

# Double-Blind Marking and Moderation Policy

This is a defined policy which all Faculties are required to follow.

It applies to summative assessments on both undergraduate and postgraduate taught programmes and specifies the University's minimum requirements. The University recognises that discipline differences or differences in assessment tasks mean that some Faculties may wish carry out more extensive scrutiny of marking than that prescribed by the policy. Where this is the case, the mechanism to be adopted must be approved by the relevant Faculty Programmes Committee following discussion at Academic Unit level.

## Glossary of Terms

- Double-blind marking:** Each marker marks the work independently, formulating their own judgement, and neither is aware of the other's assessment decision when determining their own mark.
- Double marking:** Two markers mark a piece of work and agree a final mark (or marks). The second marker can see both the mark awarded and the comments made by the first marker.
- Adjudication:** A process whereby a third marker determines the final mark in cases when the first two markers cannot agree. The third marker takes into account all available evidence, including the marks awarded and comments made by the two markers.
- Moderation:** An independent moderator or moderation team scrutinises the marks awarded, on a sample basis, to verify that the marks are appropriate and consistent in relation to the assessment criteria for the particular piece of work and the FHEQ level. Where moderation identifies a systematic issue or issues, the process for adjusting marks is defined below.
- Scaling:** The process of applying an arithmetic adjustment to the marks obtained during the marking process, so that the marks which result after scaling is applied more accurately reflect student learning and achievement against the assessment component or module learning outcomes.

## Double-Blind Marking

Any research project/dissertation which is marked by the supervisor, must be double-blind marked.

Where the assessment for any module worth more than 10 ECTS (20 CATS) consists of a single piece of work, it must be double-blind marked.

Likewise double-blind marking must be used for any sufficiently weighted component of a larger module such as an essay contributing 51% of the marks for a 20 ECTS module. A single piece of work may be, for example: a dissertation, essay, portfolio or report, a composition, or a single performance.

For examination scripts, double-blind marking is not expected though moderation is required (see section on Moderation below).

## Double-blind marking process

The two markers should share their marks and feedback with each other after they have completed their independent marking. Where their two marks differ by 6 percentage points or less, the average mark rounded up to the nearest integer shall be awarded. Where their two marks differ by more than 6 percentage points, they should agree the final mark to be awarded. Where the two markers are unable to agree a final mark, a third marker/adjudicator should be appointed to determine the final mark to be awarded.

A note of the discussions which should be given to the SAA Assessment Team together with the agreed marks and feedback, indicating the points of difference and how agreement was reached.

Where no agreement can be reached, an experienced colleague should be appointed as a third marker/adjudicator. They would not be required to mark the work 'blind' although they might choose to do so i.e. prior to looking at the marks and feedback from the first two markers. Having reviewed all available evidence, the third marker/adjudicator determines the final mark to be awarded. To ensure that there is adequate oversight, a list of all such cases should be provided to the external examiner, who can then scrutinise the assessment and adjudication process.

Feedback given to the student should include either:

- the final agreed mark and joint feedback OR
- the final agreed mark with all sets of markers' comments and the brief note about how agreement about the final mark was reached.

The approved module profile should state which of these two feedback mechanisms is to be used. In instances where the specialist nature of the subject matter means that double-blind marking would not be practicable, double marking with the second marker seeing evidence of the outcomes of first marking will be acceptable as an alternative. Where this applies the details of the marking practice being followed should be approved in advance by the Faculty Programmes Committee.

### **Double marking**

Where there are teams of markers marking a batch of assessments, or less experienced markers, there may be a double marking process to ensure consistency across the team. This is important to identify and remedy any systematic variations. The process may involve a review of the marks profile by cohort, pathway, or subject area. Alternatively, a panel of experienced markers may check the marking for all items of work, or a sample. Module Leads, in conjunction with Programme Leaders and Directors of Programmes, should determine whether such an exercise is required and select the approach that is most appropriate for the particular batch of assessments.

