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This handbook has been designed to provide all the information required to quality assure University of the Arts London Awarding Body qualifications. UAL Awarding Body is delighted to be working in partnership with its moderation team to ensure its qualifications are delivered and assessed appropriately, and that centres receive the best support possible.
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Introduction, background and context

1.1 Welcome from the Head of Academic Standards

At the University of Arts London Awarding Body, our policy for the appointment of external moderators has always been that, as one of our representatives, you should be an expert in your field. We believe that the moderation process should be a positive and worthwhile experience for both you as a moderator, and the centre you visit. Your dialogue around creative practice and assessment will maintain and improve standards and in turn, enhance the student experience.

Sarah Atkinson
Head of Academic Standards
UAL Awarding Body

1.2 Introduction

This handbook has been designed to provide all of the information required to quality assure UAL Awarding Body qualifications. Its purpose is to provide the external moderation team with clear guidance on the moderation process and the assessment and external moderation tasks they are required to carry out. The external moderation team consists of external moderators (EMs) lead external moderators (Lead EMs) and senior external moderators (SEMs), who are all responsible to the chief examiners (CEs).

Mission

UAL Awarding Body believes in transformative education. We design and award creative qualifications that empower and inspire educators to help students reach their potential.

About us

UAL Awarding Body is regulated by Ofqual, Qualification Wales and CCEA and currently offers regulated qualifications in art and design, fashion, creative media, music and performing and production arts. We are also the UK’s leading provider of the Diploma in Art & Design – Foundation Studies (FAD). Our qualifications have high retention and achievement rates because they are flexible, responsive and relevant to industry needs, and facilitate student progression.

We generally work with Further Education (FE) institutions and highly specialised arts and creative industries schools.

UAL Awarding Body offers qualifications in the following areas:
> Art & Design
> Creative Media
> Performing & Production Arts
> Music
> Fashion Business & Retail
> Short courses.
1.3 Supportive information
This handbook should be read in conjunction with the UAL Awarding Body’s assessment policy, the relevant qualification specification(s) and the centre handbook.

The assessment policy contains information on:
> UAL Awarding Body’s assessment strategy
> Assessment methods
> Recording assessment decisions and feedback.

The qualification specifications contain information on:
> Frames of reference
> Units and indicative content
> Grade criteria and grade exemplification.

The centre handbook contains information on:
> Reasonable adjustments
> Special consideration
> Aegrotat award.

All of our publications, including policies and procedures are available to view on our website: www.arts.ac.uk/awarding

Separate guidance will also be provided for tasks you are required to carry out as part of your role.

1.4 Events and training
Our focus is to build strong, mutually beneficial relationships with our moderation team. We run a range of training events each year to ensure our moderators remain up-to-date with our policies and procedures.

An integral part of your role is ensuring that you maintain a high level of knowledge and understanding of our qualifications and are fully acquainted with their academic standards.

You will be notified of upcoming training events via email so please ensure that the UAL Awarding Body team has your current email address.

1.5 Our commitment to you
We want all of our moderators to feel a part of the UAL Awarding Body team. We value your individual skills and expertise and acknowledge the important role that the moderation team plays in securing the validity of our qualifications.

We expect you to carry out this work with integrity and honesty, so we will do our best to support you by offering regular training, standardisation sessions and UAL Awarding Body conferences.
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Governance structure

Director

Products, services and projects team
- Chief Examiner L1 and L2 Art & Design
- Art & Design senior external moderators

Head of academic standards
- Chief Examiner L3 Art & Design
- Creative Media senior external moderators

Quality and operations team
- Chief Examiner Music & Media
- Performing Arts and Music senior external moderators
- Chief Examiner Performing & Production Arts
- Foundation Studies senior external moderators
- Fashion Business & Retail senior external moderators
- Chief Examiner Foundation Studies
- Chief Examiner Fashion Business & Retail
- External moderators

4 UAL Awarding Body
2.1 Quality assurance governance structure

UAL Awarding Body’s quality team exists to ensure all quality assurance systems and processes are robust.

The moderation team report to the chief examiners appropriate to the qualification area. The moderation team monitor and risk assess the centres they visit, reporting to their allocated senior external moderators (SEMs) as needed. Their findings are summarised in a report, a sample of which are reviewed by the CEs.

