



PARTNER (and taught location if relevant):					
EXTERNAL EXAMINER NAME:	R. GRAY				
ASSESSMENT AUTHOR:	Dand Cockburn				
MODULE TITLE:	Empiricists & Rationalists				
MODULE CODE:	HPPH5018		MODULE LEVEL:		5
COMPONENT NO. (e.g. 1 of 2):	2		COMPONENT WEIGHTING (e.g. 50% of the module):		50
ASSESSMENT PERIOD	☒ Semester 1	☐ Semester 1 Re-sit	☐ Semester 2	☐ Semester 2 Re-sit	Other, please state
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT:	☒ Coursework		☐ Examination		☐ Practical
LANGUAGE OF ASSESSMENT:			TRANSLATION PROVIDED:		Yes/No ☒
TURNITIN CHECK FOR UNFAIR PRACTICE:	Yes/No ☒				

FOR COMPLETION BY INTERNAL MODERATOR

[illegible]

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


INTERNAL MODERATOR (or third marker, only here 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 NA			
This box will expand as you type				
8	How was agreement between markers reached? NA			
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 <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 (internal moderator): 	Date: 18/1/21
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).