

Marking and Moderation Protocol for Online Assessments

Marking of Summative and Formative Work

Anonymous Marking

1. Summative assessments will be marked anonymously unless the assessment requires the student to make any form of oral presentation or defence where anonymity cannot reasonably be achieved. Anonymity will be maintained, primarily, via the use of the Student Reference Number (SRN) as the means by which assessments are labelled.
2. Formative assessments are not marked anonymously.
3. Anonymity should extend throughout the moderation process excepting where there is an allegation of academic misconduct in which case anonymity may be breached in order to comply with any misconduct processes.

Standardisation

4. Each unique assessment will use the same marking schema/pro forma irrespective of where the student sits the assessment or where marking takes place. In advance of the commencement of marking Markers must familiarise themselves with the assessment instrument, marking scheme, and any other guidance issued.
5. The allocation of marking to Markers will not take into account the 'home' campus of the student. The aim of Marker allocation is to provide Markers with a mix of scripts from across the various locations the assessment was sat to ensure consistency of standards across ULaw.
6. Moderators will be nominated by Academic Managers or equivalent, from those colleagues who have expertise in marking the specific subject. The allocation of moderation to Moderators will not take into account the 'home' campus of the student nor the Marker being moderated.
7. Before marking commences the Moderator (or Module Leader where there is more than one Moderator) will set the marking standard to be applied. The Moderator (or Module Leader where there is more than one Moderator) will review a sample of the submitted work and from this select three scripts from those to be marked; these will be the Standardisation Scripts and must represent different levels of attainment.
8. The Standardisation Scripts should be marked by the Moderator who will then make any changes to the marking scheme or guidance notes that are necessary, for example, to clarify where marks can be awarded. The Moderator must maintain a record of the process which should include, their marked versions of the Standardisation Scripts, changes to the mark scheme and/or guidance notes, and their reasons for making those changes.
9. Where there is more than one Moderator it will be necessary for the Moderators to meet at a standardisation meeting or 'Conference Call' Chaired by the Module Leader, to review the Standardisation Scripts and agree the marking standard. The Chair of the Conference Call must maintain a record of discussions and outcomes.

10. Where there is more than one Marker, Markers are ideally required to mark or review the Standardisation Scripts before they commence marking. Based upon marking of the Standardisation Scripts the Moderator will either agree that the marker can continue their marking allocation without any change or provide advice and guidance as to how to better interpret and apply the marking scheme.
11. Less experienced markers should be supported and mentored by more experienced markers.

Grade-Based Marking

12. Students' work should be marked using grade-based marking, to be applied at the point where academic judgment is exercised, as shown in Table 1. This provides greater clarity for students and enables them to better understand their performance.
13. Assessment for each module must comprise of no more than two assessment components, weighted appropriately, unless an exception has been approved by Programme Approval Committee, for example as required by a PSRB. Each component must generate a mark out of 100.
14. Multiple Choice Questions (MCQ) and Single Best Answer Question (SBAQ) assessments are excluded from Grade-Based Marking. Any other exception to Grade-Based Marking must be approved by Programme Approval Committee and only where they are either:
 - 14.1. Pass/fail assessments where no gradation beyond pass or fail is available to students;
 - 14.2. External Assessments which form part of University awards, but which are administered by an external body, usually a PSRB; or
 - 14.3. An assessment that is marked by reference to a clear, highly detailed, marking scheme that affords the marker no discretion beyond deciding if the point should be awarded or not. MCQs and SBAQs fall into this category.