The SEMs evaluate the information and contribute to their respective chief examiners’ annual reports. The outcomes feed into the self-assessment review carried out by UAL Awarding Body’s Quality & Operations team. This process forms an integral part of the ongoing development and enhancement of our quality assurance processes. The information also helps us to risk assess our centres and qualifications, follow up actions and put in place any necessary steps for improvement.

2.2 The role of the moderation team

**Chief Examiner**

Each UAL Awarding Body qualification is assigned a chief examiner. Chief examiners are responsible for the development and assessment of qualifications for their subject area. They are also responsible for ensuring external moderators meet UAL Awarding Body’s quality standards. They do this by reviewing reports, analysing data and reporting issues of concern to the UAL Awarding Body Quality & Operations team.

**External moderator**

All UAL Awarding Body moderators are expected to have a detailed understanding of the qualifications relevant to their subject area.

As one of UAL Awarding Body’s representatives, you have been appointed to ensure that the assessment being delivered in our centres is fit-for-purpose through external moderation.

As part of your role you are expected to advise assessment teams, confirm whether or not you are able to approve the assessment decisions made, and to ensure the quality and consistency of standards within and across our centres.

The table on the next page outlines the main areas of responsibility for each member of the moderation team.
### Roles and responsibilities

**Responsible for**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderating the standard of assessment by centre internal assessors and verifiers</th>
<th>External moderator</th>
<th>Lead external moderator</th>
<th>Senior external moderator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sampling across the achievement range to ensure that assessment decisions are consistent and of the required standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing clear and constructive feedback to the centre staff throughout the visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing clear and accurate reports on the outcomes of the moderation sampling in line with UAL Awarding body agreed requirements and time scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending and participating in UAL Awarding Body standardisation events as required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the continuous improvement of centres’ performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting as a representative for UAL Awarding Body and operating in a professional manner at all times and in a way that is consistent with the Awarding Body’s Code of conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating a team of moderators to ensure consistency in the operation of moderation during a visit, in addition to organising and writing the final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing ongoing support and guidance to external moderators, including acting as an escalation point as and when required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating and participating in standardisation, training and ad hoc regional quality events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out observations of external moderators and reporting on their performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing reports and reporting issues of concern to the chief examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out advisory visits to centres in their first year of qualification delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing accurate content for inclusion in the annual chief examiner report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annual moderation activities

3.1 Contracts
Contracts are issued each academic year. You will receive an agreement and schedule outlining your role and responsibilities.

3.2 Annual training
It is a contractual requirement that external moderators attend the moderation training each academic year.

The training covers policies, procedures and valuable updates from UAL Awarding Body.

3.3 Standardisation
We hold annual standardisation events for all of our qualifications. Moderators are required to attend these for the qualifications they moderate regularly. This ensures that they maintain a sound understanding of the assessment criteria and that assessment decisions are consistent with the agreed standard.

The chief examiner or senior external moderator for your area will advise you of the standardisation events you are required to attend.

3.4 Allocations
Allocations are managed by UAL Awarding Body. Details of the system used to operate this process will be disseminated to you when the allocations process commences each year.

3.5 External moderation visit
The majority of external moderation visits take place between May and July each year.

External Moderators are required to confirm arrangements with centres a minimum of four weeks in advance of the visit. UAL Awarding Body has a standard letter template for this.

A report and risk rating must be submitted for each visit. The lead moderator is responsible for completing and submitting the report and verifying the agreed grades.

3.6 Support
UAL Awarding Body’s team is equipped to provide you with support throughout the year, especially during the busy moderation period.

Senior external moderators are available to advise their assigned external moderators, and chief examiners are available to advise their senior external moderators.
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Terminology

4.1 Terminology

Assessment (Carried out by the centre)
The process for making decisions about the extent to which a student’s work has met the assessment requirements of individual units.

The assessment methods must cover the requirements of the learning outcomes and assessment criteria and should include a range of methods and evidence rich activities.

External Moderation (Carried out by the external moderator)
A process designed to ensure that centres provide students with fair and reliable assessment opportunities in accordance with UAL Awarding Body’s guidelines.

External moderation takes place after a centre carries out its assessment and internal verification of the qualification. It is designed to ensure that these preceding quality stages have met UAL Awarding Body’s requirements and that the criteria for awarding has been achieved.

External moderation is intended to be a supportive process which encourages centres and moderators to work collaboratively to enable centres to achieve these goals.

Sampling
A process used for assessing whether a centre’s assessments are valid, reliable, fair and effective. It is advisable to have a sample plan before carrying out a visit.

