



University Centre Colchester Regulations for Students on Pearson Programmes

2023/24

Internal Verification and Marking Policy for Undergraduate Work

Version: 3.0
Updated: September 2023
Review Date: August 2024



Contents

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | Foreword | 3 |
| 2 | Definitions..... | 3 |
| 3 | Marking Policies | 4 |
| 4 | Internal Verification Policy..... | 6 |
| 5 | Student access to examination feedback..... | 8 |
| 6 | Requests from students to have their work re-marked..... | 8 |
| 7 | The Use of Internal and External Staff for Marking..... | 10 |

List of Appendices:

Appendix A: Internal Verification Policy for all Taught Students

Appendix B: Form for requesting a re-mark of work

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback Form

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

Appendix E: Level 4 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Appendix F: Level 5 Internal Verification Form (Module Guides)

Appendix G: Level 4 Internal Verification Form (Assessment Decisions)

Appendix H: Level 5 Internal Verification Form (Assessment Decisions)

1 Foreword

- 1.1** This policy applies to all taught course students studying on Pearson validated programmes at University Centre Colchester.
- 1.2** The policy applies to assessments contributing to a mark at all levels, as well as the mark appearing on the Assignment Tracking Systems (ATS2) from which a student's final classification is derived.
- 1.3** A list of definitions and marking policies is given below; a table showing the requirements applied to different forms of assessment is shown in Appendix A.

2 Definitions

2.1 Internal Verification

Internal Verification is the over-arching term for incorporating all types of quality assurance methods used to quantify and validate the marks provided for assessments. Internal Verification covers the terms Moderation, Second Marking and (Blind) Double Marking.

2.2 Moderation

Moderation is a process separate from that of marking and provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers, and is an approach which enables consistency across academic subjects. A moderator reviews a sample of the marked student work and liaises with the first marker if they believe that the marks were not at the correct level. A moderator would not change individual student marks for the work, but the first marker and moderator would agree whether marks should be reviewed across the particular piece of assessment, or unit, which may lead to marks being adjusted. In the case of a major discrepancy, it might be necessary for all the work to be re-marked (by second marking or double marking).

2.3 Single Marking with Moderation

Work is marked by one member of staff and Moderation (see section 2.2) is applied.

2.4 Second Marking

Second Marking requires the work to be marked by a second individual, but with full access to the first marker's marks and any written feedback or comments. Marks must be reconciled and must take place in consultation with the 1st marker. – see section 4 below.

2.5 (Blind) Double Marking

Double Marking is where two markers produce independent sets of marks for an assessment, without access to each other's marks. Both marks must be reconciled. This takes place in consultation between both markers – see section 4 below.

2.6 Monitored Assessment

This is all assessment carried out under invigilation or supervision – for example: examinations, multiple-choice tests, time-controlled essays, open-book essays, presentations, performances, group discussions and viva voces.

2.7 Unmonitored Assessment

This is an assessment piece of work that is produced in a student's own time – for example: essays, journal articles, lab reports.

2.8 Performance-based Coursework with Non-permanent Output

This is coursework such as presentations or acting, dance and music assessments

where the student does not provide an output capable of being shown to the external examiner. (A presentation where output such as a PowerPoint presentation is submitted would still count as performance-based coursework with non-permanent output, unless the key learning outcome being assessed is academic content rather than presentation skill.)

2.9 Performance-based Coursework with Permanent Output

This is coursework, such as presentations and performances in acting, dance and music where the student does provide an output capable of being shown to the external examiner (for instance a video or audio recording).

3 Marking Policies

3.1 Assessment Strategy (requirement of all Schools)

3.1.1 Schools should develop an assessment strategy for each course, or set of courses, which is consistently implemented across all programme validation documents. The assessment strategy should be incorporated into every validation or periodic review and address the following issues:

- Specificity of course work
- Diversity of assessment within a course;
- Coverage of unit learning outcomes by assessment methods;
- The balance between monitored and unmonitored assessment;
- Approaches to prevent and detect plagiarism in assessment;
- Professional Body Requirements, if appropriate;
- Alternative assessments.