### **Moderation**

Moderation should be carried out for all summatively assessed work, normally at module level. Where students are required to pass each component separately, moderation should instead occur at component level. It should be carried out by a moderator or moderation team with appropriate experience. No moderator should moderate work that they originally marked or double marked.

### **Moderation process**

A sample of work should be selected for review. This will include the work of all students who have failed the module (or component) and a 5% sample from each degree class or across the range of marks where the degree is not classified. For those modules with small numbers, a sample greater than 5% should be used to cover all classifications awarded. This must include at least one script or piece of work from each degree class where this exists.

Moderation at module level should be completed prior to the responsible Pre-Board. Where double marking or moderation is applied at component level this should, where feasible, be completed prior to the release of component marks to students, or otherwise prior to the responsible Pre-Board.

The moderator is asked to confirm that the final module class is consistent with the University Descriptors for that level or any more local guidance such as an approved set of assessment descriptors by level. Alternatively, for a failing student, they are asked to confirm that the student has not met the module learning outcomes, and the more general descriptors provided at University and national level. If the work has not already been double marked, they will also want to assure themselves that the marking is in line with the marking scheme.

Except where arithmetic aggregation has been automated, this must be double checked as part of the moderation process. Moderation should also confirm that all pages in the sample have been marked, for example that they have been annotated using red ink, and that all marks in the sample have been correctly transcribed.

If the moderation process identifies concerns about the marking standards of the sample or has identified a systematic error in marking or marks processing, this should be communicated to the Module Lead. The Module Lead will then review the work, consider the concerns raised, discuss the issue with the marker(s), and respond to the moderator(s) to indicate what action they intend to take, if any. Appropriate actions include re-marking with the original scheme, re-marking with a new marking scheme, adjusting the weighting of (sub-)components, or scaling. Where the proposed action may adjust marks this must occur in a systematic and considered way so that all affected work is treated equally and not just the moderated sample.

The moderation report and Module Lead's response should be documented and communicated to the external examiner and Pre-Board so that they may decide whether to accept the response or require further action. If concerns are raised by the external examiner or at the Pre-Board, then these must be considered again at the Board of Examiners before the final marks are ratified.

When marks are returned to students prior to the Board of Examiners, this must be with the caveat that they are provisional until they have been ratified by the responsible Board of Examiners. Students should be notified of any subsequent changes to their unratified marks in a timely fashion.

Moderation should be applied as described above to each new batch of student work even in cases such as referrals or repeats where the same assessment may be repeated in a later year or within the same year.

A module may include some smaller elements of assessed work which cannot be moderated efficiently. These items might be, for example, worksheets which are marked quickly and returned to students, smaller presentations, or assessed laboratories. Such elements may be omitted from the moderation process provided the following principles are satisfied:

- a) the omitted elements contribute at most 20% to the overall module,
- b) the moderator(s) review the same assessment elements for each student in the sample,
- c) these elements enable the moderator to confirm that the final module class is consistent with the relevant descriptors and outcomes.

In the case of major presentation/performance assignments, either a sample should be moderated at the time of the event or the presentation/performance arrangements, marking sheet and criteria should be approved in advance. Alternatively (or additionally) the presentation/performance could be recorded to allow for subsequent moderation\*. Where a sample is to be moderated, this should include a selection from all markers to ensure alignment with the agreed marking criteria.

### Scaling

Scaling should only be undertaken in exceptional circumstances and should take place before marks are finalized but after other moderation mechanisms have been ruled out.

Document Information	
Author	Double-blind marking and moderation policy review group
Owner (committee)	AQSC
Approved Date	March 2000, July 2012, July 2014
Last Revision	July 2015
Type of Document	Policy

\* In Faculties where student performances are recorded, this must be clearly indicated in the student handbook. In addition, the Faculty must email students in advance of the performance to remind them that it will be recorded. Recording must not be carried out by another student and the recording itself must be retained in line with the University's Retention of Assessment Material and Student Records Policy. Recordings must not be used for any purpose other than assessment and the quality of the recording must not influence the assessment.