A plan should cover all aspects of the qualification’s provision:
1 Assessors
2 Internal verifiers
3 Cohorts
4 Assessment methods
5 Assessment grades

Attention should be given to the sampling of borderline assessment outcomes and must include assessments on the following grade boundaries:
> Fail/Referral
> Referral/Pass
> Pass/Merit
> Merit/Distinction.

A sample must be selected by the external moderator, a centre must not offer their own selection.

The size of the sample must be 10%. This should be extended by a further 5% if there are serious concerns about the quality of assessment. Where a group is below 60 students, a minimum sample of six is required.

In some cases where a Centre is deemed to be of low risk, a light touch moderation will be conducted on L3 Diploma and the sample size will be 5%. UAL Awarding Body will notify the moderator when this applies and details will be provided in the itinerary report.

Referral
Where a centre identifies a student’s failure to meet assessment criteria following assessment and internal moderation, the centre must refer the student. Centres must discuss the unit assessment criteria that they have failed to meet with the student and provide them with opportunities to work toward meeting those assessment criteria within a suitable period of time (recommended two weeks). Students are only allowed one opportunity to redeem a referral in each unit.

The centre will assess the student’s re-submitted work against the assessment criteria. If the centre’s previous assessment decisions have been agreed as meeting standards than no additional visit from an external moderator is necessary. However, where there have been a large number of referred students or reasonable quality concerns, UAL Awarding Body reserves the right to arrange another visit by an external moderator. The cost of an additional visit will be met by the centre.

A large number roughly applies to more than 10% of an assessment team’s cohort, however external moderators are strongly encouraged to use their professional judgement when making this decision.
5.1 Before the visit
UAL Awarding Body manages the first part of the moderation process by confirming all allocations with members of the moderation team. The following activities take place in the lead up to each visit:
> UAL Awarding Body provides an itinerary for each visit, including key centre and qualification information (location, contacts, group and sample size)
> UAL Awarding Body coordinates travel and accommodation as required by the moderation team
> UAL Awarding Body provides the qualification benchmark report for the past three years, as well as the previous year’s visit report. This will include progress against action points and any outstanding issues where applicable
> Moderator sends confirmation to centre using standard letter and schedule templates
> Centres must provide proposed grades for moderator to access
> Centre confirms details of: reasonable adjustments, special consideration, exemptions, recognition of prior learning, plagiarism, malpractice, complaints and appeals
> Moderator proposes the sample with centre
> Moderator prepares copies of the qualification specification and EM Handbook for the visit.

5.2 During the visit
The moderator should begin the visit by meeting with the course leader and as many other relevant staff as they deem feasible. This will provide the moderator with an opportunity to build relationships with the team. It also allows the moderator to explore any issues that need to be addressed, and advise on any areas where they feel they may be able to offer support or guidance.

There should be a discussion on the current standard of the qualification delivery and assessment, to determine if there are areas of concern which may have arisen since the last visit. A discussion about the course content and the design of the project brief for the final unit is also worthwhile.

During the moderation it is advisable to populate the report as the activity progresses to ensure accurate information is recorded.

The moderator must refer to any recommendations and/or action points from the previous year’s visit report. Recommendations which have been acted on must be acknowledged and comments made on any resulting improvements.

The moderator must acknowledge any previous actions placed on the centre, and whether the teaching team can provide evidence of progress and/or completion of the action(s). After reviewing the evidence the moderator must confirm whether the action(s) have been met. This information must be recorded in the relevant section of the visit report.

The activities indicated in the flow chart on the following page serve as a checklist when carry out the moderation of assessment.

The moderator:
> Must sample across a range of assessment decisions and assessment teams
> Does not change grades
> Must provide feedback against the assessment criteria.
> Must verify the grades via the Portal, if they have been approved.

Towards the end of a visit, and following the moderation of the sample of assessments, it is essential that the moderator holds a short meeting with the team to confirm the work undertaken and provide verbal feedback which summarises their findings from the visit, the centre should be instructed to record this feedback for their reference.

External moderators should inform centres that any agreed action points are provisional until they have been confirmed by UAL Awarding Body.

Where there has been serious cause for concern regarding the standard of the assessment decisions, the moderator should refer to an SEM who will consider the best course of action. This will either be actions for the centre or a second
moderation visit. Prior agreement will be sought from the CE before a second moderation visit can be allocated. Findings from second visits should be added against the actions noted on the original report.