In cases of School proposing to have units assessed by 100% coursework;

- Appropriate use of the academic year.

3.2 Assessment Instrument Tracking Sheets

3.2.1 All programmes are required to submit a completed Assessment Instruments Tracking (AIT) sheet to UCC Academic Services at the start of the academic year. The sheet should contain a breakdown of the units due to be taught during the year, details of all assessments including details of which learning outcomes they will be assessing, due dates and named markers and internal verifiers. For programmes commencing mid-year the AIT sheets should be submitted prior to the first taught session.

3.2.2. UCC will publish the programmes AIT sheet, and any changes must be formally requested via the AIT change request process. Changes should only be made in exceptional circumstances during the academic year.

3.3 Publication of Assessment Details

3.3.1 Details of unit assessments should be published in a UCC module guide which should be available for students (on Moodle) during the first taught session of a unit. The module guide should follow the UCC house style and assessment details should be drawn from the submitted AIT sheets.

3.3.2 All module guides, and assignment briefs, must be internally verified prior to publication. This should be recorded on the appropriate University Centre Colchester Internal Verification form (Module Guide) (Appendix E and F). Where the Internal Verification form is used it should be uploaded and attached to the assessment, and be made visible to the External Examiner, through the My Courses section of ATS2.

- 3.3.3 Where assessments are being used for the first time it is recommended that these are submitted to Pearson for approval prior to them being IV'd and entered onto the AIT sheet. This can be done either through the External Examiner or through Pearson's assignment checking service:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/Services/assignment-checking-service.html>

- 3.3.4 UCC Academic Services should be copied into any such correspondence.

3.4 Reasonable Adjustments

- 3.4.1 Students with specific learning support requirements may be eligible for their work to be marked in line with University Centre Colchester's Dyslexia Marking Policy. Eligible students will be identified by the UCC Accessibility Officer and will be identifiable on the ATS2 marking page by a pink sheet icon next to their name. The Dyslexia Marking Policy can be found within Reasonable Adjustment Code of Practice or a copy can be obtained by emailing uccsupport@colchester.ac.uk

3.5 Late Submissions on Work

- 3.5.1 Full arrangements for the late submission of course work can be found in the UCC Assessment Policy. For Pearson students in 2022/23, students can submit their first attempt at an assessment up to two weeks after their stated deadline. Work submitted within this 'late submission period' should be marked as normal, but will then be automatically capped to a pass. Submissions more than two weeks late should not be accepted or marked.
- 3.5.2 Details of how a student can request for the cap to be removed can be found in the UCC Extenuating Circumstances policy.

3.6 Plagiarism Concerns

- 3.6.1 All coursework should be submitted through ATS2. ATS2 has an inbuilt plagiarism detection system called Unoriginal (formally known as URKUND). Details of, and access to, the plagiarism report will appear next to all assignments. Where there are concerns that plagiarism or another academic offence may have taken place markers should refer to the UCC Academic Offence Policy.

3.7 Assessment of Performance-based Coursework (including oral presentations)

- 3.7.1 Performance-based assessment with a permanent output, capable of being shown to the External Examiner should be subject to the normal policy for essays/assignments, but only where the permanent output relates directly to the assessment criteria. For example, a presentation where output such as a PowerPoint document is submitted would still count as performance-based coursework with non-permanent output, unless an assessed learning outcome focuses on academic content rather than presentation skills.
- 3.7.2 Performance-based assessment with a non-permanent output worth up to and including 40% of a unit may be single marked. Where this type of assessment contributes to more than 40% of a unit, work must be either double-marked, team marked, video/audio recorded or attended by the external examiner based on 100% coverage of the whole cohort.

