



POINT BLANK

MUSIC SCHOOL

PROCEDURE 041

MARKING AND INTERNAL MODERATION

DOCUMENT CONTROL BOX

People in scope:					
All students	HE Students	Professional Students	All staff and students	Staff only	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sites in scope:			Publication:		
All	London	Online	Internal	Public	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Version:	1.1	Date Approved / Committee:	16.08.23 – Quality and Standards Committee	Date of next review:	August 2025

If you have a disability which makes reading this document or navigating our website difficult and you would like to receive information in an alternative format, please contact: support@pointblankmusicschool.com.

Document Revision History**Version Log**

Committee / Approval Date	Author	Version	Publication Date	Page Reference & Summary
Quality and Standards Committee - 13.08.24	Head of Education & Curriculum	1.1 (updated 27th June 2024)	October 2024	Page 3: Added 'are met' to 1.2 Page 4: Changed 'Production Portfolio' to 'Professional Portfolio'

Related Documentation

Document Reference No. (Policy version / Supporting doc. #)	Document Type	Link or Dept. Owner	Document Title
<i>n/a</i>	<i>Template</i>	<i>Assessments</i>	<i>Moderation Report Template</i>

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 The purpose of this procedure is to outline Point Blank's approach to carrying out assessment marking and internal moderation.
- 1.2 This procedure aims to clearly articulate the steps taken in order to ensure academic standards are met throughout Point Blank modules and courses.

2. PROCEDURE DETAILS

- 2.1 This procedure is underpinned by the following guiding principles:
 - i. Students should be provided with feedback on assessment which is timely, relevant to the learning outcomes and criteria, readily understandable and giving clear guidance on how to improve.
 - ii. The rigour and consistency of the marking and moderation processes are key to the achievement of standards expected by Point Blank.

Definitions

- 2.2 **Standardisation:** Standardisation is completed in advance of marking and involves a group of assessors all independently marking a sample of student work and assigning grades using agreed criteria. Following individual grading, the team meets, discusses and agrees a grade, which serves as a benchmark for the module run.
- 2.3 **Double Marking:** The process whereby two markers are assigned to make each a separate judgement on a piece of work. In the event of disagreement, a resolution is sought with the Module Leader, or other appropriate academic staff.
- 2.4 **Moderation:** A process intended to assure that an assessment outcome is fair and reliable and that assessment criteria have been applied consistently. Moderation focuses on the marks awarded to the full set of assessed work for a task, module or programme in the context of the academic standards for the award. It is therefore separate from the question of how differences in marks between two or more markers are resolved and is not about making changes to an individual student's marks.

Stage 1: Standardisation

- 2.5 The Module Leader, or designated nominee, schedules a standardisation meeting no later than Week 9 of each term, or two weeks before the assessment deadline – whichever is earlier.
- 2.6 All markers marking a module are required to attend the standardisation meeting. Where a marker is also marking other modules, they will need to attend the individual standardisation meetings for all relevant modules.
- 2.7 At the standardisation meeting, the Module Leader, or designated nominee, outlines the assessment criteria and grading rubric(s).
- 2.8 Using a sample of work, all members of the standardisation meeting suggest grades for each piece and the group reviews the recommendations. The Module Leader, or designated nominee, leads a discussion to consider any differences in grades between markers.

Stage 2: Marking

- 2.9 Following the submissions deadline, the Assessments Team distributes marking among the markers.

- 2.10 Marking is carried out by individual markers including assigning grades and providing written feedback.
- 2.11 Final major Level 6 modules (e.g. Professional Portfolio) are **double marked**. These are highlighted in the Programme Handbooks.
- 2.12 Markers normally complete marking within 10 calendar days.
- 2.13 Ahead of the completion of marking, the Assessment Team prepare the Moderation Report templates.

Stage 3: Internal Moderation

- 2.14 Upon completion of the marking, the Assessments Team prepare the moderation samples and add the sample lists to the [Moderation Report templates](#).
- 2.15 Samples consist of a minimum square root of the total submissions for the module and/or component, including all fails and at least 10 pieces at a passing grade (or all if the cohort consists of less than 10 students).
- 2.16 The Assessments Team distribute the moderation reports to the moderators along with the relevant data and information in the top section of the template.
- 2.17 The moderator reviews the work in the sample and completes report considering and commenting on the following (see appendix A for Moderator Guidance):
 - i. The marks and feedback given by the marker;
 - ii. Does the feedback match the grades given?
 - iii. Are students with similar marks of a similar standard?
 - iv. Is the feedback reasonable and constructive?
 - v. Are there a high number of students with below 40% or above 70%?
 - vi. If a marker has indicated that files cannot be opened, check that this is the case.
 - vii. Have there been any referrals for suspected academic misconduct?

In the event of a discrepancy

- 2.18 If the moderator believes the overall standard to be unduly harsh or lenient, for example where there is a discrepancy of >5% in the mark distribution for the sample as a whole then the initial marker should review the full set of assignments in consultation with the moderator. If there is a failure to reach agreement, the Programme Leader (or nominee) should be or identify a third, independent marker(moderator) to adjudicate the decision.
- 2.19 Where feedback is insufficient, the marker should be contacted to provide the required standard of feedback.

3. PROCEDURE SCOPE

- 3.1 This procedure applies to the marking and moderation of all summative assessments on Point Blanks higher education programmes.
- 3.2 The scope of this procedure includes programmes operating at Point Blank London and Online.

4. PROCEDURE OWNER

This procedure is under the responsibility of the Quality and Standards Committee. The responsible committee will ensure the cyclical review of this procedure is carried out in line with Point Blank's Quality Assurance Framework.

The Quality and Standards Committee delegates the operational responsibility of this procedure to the following staff:

- Head of Quality
- Head of Education and Curriculum
- Programme Leaders
- Markers
- Moderators
- Assessment Manager
- Programme Officers

5. EXHIBITS, APPENDICES AND FORMS

- Moderation Report Template

6. REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

6.1 Internal

- Teaching and Learning Strategy

6.2 External

- QAA The Revised Quality Code for Education (2018)
- QAA Quality Code Advice and Guidance: Assessment (2018)
- Middlesex University Academic Regulations

Appendix A – Moderator Guidance

Within 10% of all assessments must be moderated.

All failing assessments (below 40%) should be moderated and all firsts/ distinctions over 80%

What to look for when moderating

Moderation is different to second marking. The aim is to make sure that grades and feedback are consistent across the module and across all markers.

- Look at the assessments and consider the marks and feedback given by the marker (if there are multiple markers, they must all be considered in the moderation sample)
- Does the feedback match the grade given?
- Are students with similar marks of a similar standard?
- Is the feedback reasonable and constructive?
- Are there a high number of students with below 40% or above 70%?
- If a marker has indicated that files cannot be opened, check that this is the case.

If you notice a discrepancy

- If the grades and feedback do not match the students' work on the whole, contact the first marker to review the full set of assignments. The moderator should support the first marker in doing this and agree upon the final outcome. Any alterations to grades and feedback must be noted in this report and reflected in the VLE.
- Where feedback is insufficient, the marker should be contacted to provide the required standard of feedback.
- If the marker has indicated that a student's files are not accessible but through your checks they can be opened, contact the marker and ask them to complete the marking.
- If there is a high proportion of grades below 40 or above 70 this should be commented on within the moderation. If all the work is valid within this banding, then this should be indicated in the comments.
- Where a significant concern about the quality of marking is raised through moderation, please contact the Programme Leader in the first instance to discuss further.

Appendix B – Moderation Process Flowchart