5.3 After the visit
A moderation report must be completed within 10 working days. At the same time, the moderator must indicate the centre’s overall performance for the delivery of the qualification. The rating must be based on the moderator’s professional judgement, taking into account their responses made against each of the questions in the moderation report.

UAL Awarding Body’s Academic Standards team will review a sample of all moderators’ report submissions for the academic year. A report may be returned to the moderator for amendment prior to it being published to the centre.

UAL Awarding Body is responsible for making the report available to the centre, this is not done by the external moderator.

Any actions required for the upcoming academic year will be monitored by UAL Awarding Body’s relevant chief examiner and quality team to ensure the centre completes the actions by the agreed date.

5.4 Code of conduct
As representatives of UAL Awarding Body, the moderation team will:
> Be professional and ethical in their conduct at all times
> Declare any conflicts of interest relating to a centre, staff or student, which could impact, or be seen to impact on moderator objectivity
> Be the expert during a visit and manage the process of moderation from start to finish
> Guide and support centres through the moderation process
> Advise on areas requiring improvement
> Provide objective advice in-line with UAL Awarding Body policy
> Engage positively with centres and colleagues
> Respond promptly to requests from UAL Awarding Body for information relating to moderation activity
> Report any concerns relating to maladministration or malpractice
> Report any hostile behaviour by centres relating to or during the visit
> Avoid discussing or sharing information relating to a centre, with anyone other than the appropriate individuals within the centre or UAL Awarding Body
> Always act in compliance with UAL Awarding Body’s policies and procedures
> Keep activities on-site and within the remit of the moderator role
> Take responsibility for own competence and development, and for maintaining own continuing professional development (CPD) records
> Dispose of paper files containing confidential or personal information, such as centres and student records. These must be disposed of confidentially, e.g. through shredding
> Regularly review all electronic files relating to the moderator role and delete all documentation in excess of three-years-old or when it is no longer required
> Ensure they have access to the essential tools required to fulfil the moderator role, including email, word processing and printing facilities.
### 5.5 Step by step guide to the moderation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Centre presents evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All assessment and standardisation records for both formative and summative units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Brief for final unit and full portfolios of all candidates in sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>External moderator reviews evidence &amp; moderates assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the internal assessment methodology rigorous?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the assessment decisions fair, valid, consistent and free from bias?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the grading decisions for the final unit reflect the evidence produced for the assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concerns about quality of assessment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use professional judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If incorrect assessment only applies to a small proportion of sample, and there is sufficient evidence of a robust assessment process, grades can be signed off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grades approved and visit completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree content of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide constructive feedback against assessment criteria to the whole team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledge strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verify grades via the Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>EM extends the sample by 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enter into dialogue with Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confirm whether assessment decisions meet standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the extended sample provides the additional evidence of a robust assessment process grades can be signed off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grades not approved subsequent to an extended sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If a specific pathway/grade boundary is in question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek advice from SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEM seeks advice from CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CE confirms if actions are suitable or whether a second visit is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If actions are suitable, go straight to step 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Second visit arranged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEM moderates reassessed decisions for sub-set or entire cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent on outcome of first visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of visit met by centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If resolution cannot be reached, centre may appeal against the assessment decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grades approved and visit completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree content of report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide constructive feedback against assessment criteria to the whole team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledge strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggest recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify actions where standards have not been met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verify grades via the Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Written report completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report content checked for accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Submitted to UAL Awarding Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within 10 days of visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6

Allocation and remuneration

6.1 External moderator allocation and remuneration

Allocation
> An external moderator can be allocated to a centre for up to three years but is contracted annually.
> An external moderator can be re-allocated, subject to an acceptable standard of performance, every three years to ensure clarity of judgements and to extend experience across a range of centres.

Length of working day
> The normal external moderator working day is seven hours, of which approximately one-hour should be spent receiving guidance from the course leader on the location and format of the evidence and the proposed grades (if allocated). External moderators should also spend this time reporting judgments and conclusions, and double-checking evidence where necessary.

Full-time course workload
> On average, external moderators are expected to review the evidence of two to three externally moderated units per hour. This takes into account that some sets of evidence will require more time and others less.
> An external moderator for one of the large qualifications should therefore be able to moderate up to 12 sets of evidence in a day for L3 Extended Diplomas and Foundation Studies Diplomas, and 15 sets of evidence in a day for L2 and L3 Diplomas.