3.8 Assessment of Group Work

- 3.8.1 Group work with a permanent output should be subject to the normal Internal Verification process for essays/assignments.
- 3.8.2 Group work with a non-permanent output should be subject to the policy for the assessment of performance-based coursework.

- 3.8.3 Assignment criteria should make clear how marks are awarded for teamwork and individual performance. This balance should be considered carefully when such assignments are being designed.
- 3.8.4 The maximum amount that a joint mark (where a single group mark is derived from people working together in a group) can contribute to a single unit is 50%. In exceptional circumstances only, and with specific approval from the Dean of Higher Education and the External Examiner, the mark can be higher.
- 3.9 Marking or moderation of the work of students who are partners or close relatives**
- 3.9.1 Staff should not mark or moderate (including second or double marking) the work of partners or close relatives. In the case of a query, the Dean of Higher Education should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.
- 3.9.2 Staff must ensure that they declare any relationship with partners or close relatives in line with college policy.
- 3.10 Moderating/second marking/ double marking where the first marker is a partner or close relative**
- 3.10.1 Staff should not act as moderator or second marker where their partner or close relative is the first marker. In the case of a query, the Dean of Higher Education should determine whether there is a conflict of interest.
- 3.11 Marking Turnaround**
- 3.11.1 It is the UCC requirement that both marking and internal verification be completed, and marks released, within 20 working days of the assessment submission date. Marking will be required to be completed within 15 working days which will allow at least 5 working days of the marking turnaround period for internal verification processes to be undertaken.
- 3.12 Feedback**
- 3.12.1 Marks and feedback should be entered into the UCC Pearson feedback sheet and contain both feedback and feedforward.
- 4 Internal Verification Policy**
- 4.1 Arrangements for Internal Verification**
- 4.1.1 The Internal Verification arrangements for undergraduate Pearson programmes at University Centre Colchester can be found in Appendix A.
- 4.1.2 For each unit, programme leaders, in conjunction with unit tutors, shall identify one or more colleague(s) to act as an Internal Verifier. It is acceptable, and often normal, that the marking and the internal verification is shared amongst the programme team.
- 4.1.3 If an individual programme believes it is not possible to comply with an aspect of University Centre Colchester's Internal Verification policy, then the programme team must apply for an exemption to this aspect and propose an acceptable alternative arrangement for approval by the Head of School **and** Dean of Higher Education.
- 4.1.4 All work marked by new members of teaching staff should be subjected to internal verification. It is for the Head of School to determine how long full internal verification of work needs to apply for a new member of staff.
- 4.1.5 Internal verification should take place before the work is returned to students so

that any queries regarding the standard and/or consistency of marking can be resolved at the time.

4.2 Selection of work for Internal Verification

- 4.2.1 When a selection of work is required for either moderation, second marking or double marking the initial marker should select a sample of work that contains all 'fails' and an indicative range of other grades (Pass, Merit and Distinction).
- 4.2.2 An independent check on all marks calculations must be made where a marking schedule is used. Marking schedules must be sent with draft exams to the External Examiner for comments and approval.

4.3 Recording of Internal Verification

- 4.3.1 Internal Verifiers shall record the process of internal verification either within ATS2 or on the University Centre Colchester Internal Verification form (Assessment Decisions) (Appendix G and H). Where the Internal Verification form is used it should be uploaded and attached to the assessment, and be made visible to the External Examiner, through the My Courses section of ATS2.
- 4.3.2 Schools are required to keep a full record of both individual and agreed marks for all work which is second or double marked.

4.4 Roles of the Internal Verifier

- 4.4.1 When moderating the Internal Verifier considers whether the assignments have been marked at an appropriate standard; i.e. in line with Pearson grading criteria.
- 4.4.2 The purpose of moderation is to ensure that the grading of assignments is generally appropriate for the level. This often involves discussion between the two parties. The Internal Verifier should liaise with the first marker if he or she believes that the marks are not at the correct standard, with a view to the first marker reviewing and adjusting the marking.
- 4.4.3 When second marking, Internal Verifiers mark students' work and have access to the original marker's notes and grades, therefore scrutinizing the first marker's work.
- 4.4.4 When double marking the Internal Verifier blind double marks students' work (i.e. does not have access to the first marker's grades and/or comments).
- 4.4.5 A record of all discussions between markers and internal verifiers must be kept for audit purposes (see 4.3.1).

