practical Application Skills				
Section 5: Critical choice and justification of final solution (/10) Well justified for a range of reasons given. Two good alternatives given and a ranking system use to grade the criteria; the highest score being the most suitable option. Well justified for a range of reasons given. Two good alternatives given and a ranking system use to grade the criteria; the highest score being the most suitable option.	10	8	8	8

Section 6: Project Planning and working breakdown structure (/10) WBS was excellent, Gantt chart showed timing though milestones were not identified. Contingencies not on the presentation slides but explained verbally. Detailed Gantt chart and WBS used. WBS was excellent, detailed Gantt chart showed timing though milestones were not identified. Contingencies not on the presentation slides but explained verbally.	10	8	8	8
Response to questions 3 and 5 (/5) Clear answers given. Detailed Gantt chart and WBS explained. Clear answers given. Detailed Gantt chart and WBS explained.	5	4	4	4
Total	25	20	21	20
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice				
All sections: Quality of the presentation slides – (/5) Excellent quality of presentation slides (except one small issue with 1 photo) All slides of a good quality. Excellent quality of presentation slides (except one small issue with 1 photo)	5	4	4	4
All sections: Quality of the delivery style – (/5) Confident, coherent and concise within the allotted time. Delivery style was clear and precise. All questions answered with confidence. Confident, coherent and concise within the allotted time. Delivery style was clear and precise. All questions answered with confidence.	5	4	5	4.5
Total	10	8	9	8.5
Grand Total	100	76	78	77

SGEE6003 Major Project

DOUBLE MARKING SHEET AND COMBINED STUDENT FEEDBACK

Presentation 1 – Project Definition, Research and Quality Planning

2018-2019

Agreed mark

62%

Student Name: Michael Charles Lewis

Student Number 1402807

Generic Assessment Criteria	Marks available	1st Marker (RD)	2nd Marker (MH)	Agreed Mark
1. Engagement with Literature Skills.				
Section 1: Engagement in research, for project background (/5) Good evidence of background research. Evidence of research was demonstrated. Good evidence of background research demonstrated.	5	3	4	4
Section 5: Engagement in research, for review of solutions (/5) Evidence from answers to questions showed that other solutions had been considered in detail. Evidence of research was demonstrated. Evidence from answers to questions showed that other solutions had been considered in detail.	5	3	4	3
Total	10	6	8	7
2. Knowledge and Understanding Skills				
Section 1: Project background (/5) Briefly stated though further details could have been given. Background and context described, but any commercial, economic and social context was not clear. Background and context described, but any commercial, economic and social context was not clear.	5	2	3	2.5
Section 3: Project risks, health and safety etc (/5) Legislation covered by research, risks and health and safety given good consideration Risk assessment could have been more rigorous considering this is a medical device. Legislation covered by research, risks and health and safety given good consideration. However, risk assessment could have been more rigorous considering this is a medical device.	5	3	2	2.5
Response to questions 1, 4, 7 and 8 (/10) Showed a good awareness of risk and supplied some detailed answers to questions relating to business and customer needs, wider context, public perception, commercial, economic and social context, legal requirements and IP issues. Some consideration given, but questions were not fully prepared for. Showed a good awareness of risk and supplied some detailed answers to questions relating to business and customer needs, wider context, public perception,	10	6	5	5

commercial, economic and social context, legal requirements and IP issues. Some consideration given, but questions were not fully prepared for.				
Total	20	11	10	10
3. Cognitive and Intellectual Skills				
Section 1: Problem Definition and constraints (/10) Explained briefly and clearly with good slides that defined the problem in it context and set out the constraints. What was being done is described, why it is being done was vague. Explained briefly and clearly with good slides that defined the problem in it context and set out the constraints. However, what was being done is described, why it is being done was vague.	10	7	6	6
Section 2: Functional Design Specification (/10) Very good level of detail provided that set out the requirements of the end product. The specification was vague and lacked context at times. Good level of detail provided that set out the requirements of the end product. However, the specification was vague and lacked context at times.	10	8	6	7
Section 4: Test planning (/10) Some consideration given during presentation but further details were provided for calibration and concerns over reliability were satisfied by answers to questioning. Testing lacked clarity. Some consideration given during presentation but further details were provided for calibration and concerns over reliability were satisfied by answers to questioning. However, testing lacked clarity.	10	7	5	6
Response to questions 2 and 6 (/5) Generally good, covered sustainable by discussing recycling and ethics by sourcing of components. Preparation for these questions was evident from the answers on sustainability. Generally good, covered sustainable by discussing recycling and ethics by sourcing of components. Preparation for these questions was evident from the answers on sustainability.	5	3	4	4
Total	35	25	21	23
4. Practical Application Skills				
Section 5: Critical choice and justification of final solution (/10) Detailed, covering most aspects though a scoring system would have been better in order to justify the correct solution selected. A better method of comparison should have been used rather than "bad and good" Detailed, covering most aspects though a scoring system would have been better in order to justify the correct solution selected. A better method of comparison should have been used rather than "bad and good".	10	7	4	5.5
Section 6: Project Planning and working breakdown structure (/10) A very good WBS explained with reference to the Gantt chart for planning with a detailed break down of tasks to be performed with contingencies. WBS does not conform to any standard methodology i.e. the sum of each level does not equal its parent level.	10	7	5	6

A good WBS explained with reference to the Gantt chart for planning with a detailed break down of tasks to be performed with contingencies. However, WBS does not conform to any standard methodology i.e. the sum of each level does not equal its parent level.				
Response to questions 3 and 5 (/5) Covered issues relating to professional conduct, codes of practice and management techniques. Questions on code of conduct and management techniques were well answered. Questions on code of conduct and management techniques were well answered.	5	3	4	4
Total	25	17	12	15.5
5. Transferable Skills for Life and Professional Practice				
All sections: Quality of the presentation slides – (/5) Generally good quality though slides contained too many words in small font. Most slides were generally readable and well presented. Generally good quality though slides contained too many words in small font.	5	3	4	3.5
All sections: Quality of the delivery style – (/5) Generally good. However, too much time was spent looking at and reading from the slides, slightly nervous delivery but showing some confidence. Slightly nervous, as to be expected, but confidently presented. Generally good. However, too much time was spent looking at and reading from the slides, slightly nervous delivery but showing some confidence.	5	2	4	3
Total	10	5	8	6.5
Grand Total	100	64	59	62