Short courses workload
> For stand-alone units, external moderators are expected to review an average of four sets of evidence for an Award (two units) or three sets of evidence for a Certificate (four units) per hour.
> External moderators should be able to moderate up to 20 sets of evidence per day for a stand-alone award, and up to 15 sets of evidence per day for a stand-alone Certificate.
> For units embedded in a ‘host’ qualification, external moderators are expected to review an average of three sets of evidence for an Award and two sets of evidence for a Certificate per hour.
> External moderators for an embedded Award should be able to moderate up to 15 sets of evidence per day, or up to 12 sets of evidence per day.

Sample size
> The normal size of a sample for external moderation is 10%, although this may be extended by 5% if external moderators are unclear if agreed standards are being met.
> A ratio between registrations at a centre and the number of external moderators required can therefore be established, e.g. a 10% sample from a centre with 100 × Diploma in Art & Design – Foundation Studies candidates would be 10; requiring one external moderator for one day.
> Where a Centre is deemed to be of low risk, a light touch moderation will be conducted on L3 Diploma and the sample size will be 5%. UAL Awarding Body will notify the moderator when this applies and details will be provided in the itinerary report.

Remuneration
> The fee for undertaking external moderation duties includes the activity of moderation and the completion and submission of a visit report.
> When external moderators work in teams, the lead external moderator will be remunerated at a higher rate for coordinating the activities of the team. The report should be based on contributions from all members of the team.
> If a visit overruns due to either the sample being extended or other quality concerns, a moderator is able to claim an additional fee on top of the daily rate. This must be agreed and signed off by the moderator’s SEM. Further details on fees can be found in the document ‘Guidance for fees and expenses’.
> Where it has been necessary to extend the sample, and with the agreement of UAL Awarding Body, an external moderator may claim an additional payment for the extra time spent moderating.
## Contacts

### 7.1 Chief Examiner contact details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Atkinson</td>
<td>Head of Academic Standards</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.j.atkinson@arts.ac.uk">s.j.atkinson@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Cook</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Diploma in Art &amp; Design – Foundation Studies (FAD)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sue.cook@arts.ac.uk">sue.cook@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew Moseley</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Level 3 Diploma and Extended Diploma in Art &amp; Design</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.moseley@arts.ac.uk">m.moseley@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Cull</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Level 1 and Level 2 Award and Diploma in Art &amp; Design</td>
<td><a href="mailto:v.cull@arts.ac.uk">v.cull@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Sankey</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Music Performance &amp; Production</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.sankey@arts.ac.uk">a.sankey@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Mollica</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Performing &amp; Production Arts</td>
<td><a href="mailto:m.mollica@arts.ac.uk">m.mollica@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justine Head</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Fashion Business &amp; Retail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.head@arts.ac.uk">j.head@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Harland</td>
<td>Chief Examiner, Creative Media Production &amp; Technology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.harland@arts.ac.uk">j.harland@arts.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1 Completing the report
External moderators should comment on the following in their reports:
> Evidence produced for assessment
> Assessment methodology
> Areas of good practice
> Any recommendations that should be considered by the centre.

The report should only contain information discussed with the centre in the feedback session at the end of the visit.

The following information details advice and prompts for the completion of a report:

Reports should be completed in the third person and grammar and spelling should be corrected before submitting them to UAL Awarding Body.

Part 1
Candidate sample
The candidate sample must be at least 10% of the cohort. The candidate sample may be extended by an additional 5% if it is necessary to clarify the accuracy of grading decisions. Candidates in the sample should be identified only by their Unique Learner Number (ULN) which can be retrieved from the course leader. External moderators should note the following:
> Number of candidates in the cohort
> Number of candidates in the sample
> How the course is delivered – across specialist areas or pathways
> List the pathways and select a representative sample as % of each area (10–15% of each)
> Number and % of D/M/P/R/W/F

Part 2
Sample information
> List the ULN of the samples along with the pathway, grade awarded by the centre and indicate either YES or NO to confirm if the assessment decision is accurate against the learning outcome. Any comments must be recorded in part 4.

Part 3.1
Candidate authentication forms
Indicate either YES or NO to confirm that Candidate authentication forms were made available at the point of external moderation. If the response is no this must be an action for the following year.

Part 3.2
Special considerations
Indicate either YES or NO that any Special considerations have been approved by the awarding body at the point of external moderation. If the response is no, partially or otherwise this must be an action for the following year.