4.5 Following Internal Verification

- 4.5.1 If discrepancies in marks are suspected when completing internal verification the internal verifier should undertake a risk based approach. An example of this approach would be internally verifying a further 10% or 4 scripts (whichever is greater) until either the internal verifier is satisfied with the accuracy of marking or the entire cohort has been internally verified.
- 4.5.2 When second and double marking has taken place the first marker and the internal verifier are required to confirm agreement on the final mark. An agreed mark should not be merely based upon splitting the difference between the two original marks.
- 4.5.3 Where the two internal markers are unable to reach agreement, the school should make every effort to resolve the matter internally, for example by involving a third person to arbitrate or, if necessary, to act as a third marker. Work should only be sent to an External Examiner, who will be asked to arbitrate, in exceptional

circumstances. The External must be given access to written comments from internal markers on the piece(s) of work involved. The School should then make every effort to agree a mark by reference to comments from the three markers (not purely by averaging). In instances where a mark is not agreed upon after involving a third marker Schools should seek further guidance and advice from the Dean of Higher Education.

4.5.4 Internal verification must take place before the work is returned to students.

4.6 **Internal Verification for Resubmitted Work**

4.6.1 Teaching staff are only required to undertake Internal Verification on resubmitted work if the initial marker grades the assessment a fail. The internal verifier should follow the appropriate level of internal verification as outlined in Appendix A.

5 **Student access to examination feedback**

5.1 A student who requests access to their examination script, or who wishes to know the marks received for individual questions, may apply to the department which is responsible for that unit. The department should either:

- permit the student to see their examination script in the presence of a relevant member of the academic staff (normally one of the staff responsible for teaching the unit); or
- supply the student with a copy (or a summary) of the examiners' comments on the student's performance in the examination, including marks for individual questions.

[Note: The second of these options will normally be appropriate when markers have not written their comments on the examination script itself.]

5.2 Requests of this type should normally be received within four weeks of the publication of the examination marks.

5.3 When the assessment for a unit comprises, or includes, a piece of work other than an examination which is not returned to the student until after the mark has been confirmed by the Board of Examiners, the department should ensure that feedback on the work is available to students who require it after their marks have been made available.

5.4 Where a student has not passed a unit(s) and is undertaking reassessment over the summer they should have access to feedback on the elements being reassessed. Where they are resitting an exam, they should be provided with written feedback on the exam, or other piece of work for which feedback has not already been provided, within two weeks of the publication of the results by the Board of Examiners. Feedback may take the form of feedback on candidates' overall performance in the exam/piece of assessed work and/or individual feedback on the candidate's exam script/assessed work. The feedback should be sent to the student by the department.

6 **Requests from students to have their work re-marked**

6.1 Students have the right to request that a piece of work is re-marked if they disagree with the original mark in the following circumstance:

1. **Procedural and/or administrative error is suspected**
2. **Coursework which is moderated**

Where coursework has been single marked with a sample being moderated students may only request a re-mark under this criteria if:

- The work had a permanent output; **and**
- The work was not initially included in the sample for moderation; **and**
- Where the work is of a physical nature it has not already been returned to the student.

6.2 In all cases for a re-mark to be considered the student must:

- Meet with the initial marker (or suitable nominee appointed by the Head of School) to obtain further feedback on the reason for the initial mark before making a formal request for a re-mark; **and**
- Complete and submit the form (Appendix B) with the signature of the first marker (or nominee, see above) confirming that the meeting has taken place, no later than two weeks of term time from the date of the initial feedback to students.

