

Moderation Report[[1]](#footnote-2)\*

This report is the culmination of different peer review phases of the moderation process, as described in the [*Regulation for internal and external moderation*](https://sunrecords.sun.ac.za/controlled/C4%20Policies%20and%20Regulations/2.%20Regulation%20for%20Internal%20and%20External%20Moderation_2024.pdf)(2024) and should be completed for all exit-level modules*.*

Sections A and D should be completed by the module coordinator, and section C by the external moderator. Section B could be completed either by the module coordinator in consultation with the internal moderator or by the internal moderator.

A. General information

**Request to Stellenbosch University module coordinator**

Please read the *Regulation for internal and external moderation* (2023) and complete the following information before submitting this report to the internal or external moderator.

* + - 1. Module information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Module name(s) and code(s) |  |
| NQF level and credits |  |

* + - 1. Access to documents

|  |
| --- |
| Please provide a hyperlink(s) or explain how/where the module framework, all the assessment tasks, a sufficient sample (typically $\sqrt{class size}$) of assessment products, the mark sheet, and previous moderation reports should be accessed. |
|  |
|  |

* + - 1. Response to previous moderation report(s)

|  |
| --- |
| What were the main findings of the previous moderation report(s) and how have these been addressed? |
|  |
|  |

Section B: Internal moderation

**Request to Stellenbosch University module coordinator and internal moderator**

Internal moderation is conducted in a collegial, constructively critical and non-threating manner. Please verify that the module coordinator and internal moderator (a) considered and discussed the assessment plan of the module and determined that it is fair, valid, reliable and practicable, (b) reviewed a representative selection of summative assessment tasks (including, e.g., rubrics and marking guides) before they were distributed to students, and (c) moderated a sufficient sample of graded assessment products (typically $\sqrt{class size})$ to ensure that the mark allocation was fair and reasonable, and calculated and recorded in an accurate and reliable way.

1. Internal moderator

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of internal moderator |  |
| Department/Division |  |

1. Moderation of the module framework and assessment plan

|  |
| --- |
| What aspects of the module framework and assessment plan elicited some conversation? Please verify that the assessment plan was deemed to be fair, valid, reliable and practicable, and comment on any improvements that were proposed and implemented (e.g., related to the weighting of the assessment tasks; the balance between formative, summative and other types of assessment, or ways to increase opportunities for learning-centred feedback). |
|  |
|  |

1. Moderation of a representative selection of assessment tasks

|  |
| --- |
| Which summative assessment tasks were selected for moderation and why? Please verify that they contribute(d) to ≥40% of the final mark, and comment on any improvements that were proposed and implemented (e.g., related to the clarity of formulations, the standard set, the appropriateness of assessment methods, rubrics and marking guides, constructive alignment with the intended learning outcomes, and the promotion of academic integrity, etc.). Were there any ideas on improving the authenticity and relevance of the assessment tasks? |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Moderation of sufficient sample of assessment products

|  |
| --- |
| Please explain how the sampling of assessment products for moderation was done, and comment on any adjustments made to the marks. In terms of the assessment process, please verify that the standard set by the assessors was appropriate, and that the mark allocation was fair and reasonable, and calculated and recorded in an accurate and reliable way. |
|  |
|  |

1. Concerns, observations or suggestions for improvement

|  |
| --- |
| If any concerns were raised, or observations or suggestions for improvement made about the module in general (e.g., related to the decoloniality of the module content, parity of student success, how the learning opportunities are structured, the quality of the module framework, or the assessment tasks set for this module), please explain what adjustments have been made or will be considered in the future. |
|  |
|  |

Section C: External moderation

**Request to external moderator**

Please consider whether the assessment process to date has been credible and completed in an ethical way. This can be verified by (a) commenting on the internal moderation process, (b) peer reviewing a sufficient sample (typically $\sqrt{class size})$ of assessment products in full, and (c) conducting a cursory check of at least $\sqrt{class size}$ to verify that marks have been calculated and recorded in an accurate and reliable way. Please pay special attention to the assessment products of those students whose marks are near 50% (fail/pass) and/or 75% (distinction), as well as those that obtained the highest and lowest marks, respectively.

1. External moderator

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name of external moderator |  |
| University/HE institution  |  |
| Highest qualification |  |

1. The assessment- and moderation process

|  |
| --- |
| Reading the previous sections of this report, studying the module framework, looking at the assessment tasks and products, and all the documents made available, are you satisfied that you can make an informed judgement about the quality of this module, and its assessment- and moderation processes? If so, what is your impression of the standard of this module? Please verify that the assessment plan and moderation process were appropriate and adequate, and that the module coordinator and internal moderator correctly identified and addressed the most pertinent quality issues. |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. External moderation of assessment products

|  |
| --- |
| Please verify that the assessment process was credible and completed in an ethical way. You could comment on the following:* 1. How did you and the module coordinator decide on the summative assessment tasks to be moderated?
	2. Were the assessment criteria, weighting and mark allocation clear?
	3. Are you satisfied with the standard set by the assessors, i.e., that the grading was fair and reasonable, also for the products of those students whose marks are near the borderline of 50% and 75%?
	4. What grade adjustments would you propose?
	5. Are you satisfied that the marks have been calculated and recorded in an accurate and reliable way?
 |
|  |
|  |

1. Final observations, concerns or suggestions for improvement

|  |
| --- |
| Do you have any concerns about the module, the assessment plan or process, or the internal or external moderation process? Are there any matters that require urgent attention? Do you have any suggestions for improvement/enhancement going forward, or observed good practices to be commended? |
|  |
|  |

1. Confirmation

|  |
| --- |
| I hereby confirm that I externally moderated the assessment process of the module. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| External moderator signature |  |
| Date signed |  |

Section D: Reflection and improvement

**Request to Stellenbosch University module coordinator**

Given the moderation feedback above, please identify any good practices to share, or quality risks or improvement areas to be addressed and monitored at departmental/faculty level.

1. Improvement areas

|  |
| --- |
| If the internal or external moderator raised any concerns, please explain what adjustments will be made to the marks before the results are processed. Are there any improvement actions that will be addressed before or when the module is offered again? |
|  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Module coordinator signature |  |
| Date signed |  |

1. \* This is a generic template for the entire University and may be adapted by each faculty, *cf.* the *Regulation for internal and external moderation* (2024), sections 5.5, 6.2 (d) and9.6 (b). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)