Part 4
Profile of assessment
This section should be used to report on the general strengths of the candidate evidence in relation to unit aims and assessment criteria.

External moderators should use sub-headings for this section of the report and comment on any areas of strength or good practice and any areas for development or improvement. It is important to note differences between specialist areas or pathways where this occurs.

External Moderators may identify, but not name, candidates as examples by using the ULN.

When completing sections referencing grade criteria, external moderators should select the descriptors below to comment as applicable for the qualification being moderated:
Quality of project proposals
> Word-processed
> Articulate
> Comprehensive
> Level of challenge enabling students to meet higher criteria
> Critical and contextual references
> Relevance and depth of bibliography
> Harvard referencing
> Planning and evaluation.

Research
> Thoroughness
> Appropriateness
> Relevance
> Integration throughout the project
> Contextual understanding
> Impact on practice
> Primary and secondary
> Extended research.

Problem solving
> Breadth of experimentation
> Recording methodology
> Practical and technical challenge
> Investigation and decision making
> Initiative and ability to adapt to unforeseen challenges
> Measurement of impact
> Intention, content and theoretical challenge.

Planning and production
> Ability to work effectively within a time frame
> Effectiveness in collaboration
> Accessing resources
> Documentation of planning and production
> Self-direction.

Practical skills
> Level and application of skills across all pathways
> Access to resources
> Consistency of technical support
> Range of available materials
> Supportive teaching practices for technical skills
> Ambition and quality of outcomes.

Evaluation and reflection
> Regularity of ongoing reflection
> Recording methodology
> Inclusion of peer and self-assessment
> Level of visual analysis
> Level of written analysis
> Self-awareness and perception
> Quality of final evaluative statement.

Quality of exhibition, display or performance of work
> Professionalism of presentation
> Strategies explored and considered within constraints
> Organisation and presentation of supporting work
> Clarity of communication to the audience
> Independence in realisation.

Part 5
Centre internal quality assurance
This section should be used to confirm whether the centre's assessment methodology is sound and of good practice.

If the assessment methodologies are unsound, the external moderator must provide a commentary on those aspects which require re-design or strengthening. These must be noted as actions and a date for completion agreed with the centre.

External moderators should use this section to confirm, through discussion with the assessment team and examination of relevant records, whether:
> Assessment paperwork is fit for purpose, assessment judgments clearly relate evidence to the criteria and feedback is relevant and constructive
> Assessment methodology for internally assessed units is rigorous and ensures assessment decisions are fair, valid and free from bias. This should include a description of the centre assessment process e.g. team, blind marking, cross pathway marking etc.
> Assessment, internal verification and standardisation processes are suitably robust (centres should provide the external moderator with examples of assessment and internal verification paperwork for internally assessed units)
> Assessment and internal verification documentation clearly evidences the decision making process in ‘borderline’ candidates
> Assessors refer to the UAL Awarding Body exemplification matrices, at the relevant level, to ensure consistency of grading decisions
> Referred students are given clear feedback and time frame for re-submission
> Grading decisions across all pathways are consistent
> The external moderator is able to confirm that assessment decisions made by the centre are consistent with national standards.
> The external moderator should also note examples of good practice and any recommendations.
Part 6
General commentary
This section should be used to provide a brief summary of your conclusions identifying areas of good practice as appropriate e.g.
> Use of handouts in introducing the final unit
> Students are clear in their understanding of criteria and expectations as evidenced in self-assessment
> Opportunities for tutorials, group critiques and peer review
> Employer engagement
> Quality of project proposals
> Range of topics
> Breadth and depth of research in informing project development
> Level of investigation and experimentation
> Quality of centre documentation
> Student progression
> Overall quality of work by pathway.

Part 7
Recommendations
> This section should be used to outline any recommendations that should be considered by the centre, including areas for development based on the findings of the external moderation visit above. The external moderator should acknowledge any recommendations from the previous years report that have been acted on and any resulting improvements.
> Recommendations are for guidance only and can be carried out at the discretion of the centre.

Part 8.1
Previous Actions
Where applicable moderators must provide an update on actions detailed in the previous report.

Part 8.2
Actions
If the responses to any of the above sections require actions to be taken by the centre or UAL Awarding Body, the external moderator must complete this section.

External moderators should ensure that actions are noted by the centre at the time of the visit and are accurately recorded in the EM report.