Table 1: Grade-Based Marking

Numerical Scale	Undergraduate Classification Scale	Postgraduate Pass/Merit/Distinction Scale
100 95 85 78 75 72	First Class	Distinction
68 65 62	Upper Second Class	Merit/Commendation
58 55 52	Lower Second Class	Pass
48 45 42	Third Class	Fail

38	Fail	Fail
35		
32		
25		
20		
10		
0		

Moderation, Double Marking, and Second Marking

The Purpose of Moderation

- Moderation aims to ensure that assessment outcomes are fair and reliable. Moderation determines whether the marking criteria have been applied consistently across the cohort, and whether the marks or levels of achievement awarded are appropriate and consistent across modules and programmes.
- Moderation is different to second marking (where work is remarked by a second person with sight of the first marker's marks and comments) and double marking (where work is marked by a second person without sight of the first marker's marks and comments). Moderation is the standard process to be employed for all assessments excluding only Dissertations and similar substantive pieces which may use Double Marking or Second Marking in place of Moderation.
- It may be necessary, due to the volume of students being assessed, to appoint more than one Moderator. The number of Moderators should be kept to a minimum.

Selection of Work for Moderation

- Moderators will have available to them all assessment scripts and will determine which scripts they wish to sample, noting the specific requirements stated below. In the event of more than one moderator being allocated, the moderators will determine the allocation of scripts between them.
- The Registry will make available to Moderators key data which will be useful in guiding the moderation process.
- All summative assessment which contributes to the final award must be subject to moderation. Table 2 details the minimum sample which must be moderated for every marker.

Table 2: Samples for Moderation Per Marker

Undergraduate Mark Range Awarded by Marker	Post Graduate Mark Range Awarded by Marker	Number of Scripts to be Sampled by Moderator
Below 30	Below 40	1
30-36	40-46	1
37-39	47-49	1
40-41	50-51	1
42-56	52-56	1

57-59	57-59	1
67-69	67-69	1
70 or above	70 or above	1

21. The above represents the minimum requirement; Moderators are free to select further samples for review as they determine necessary or as instructed.
22. Scripts sampled by the Moderator may include the standardisation scripts where these were used.
23. A Marker may not produce a script in each of the boundaries given in Table 2; this is inevitable and not in itself indicative of the need for further action.

Outcomes of Moderation

24. Markers and Moderators are not likely to always agree on the exact mark to be awarded. It is therefore necessary for the Moderator to determine when the variation between the Markers' view and the Moderators' view leads to inconsistency in standards across the University.
25. As part of or during the moderation process, Moderators have available to them the following outcomes:
 - 25.1. Confirm the marking standard meets expectations;
 - 25.2. Require the work of one or more Marker(s) to be remarked;
 - 25.3. Require all work to be remarked;
 - 25.4. Recommend to the relevant External Examiners that numerical intervention of all marks is undertaken e.g. scaling of marks, which if approved, must be reported to the Exam Board.
26. Moderators may not adjust individual marks .
27. Where more than one Moderator has been appointed the outcome of Moderation must be agreed by all Moderators.
28. At the conclusion of Moderation, the Moderator(s) must produce a Moderation Report. There shall be one report per assessment; where there is more than one Moderator, the Moderators must collaborate on the production of a single report.

External Examination

Selection of Work for Review by External Examiners

29. External Examiners will be asked to review a representative sample of student work after it has been marked and moderated. The External Examiner will be asked to confirm, or otherwise, the appropriateness of the marking standard compared to the wider sector.
30. The External Examiner will be provided with access to all marked work, the marks awarded, and the Moderation report. The External Examiner will be asked to review, as a minimum, a sample of the scripts at each boundary identified in Table 2. This should

equate to at least 10% of all scripts. External Examiners may review additional scripts as they deem necessary, up to and including all scripts.

Outcomes of External Examination

31. External Examiners may not change individual marks but may comment on any noted deviations from the standard.
32. The External Examiner will be asked to complete a short report summarising the scripts they have sampled and the outcome of their review. The Programme Directors will consider the External Examiner's report and determine whether any immediate action is necessary.

Provision of Feedback to Students

33. Provisional Marks are assessment marks that have been subject to internal moderation, but which have not been confirmed by a Board of Examiners. Confirmed Marks are assessment marks that have been confirmed by a Board of Examiners.
34. Students must receive Provisional Marks and feedback on every summative and formative assessment.
35. Feedback should meet the expectations set out in the Feedback and Feedforward Policy.
36. Students must be notified how and when feedback will be provided.

Version history

Version	Amended by	Revision summary	Date
V1.0		New	January 2024