6.3 Forms should be submitted to UCC Academic Services either in person in room HE103 or by email to uccacademicservices@colchester.ac.uk Forms must be accompanied by a detailed rationale, outlining evidence-based factual information which supports the request.

6.4 Upon receipt the form will be passed to the Schools' gatekeeper to review the request, ensure it meets the criteria for re-marking, and authorize or decline the request. Students must be aware that marks can decrease, increase or remain the same after the re-marking.

6.5 If a request for a re-mark is approved, work will be either second or double-marked and marks must be agreed (see section 4).

6.6 Where there are exceptional circumstances that prevent the second or double-markers from agreeing the marks, the work will be marked by two new markers who will agree their marks (see section 4).

6.7 **Other Circumstances**

There may be exceptional circumstances where approval is given for a piece of work to be re-marked which falls outside those defined in 6.1. Where this is the case, the procedures set out in 6.2 apply.

6.8 **Examinations**

Students may only request a re-mark of examination scripts if procedural and/or administrative error is suspected.

6.9 **Appealing a Request for a Remark**

Where a request for a remark is unsuccessful a student may only appeal this outcome under either:

- a) Perception of bias has taken place;
- b) Procedural irregularities.

The appeal should be submitted to uccacademic@colchester.ac.uk within five working days of the date of the correspondent which outlined the unsuccessful request. Any appeal will be considered by the Dean of Higher Education or their nominee.

7 The Use of Internal and External Staff for Marking

7.1 Examination Marking by PGCE students

7.1.1 It is generally desirable that examinations should be marked by a member of teaching staff who has been approved by University Centre Colchester staff procedures. Where it is necessary for graduate students to undertake this role, the following policy applies:

- A PGCE student should be used to mark examinations only when the individual has taught the whole or a significant part of the unit.
- Permission to use a graduate student for marking must be sought in advance from the Dean of Higher Education, on the basis of a case made by the Head of School indicating the training and monitoring arrangements proposed.

7.2 The Role of the External Examiner

7.2.1 Unless the External Examiner has been specifically sent work to arbitrate on a dispute between internal markers, the External Examiner's role will be as a moderator. Externals should not act as second markers. In moderating student work the External Examiner is providing an independent overview of the standards in, and consistency of approaches to, assessment. As such, the External Examiner's primary concern is with the overall marking standard and consistency rather than with marks obtained by individual students. The External Examiner should not alter the marks of any individual student.

7.3 Exemptions to the University Centre Colchester's marking policy

7.3.1 If a School believes it is not possible to comply with any aspect of University Centre Colchester's marking policy, the School must apply for an exemption to this aspect and propose an acceptable alternative arrangement for approval by the Dean of Higher Education.

Appendix A: Internal Verification Policy for all Taught Students (Pearson)

Internal Verification of Assessment Marks Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Students

| Unit Level and Credit Value | Assessment Weightings | Marking Protocol |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| All Units <i>under</i> 30 Credits | All Assessment Weightings 100% or split assessment. (e.g. 70% Essay / 30% presentation) | Moderation* of a representative spread of marks based on the following formula: 10% or 4 in number, whichever is greater, <i>plus all fails</i> . |
| All Units 30 credits and over | All split assessment (e.g. 70% Essay / 30% presentation) | Double Marking** of a representative spread of marks based on the following formula: 10% or 4 in number, whichever is greater, <i>plus all fails</i> . |
| | Single Assessment (e.g. 100% Written Dissertation) | Double Marking** of all submissions. . |

Reconciling of Marks (for Single and Double Marking)

Where two sets of assessment marks are being given the marks must be agreed. An agreed mark should not be merely based upon splitting the difference between the two original marks.