Actions are essential measures for improving centre standards for assessment and must be carried out by the agreed date. The external moderator must acknowledge that any previous actions placed on the centre have been completed.

Before sending the report to UAL Awarding Body the external moderator should ensure that they have checked the details and information on the front cover sheet. This needs to include the following:
> The Centre Name and site
> The group ID
> The full qualification title
> The level of the qualification
> Date of the visit
> Name of the course leader
> Name of the moderator/moderation team

8.2 Definitions of actions and recommendations
Actions
> Advice given by an external moderator to a centre
> Essential measures for improving centre delivery, to meet quality assurance standards for assessment processes and for the continuing validation of UAL Awarding Body
> Actions to be taken within a period of time agreed between UAL Awarding Body and the centre; this would usually be prior to the final assessment of the next completing cohort.

Recommendations
> Guidance given by an external moderator to a centre
> Desirable measures for continuing improvement to centre delivery, quality assurance standards and assessment processes
> Recommendations to be carried out at the discretion of the centre in discussion with UAL Awarding Body.
Section 9

Internal verification guidance

9.1 Guidance for good practice on assessment and internal verification

Formative assessment
A formative assessment tutorial supported by verbal and written feedback on achievement and areas for improvement should be given at least once during the delivery of a unit or units. This gives the tutor an opportunity to monitor the progress of a student and to ensure that actions are taken to address any areas of concern prior to project deadlines.

Self-assessment and peer assessment
Evaluation and reflection should be an ongoing part of the student learning experience. Centres should also encourage students to self-assess against the assessment criteria prior to a formative or summative assessment. The process of self-assessment reinforces an understanding of how assessment decisions are arrived at and enables students to identify their own strengths and areas for improvement.

Assessment for units
Initial assessment should be undertaken by one or more members of the teaching team. Ideally each student should receive a one-to-one assessment tutorial to provide them with an opportunity to present and explain their work and achievements. Verbal and written feedback against the assessment criteria should be given, with tutorial notes and action plans noted. Indicative grading feedback may be used. Any borderline decisions should be discussed and agreed with another member of the course team.

Summative assessment for graded units
The initial summative assessment should be undertaken independently by one or more members of the teaching team. Blind marking and double marking are recommended. Student work should always be assessed against the unit assessment and grading criteria. Once assessment is complete, the team should meet to discuss and agree decisions. Minutes of discussion on borderline, disputed and subsequently agreed grades should be recorded and presented to the external moderator. Where assessors have recorded different grades and no agreement is reached these submissions should be added to the internal verification sample.

Internal standardisation
To ensure parity of grading decisions the teaching team should agree benchmarks for Pass, Merit and Distinction across disciplines before assessing the whole cohort.

Internal verification
To check the accuracy of individual assessment decisions the Internal Verifier should select a sample of at least 10% of the assessed cohort. The sample should represent grading decisions across all levels and disciplines. In addition, all disputed and borderline decisions should be seen and agreed by the Internal Verifier.

Referrals
The criteria where a student has failed to reach the required level should be made clear. Students should receive written feedback and guidance against the criteria on what they must do to achieve a Pass. Ideally the student should also be given the opportunity to attend a tutorial. An appropriate date for re-submission should be given and students are allowed only one opportunity to resubmit. On re-submission referred students are always capped at Pass.
### Section 10

#### Glossary

**Aegrotat award**
An award made in exceptional circumstances where there is no prospect of the student ever being able to be reassessed. Awards can only be made if the student has generated sufficient evidence of achievement upon which to base the aegrotat assessment decision.

**Appeal**
A process through which an awarding body may be challenged on the outcome of an enquiry about results or, where appropriate, other procedural decisions affecting a centre or individual.

**Assessment criteria**
The requirements that candidates need to meet in order to successfully complete the learning outcomes for a unit or qualification.

**Authentication**
Confirmation that evidence was produced by the candidate who is putting it forward for assessment (in the form of a declaration of authenticity by the candidate).

**Candidate**
A person who is registered with an awarding body for a qualification or unit.

**Centre**
An organisation or consortium accountable to an awarding body for the assessment arrangements leading to a qualification or units.

**Certificate**
The record of attainment in a unit or qualification issued by the awarding body.

**External Moderator**
An individual appointed by the awarding body to ensure accurate and consistent standards of assessment across centres and over time. Presiding over the decision/discussion/mediation

**External moderation final visit report form**
Records details of candidates sampled for the external moderation and a commentary on the conduct of the internal assessment and grading methodology at each centre.

