

ASSESSMENT MODERATION POLICY

Scope

1. This policy applies to all courses at the University of Suffolk and its partner institutions that are summatively assessed.

Principles and purpose

2. This policy underpins the institution's assessment practice and seeks to ensure that
 - a. all assessments are fit for purpose, conform to validated course documentation, and provide accurate and accessible instructions and guidance to students.
 - b. all marking decisions are reliable, robust, consistent (within cohorts and over time) and fair; and that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately.
 - c. differences in academic judgement between markers can be acknowledged and appropriately addressed.
3. This policy aligns with the relevant Expectations for Standards and Quality within the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education, and the associated core and common practices, as set out in the [Advice and Guidance document for Assessment](#). We also take into account the Guiding Principles set out in that document.
4. All summative assessment utilises clear marking criteria against which student performance and achievement is measured. This process is operated by academic staff in accordance with this policy in order to ensure that each student is treated in a fair and equitable manner, that the grades are awarded consistently, and that the process is transparent and clearly documented.

Definitions

5. For the purposes of this policy:
 - a. **Verification** is defined as the initial (pre-issue) checking

standards of assessment are appropriate. The comments and grades of the first assessor will be available to the internal moderator. The internal moderator is expected to make separate notes as evidence of the moderation process and on the quality of the feedback provided to students. However, it is not the role of the internal moderator to mark the work again unless they do not agree that the standard of assessment is appropriate (see paragraph 25).

7. Where practical, it is good practice to ensure the internal moderator has not been involved in the teaching or assessment of the module in question.

8. It is recognised that dependent on the size of the module/course being assessed the assessor and moderator roles may be undertaken by more than two people. In such cases it is as consistently as possible

plans or a brief review of the possible scope of an answer. The intention is to inform the verifier

second mark

32. When, in accordance with the [Academic Appeals Procedure](#), student work is remarked, where possible this shall be done by the same internal moderator as was involved in the original moderation process. If, as a result of the remarking process, the mark proposed for the work involved was increased, effort should be taken to ensure that a similar adjustment is proposed for [@!Áč â^} • q, [!\Á @!^Á@Áæ ^Á! [~ } a•Áe^Áe] |Bca|^ . However, if as a result the mark is revised downwards, proposals to revise [@!Áč â^} • q, [!\Á @ ~ |aÁ [a^Á ~ Á! , æâÉ

Moderation of previously referred work

33. Previously referred work should be moderated in line with the arrangements outlined above including meeting the samp0 598710.000008871 0 595.32 841.92 re4t 62.424 cm0 g0 G[)]TETQq0.0000088