Definitions:

- * *Moderation* is a process separate from that of marking and provides assurance that assessment criteria have been applied appropriately, reflecting the shared understanding of the markers, and is an approach which enables comparability across academic subjects. A moderator reviews a sample of the marked student work and liaises with the first marker if they believe that the marks were not at the correct level. A moderator would not change individual student marks for the work, but the first marker and moderator would agree whether marks should be reviewed across the particular piece of assessment, or unit, which may lead to marks being adjusted. In the case of a major discrepancy, it might be necessary for all the work to be re-marked (by second marking or double marking).
- ** *Double Marking* is where two markers produce independent sets of marks for an assessment, without access to each other's marks. Both marks must be reconciled. This takes place in consultation between both markers – see section 2 and 4 of this policy.

NB: There are exceptions to the marking requirements above, which are described in more detail in the Marking Policy for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Work. For example, where a member of staff is new to teaching full moderation of all marks given should be undertaken and where performance-based assessment with a non-permanent output worth up to and including 40% of a unit may be single marked.

Appendix B: Form for requesting a re-mark of work



| |
|---|
| Name of Student: |
| Registration Number: |
| Title and code of module affected and a <i>brief</i> description of the piece of work, with date on which feedback was given to students, for which you are seeking re-marking. |
| Signature of first marker (or nominee by the Head of School) to confirm that a meeting to discuss the initial feedback has taken place. |
| Signed: _____ Date: _____ |
| Print name: _____ |
| Brief description of the grounds for requesting a re-mark: |
| Declaration by student: <p>I declare I have had a meeting with the initial marker (or nominee) to discuss the feedback on my work, and that I am still dissatisfied with the mark: and I request remarking of the work. I understand that marks can go up as well as down as a result of remarking. I further understand that the decision of the new marker is final relating to this piece of work (unless further procedural irregularity is suspected).</p> |
| Signed: _____ |
| Date: _____ |

Appendix C: Example of Level 4 Feedback form

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|
| UCC SCHOOL OF | | | | Pearson Unit Assignment Feedback | |
| PROGRAMME: Pearson BTEC Level 4 Higher National Certificate in | | | | LEVEL 4 | |
| Student ID | | First Marker | | Unit Moderator/ Second Marker | |
| UCC unit/module code | | Pearson Unit Title | Unit 1: | | Credits 15 |
| Assignment Details | Assignment 1: | | | | |
| Location | Colchester Campus | Word count | | Submission deadline | //2021 |
| Feedback Comments: | | | Feed Forward Advice: | | |
| | | | | | |
| Overall Grade | | Marker's Signature | | Date | |

| Assignment Learning Outcomes This assignment will be assessing the following learning outcomes: | | LO Achieved (Yes; No; N/A) | LO Achieved on Resubmission (Yes; No; N/A) |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| L01 | | | |
| L02 | | | |
| L03 | | | |
| L04 | | | |

| Assessment Criteria | | Achieved (Yes; No; N/A) | AC Achieved on Resubmission (Yes; No; N/A) |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|
| P1. | | | |
| P2. | | | |
| P3. | | | |
| P4. | | | |
| P5. | | | |
| P6. | | | |
| P7. | | | |
| P8. | | | |
| P9. | | | |
| M1. | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| M2. | | | |
| M3. | | | |
| M4. | | | |
| M5. | | | |
| D1. | | | |
| D2. | | | |
| D3. | | | |
| D4. | | | |

Resubmission Feedback Comments (if required):

Resubmission Feed Forward Advice:

Appendix D: Example of Level 5 Feedback Form

UCC SCHOOL OF **Pearson Unit Assignment Feedback**

PROGRAMME: Pearson BTEC Level 5 Higher National Diploma in **LEVEL 5**

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Student ID | | First Marker | | Unit Moderator/ Second Marker | |
|-------------------|--|---------------------|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------|----------------|----|
| UCC unit/module code | | Pearson Unit Title | Unit: | Credits | 15 |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|-------|----------------|----|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------|
| Assignment Details | Assignment 1 |
|---------------------------|--------------|