**Internal verifier**
Individual(s) appointed by the centre to ensure accurate and consistent standards of assessment across assessors.

**Qualification**
An award made to a student for the achievement of the specified combination of credits.

**Reasonable adjustment**
Any action that helps reduce the effect of a disability or difficulty that places the candidate at a substantial disadvantage in the assessment situation. Reasonable adjustments are approved before the assessment activity takes place; they constitute an arrangement to give the candidate access to the qualification. Full details can be found in the relevant policy.

**Results sheet**
A record indicating candidates’ achievement. External moderators are responsible for verifying and endorsing the results sheet following a satisfactory visit.

**Special consideration**
Can be applied where a candidate has been disadvantaged during the assessment due to an unforeseen circumstance, or something which is outside the candidate’s control which may have impacted upon their performance. It may result in an extension to an assessment deadline or a small post-assessment adjustment to a candidate’s grade. Full details can be found in the relevant policy.

**Standardisation of assessment**
A process to ensure that the assessment criteria for a qualification or unit are applied consistently by assessors and moderators. Standardisation can be carried out within centres, (internal moderation) as well as by awarding bodies across their centres.

**Unit**
The smallest part of a qualification that is capable of certification in its own right.
UAL Awarding Body has produced a series of documents to support the delivery of our qualifications and facilitate the moderation process and support our external moderators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Document name</th>
<th>Document type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Purpose and content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External moderation visit</td>
<td>EM Visit: Template contact letter</td>
<td>Template</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>For EMs to send to centres. Outlines introduction and confirms the evidence required for the visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM Visit: Template schedule</td>
<td>Template</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>For EMs to send to centres. Serves as an example of how a visit is planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance for fees and expenses</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>Provides guidance on the varying fee payments and the criteria for claiming expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel and accommodation booking form</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>For EMs to complete ahead of each visit scheduled and submit to UAL Awarding Body. All travel and accommodation is arranged by UAL Awarding Body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External moderator operations guide</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>Provides a straightforward guide to the administration steps involved before, during and after the moderation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade record forms</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>Serves as a supportive document during visits, to capture the moderation of assessment decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EM visit report templates</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Portal</td>
<td>For EMs to complete per qualification as part of their moderation visit. Reports must be completed and submitted to UAL Awarding Body within 10 working days following the visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document name</td>
<td>Document type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Purpose and content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy &amp; procedure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment policy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For use by centres, students and moderators. Provides the full policy on UAL Awarding Body assessment strategy, assessment methods and recording assessment decisions and feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Adjustments &amp; Special</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For use by centres, students and moderators. Provides the full policy and procedure for the submission of either a reasonable adjustment and/or special consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerations policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malpractice &amp; Maladministration policy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For use by centres, students and moderators. Provides the full policy and procedure for the identification and management of a case of malpractice and/or maladministration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest declaration form</td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For EMs to complete on an annual basis as part of their contractual agreement with UAL Awarding Body.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of interest policy</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For use by all UAL Awarding Body staff and centres. Provides the full details for the definition and the procedures in place to manage all instances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification specifications</td>
<td>Specification</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For use by centres, students and moderators. Provides frames of reference, units and indicative content specific to the qualification and grade criteria and exemplification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Handbook</td>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>For use by centres, students and moderators. Provides instruction for internal assessment and verification, external moderation and outlines of appropriate policy relating to assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UAL Awarding Body believes in transformative education. We design and award creative qualifications that empower and inspire educators to help students reach their potential.

UAL Awarding Body is regulated by Ofqual, Qualification Wales and CCEA and currently offers regulated qualifications in art and design, fashion, creative media, music and performing and production arts. We are also the UK’s leading provider of the Diploma in Art & Design – Foundation Studies. Our qualifications have high retention and achievement rates because they are flexible, responsive and relevant to industry needs, and facilitate student progression.

University of the Arts London (UAL) is Europe’s largest specialist art and design university, comprising six renowned Colleges: Camberwell College of Arts, Central Saint Martins, Chelsea College of Arts, London College of Communication, London College of Fashion and Wimbledon College of Arts.

Want to find out more?

Contact

UAL Awarding Body
272 High Holborn
London WC1V 7EY

Tel: 0207 514 9851
Email: ual.awardingbody@arts.ac.uk
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