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| Location | Colchester Campus | Word count | | Submission deadline | |
|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|----------------------------|--|

Feedback Comments:

Feed Forward Advice:

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Overall Grade | | Marker's Signature | | Date | |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|--|-------------|--|

Assignment Learning Outcomes

This assignment will be assessing the following learning outcomes:

| | LO Achieved (Yes; No; N/A) | LO Achieved on Resubmission (Yes; No; N/A) |
|------|---------------------------------------|---|
| LO1. | | |
| LO2. | | |
| LO3. | | |
| LO4. | | |

Assessment Criteria

| | AC Achieved (Yes; No; N/A) | AC Achieved on Resubmission (Yes; No; N/A) |
|-----|---------------------------------------|---|
| P1. | | |
| P2. | | |
| M1. | | |
| D1. | | |

Resubmission Feedback Comments (if required):**Resubmission Feed Forward Advice:**

UCC SCHOOL OF

MODULE GUIDE IV SHEET LEVEL 4

Programme:

Module Title:

Module Tutor:

Module Internal Verifier(s):

Module Start Date:

| UCC Module Code | Credits | Date submitted for IV |
|--------------------|---------|-----------------------------|
| | | |

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

| Does the module guide: | Yes / No / NA | Comments |
|--|---------------|----------|
| Contain the correct information concerning the module code, module level and module tutor etc? | | |
| Contain an informative introduction/overview of the module? | | |
| Include an accurate statement of the learning outcomes? | | |
| Contain a summary of teaching and learning strategies? | | |
| Contain a detailed scheme of work with a weekly plan? | | |
| Include a list of the main text and supplementary texts? | | |
| Contain correct information concerning the number of weeks and direct teaching time? | | |

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

| Does the assignment information: | Yes / No / NA | Comments |
|--|---------------|----------|
| Provide students with an opportunity to meet the learning outcomes of the module? | | |
| Contain a scenario or case study that is clearly written and relevant? (Write 'n/a' if not appropriate.) | | |
| Include clear instructions regarding assignment requirements? | | |
| Indicate the word limit (written assignment) or duration (oral presentation or examination)? | | |
| Clearly state the completion ('hand-in') date for the assignment/s? | | |
| Avoid repeating an assignment instrument similar to one used within the previous three years? | | |
| Indicate assessment criteria (and their relative weightings)? | | |
| Match the submission information provided on the AIT sheet? | | |

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

| Accessibility | Yes / No / NA | Comments |
|---|---------------|----------|
| Is the Module Guide (and the assignment brief) accessible for all students? For example, is it available in a form that can be used by students with sight impairments? | | |
| Is the Module Guide ready to be shared with students? * | | |

*If "No" is recorded then the Internal Verifier should recommend actions before the Module Guide is issued, the Internal Verifier should confirm that the action/s has been undertaken.

General comments by the Internal Verifier:

Actions (if needed) after Internal Verification confirmed

Actions viewed and approved by Internal Verifier:

**Module Tutors
signature**

**Internal
Verifier(s)
signature**

**IV completion
date**

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| UCC SCHOOL OF | MODULE GUIDE IV SHEET LEVEL 5 |
| Programme: | |
| Module Title: | |
| Module Tutor: | |
| Module Internal Verifier(s): | |
| Module Start Date: | |

| UCC Module Code | | Credits | | Date submitted for IV | |
|--------------------|--|---------|--|-----------------------------|--|
|--------------------|--|---------|--|-----------------------------|--|

| CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS | | |
|---|--|--|
|---|--|--|

| Does the module guide: | Yes / No / NA | Comments |
|--|---------------|----------|
| Contain the correct information concerning the module code, module level and module tutor etc? | | |
| Contain an informative introduction/overview of the module? | | |
| Include an accurate statement of the learning outcomes? | | |
| Contain a summary of teaching and learning strategies? | | |
| Contain a detailed scheme of work with a weekly plan? | | |
| Include a list of the main text and supplementary texts? | | |
| Contain correct information concerning the number of weeks and direct teaching time? | | |

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

| Does the assignment information: | Yes / No / NA | Comments |
|--|---------------|----------|
| Provide students with an opportunity to meet the learning outcomes of the module? | | |
| Contain a scenario or case study that is clearly written and relevant? (Write 'n/a' if not appropriate.) | | |
| Include clear instructions regarding assignment requirements? | | |
| Indicate the word limit (written assignment) or duration (oral presentation or examination)? | | |
| Clearly state the completion ('hand-in') date for the assignment/s? | | |
| Avoid repeating an assignment instrument similar to one used within the previous three years? | | |
| Indicate assessment criteria (and their relative weightings)? | | |
| Match the submission information provided on the AIT sheet? | | |

CHECK LIST FOR VERIFICATION OF PROPOSED MODULE GUIDE AND ASSIGNMENTS

| Accessibility | Yes / No / NA | Comments |
|---|---------------|----------|
| Is the Module Guide (and the assignment brief) accessible for all students? For example, is it available in a form that can be used by students with sight impairments? | | |
| Is the Module Guide ready to be shared with students?* | | |

*If "No" is recorded then the Internal Verifier should recommend actions before the Module Guide is issued, the Internal Verifier should confirm that the action/s has been undertaken.

General comments by the Internal Verifier:

Actions (if needed) after Internal Verification confirmed

Actions viewed and approved by Internal Verifier:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|
| Module Tutors signature | | Internal Verifier(s) signature | | IV completion date | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|

Internal verification of assessment decisions – BTEC (RQF) – Level 4 (HNC)
INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSESSMENT DECISIONS

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Programme title | | | |
| Assessor | | Internal Verifier | |
| Unit(s) | | | |
| Assignment title | | | |
| Student's name | | Student ID Number | |

| Grade awarded | Referral | Pass | Merit | Distinction |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|
| | | | | |

INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| Is the grade awarded justified by the assessor's comments on the student work? | Yes/No | |
| Has the work been assessed accurately? | Yes/No | |
| Is the feedback to the student: Give details: Constructive? | Yes/No | |
| Linked to relevant assessment criteria? | Yes/No | |
| Identifying opportunities for improved performance in future assignments? | Yes/No | |
| Does the assessment decision need amending? | Yes/No | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------|--|
| Assessor signature | | Date: | |
| Internal Verifier signature | | Date: | |
| Programme Leader signature (if required) | | Date: | |

CONFIRM ACTION COMPLETED

Remedial action taken

Give details:

Assessor signature

Date:

Internal Verifier signature

Date:

Programme Leader signature (if required)

Date:

Internal verification of assessment decisions – BTEC (RQF) – Level 5 (HND)

INTERNAL VERIFICATION – ASSESSMENT DECISIONS

| | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Programme title | | | |
| Assessor | | Internal Verifier | |
| Unit(s) | | | |
| Assignment title | | | |
| Student's name | | Student ID Number | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Grade awarded | Referral | Pass | Merit | Distinction |
| | | | | |

INTERNAL VERIFIER CHECKLIST

| | | |
|---|--------|--|
| Is the grade awarded justified by the assessor's comments on the student work? | Yes/No | |
| Has the work been assessed accurately? | Yes/No | |
| Is the feedback to the student: Give details: Constructive? | Yes/No | |
| Linked to relevant assessment criteria? | Yes/No | |
| Identifying opportunities for improved performance in future assignments? | Yes/No | |
| Does the assessment decision need amending? | Yes/No | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------|--|
| Assessor signature | | Date: | |
| Internal Verifier signature | | Date: | |
| Programme Leader signature (if required) | | Date: | |

CONFIRM ACTION COMPLETED

Remedial action taken

Give details:

Assessor signature

Date:

Internal Verifier signature

Date:

Programme Leader signature (if required)

Date: