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Introduction

1. This Code sets out the University of Surrey’s policy and procedural framework relating to the role and responsibilities of Moderators appointed for validated undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes leading to awards of the University of Surrey at Associated Institutions (AIs) (hereafter know as Institutions); it should be read in conjunction with the relevant University Regulations and Codes of practice. The Convenor/Director of a validated programme will be notified by the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) of the appointment of a Moderator and is supplied with a copy of this Code.

2. The role of Moderator may be characterised as being a “critical friend” and advisor. It should be a developing one as the working relationship with the programme team evolves and knowledge is acquired of the nature of the programme and the quality assurance procedures of the institution within which it is delivered. The relationship should be based on dialogue and problem solving, developing good communication with, and responding to the needs of, the programme team.

3. The Moderator is not an additional external examiner nor a decision maker on issues concerning admissions, mitigating circumstances, student complaints etc. Guidance on all these matters and others such as plagiarism should be included in College quality assurance guidelines or programme handbooks.

Nomination and approval of appointments

4. Moderator appointments shall be made by the University, drawn from the University’s Faculties: Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS), Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences (FEPS) and Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences (FHMS).

5. In all cases permission for the nominee to act as Moderator must be obtained from the relevant Department/School and Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) (ADLT).

6. All nominees will be required to submit a full CV and completed nomination form (Appendix 1) (in which they will self-declare they meet the criteria below) for consideration and approval by the Chair of the Quality and Standards Sub-committee (QSS).

7. All moderators are expected to meet the following criteria:
   - broad expertise in the subject area/delivery method of the validated programme and an academic qualification at an equivalent or higher level than the validated programme
   - appropriate teaching experience
   - knowledge and understanding of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education;
   - sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers
   - awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula
   - competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience
   - experience of validation collaborative arrangements

8. Moderators shall normally be appointed for a period of three to five years, with the possibility of re-appointment for up to a further two years in instances of a teach-out period.

9. A Moderator would normally only be appointed for one institution.
10. Where a Moderator is appointed for an existing programme, a handover meeting will be arranged between the outgoing and incoming Moderator.

11. Moderators and institutions are responsible for bringing to the attention of the University any changed circumstances which may cause a potential or actual conflict of interest.

12. After the appointment is approved Moderators will be issued with the following:
   - official notification of appointment letter (sent from the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards)
   - the programme specification(s) and handbook(s) (supplied by the Institution)
   - dates of Boards of Examiners and Boards of Studies and a timetable for assessments (from the Institution)
   - Regulations for taught programmes
   - a copy of this Code of practice
   - a copy of the Code of practice for external examining: taught programmes
   - a copy of the Code of practice for assessment and feedback

13. Moderators will be guided and supported in their role by:
   - a Moderator Induction event (at University of Surrey and at the Associated Institution)
   - staff in the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards
   - Moderator web pages/electronic handbook
   - networking opportunities

14. Moderators will meet with the Convenor/Director for the programme to establish mutual expectations regarding attendance at meetings of Boards of Studies and Boards of Examiners, involvement in curriculum development and in student assessment.

15. Moderators are expected to take time get to know the programme team, the profile of student and the Institution. The Moderator ideally should meet the teaching team and students drawn from each year/level of the programme outside the context of formal meetings at least once a year.

Interim Moderatorship

16. In the event of a Moderator unable to complete their full term of office (sabbatical) a replacement will be sourced from the same Faculty in order to ensure continuity of academic support and scrutiny.

17. The Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) will contact the relevant Faculty's Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) to nominate a suitably qualified and experienced Moderator within the subject field. Once nominated, approval will be ascertained via correspondence with the Chair of the Quality and Standards Subcommittee.

18. Once approved, the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) will issue the Interim Moderator with the documentation issued to the Moderator (see paragraph 12 above) together with the previous Moderator Report Forms for the validated programmes.

19. The Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision)/outgoing Moderator will arrange a changeover briefing meeting with the Interim Moderator to discuss role involvement, the Associated Institution’s programmes and standards, any issues from previous reports/visits plus any areas of concerns raised by the external examiner.
20. The Interim Moderator will also be required to attend an introductory meeting with the institution as soon as possible to progress with the Moderatorship.

**End of term/renewal**

21. In the case of a moderatorship coming to the end of its term, a replacement will be sought from the same University of Surrey Faculty, and the normal processes will be adhered to.

22. Once the new moderator is appointed, a changeover briefing meeting will be arranged during the pre-induction stage by the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) in liaison with the leaving Moderator.

23. In the event of a teach-out arrangement in place, it will be deemed appropriate to request the current Moderator to remain in office (for a period of no more than two years) in order to see out the programmes.

24. The Moderator Renewal Form ([Appendix 4](#)) will be issued to the Moderator requesting their continuation in post until the end of the teach-out period. The signed form will be issued to Quality and Standards Subcommittee for notification and the Moderator Register for the appropriate academic year will be updated accordingly.

25. At the end of the teach-out period, a final report will be completed by the Moderator in line with current *Code of practice* and submitted to Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards for review.

**Termination of a Moderator’s engagement**

26. If a Moderator fails to submit a written report in two consecutive years, or fails to fulfil any of his/her other duties, including attendance for induction or at specific Board of Examiners/Studies, the appointment will be terminated. Identification of any conflict of interests will also result in termination of appointment.

**Induction for Moderators**

27. To supplement the documentation listed in paragraph 12 above, each newly appointed Moderator is invited to attend an annual Moderator induction event as well as an appropriate induction/briefing session conducted by the departing Moderator and/or the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards representative in advance of the first Board of Examiners meeting. This may be organised to coincide with the new Moderator’s first visit to the institution but can also be undertaken via correspondence.

28. Moderators will also be invited to attend an induction conducted by the institution which will focus on the validated programme(s), resources and facilities at the Institution, together with meeting the programme team.

29. All newly appointed Moderators will be contacted by the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards within two months of their appointment to confirm receipt of required documents (as listed above) and to ascertain their precise induction needs. Where there is a changeover of Moderators, the details of arrangements for handover will also be confirmed at this stage.

30. In the event that the Moderator is unable to attend an induction event (interim or end of office replacement, significant period of time after the appointment), the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) will arrange a one-to-one meeting to discuss the areas that would be raised in the induction event.

31. The University induction session should focus in particular on:
   - the nature of the validated award
   - the relationship between the University and the Associated Institution
• the role and responsibilities of the Moderator
• the University of Surrey’s Regulations and requirements for assessment and award of its qualifications
• the precise assessment requirements of the particular programme(s) for which the Moderator has responsibility
• any issues highlighted in the reports submitted by previous external examiners/Moderators
• any relevant issues with regard to the cultural context within which the degree is operated

32. At the end of the induction/briefing session, the Moderator concerned will be required to complete and sign a pro-forma (Appendix 2) to confirm completion of the induction session.

33. The University and institution will be responsible for the induction of the Moderator and for communicating with him/her throughout the academic year.

Duties and functions of the Moderator

34. The Moderator might expect to spend up to five days each academic year in fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of the role, including attendance for at least one meeting of the Board of Studies and the Board of Examiners (the Moderator is a full member of both Boards).

35. A Moderator should provide a source of advice and help to the Programme Convenor/Director and the teaching team, in particular as regards matters relating to the content and delivery of the programme of study, the scheme of assessment and procedures and regulations attaching to delivery and annual review of the programme.

36. The Moderator should maintain an overview of the regime of assessment, in line with the Code of practice for assessment and feedback, to ensure that marking takes place appropriately and that the external examiner is asked to consider draft question papers and receives appropriate size samples of scripts, dissertations and coursework in good time to allow for the appropriate level of scrutiny.

37. The Moderator is charged with:
• a quality enhancement and programme development role for an institution and its programme(s)
• responsibility to report to the Quality and Standards Sub-committee as to whether practices and procedures at the Institution (for the validated programme) equate to those pertaining to the University of Surrey and that adequate resources are in place

38. The Moderator is expected to perform a key developmental and enhancement role in terms of:
• liaising on a regular basis with key academic/administrative staff at the institution
• meeting with staff and conducting staff development sessions as appropriate
• meeting privately with students to offer advice on the facilities available at Surrey to students and staff of the Institution
• attending at least one meeting of the Board of Studies each academic year (meeting with students outside the context of the Board if appropriate) and at least the final meeting of the academic year of the Board of Examiners (when recommendations are made for awards)
• attending any periodic or institutional reviews as required during the academic year as a panel member
• reviewing and implementing of external examiners’s and Moderator’s recommendations
• providing a source of advice regarding the University’s Regulations, procedures and processes surrounding assessment and quality assurance of academic programmes
• identifying when problems arise regarding staffing and physical resources that are needed to maintain effective teaching at an appropriate level. The Moderator should inform the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) if there is a concern that an Associated Institution is unable to maintain resources at an appropriate level

39. The Moderator will support the Chair of the Board of Examiners in applying University Regulations and in dealing with difficult/exceptional cases (seeking advice from the Deputy Head of Student Administration (Assessment & Awards) at the University as appropriate).

40. The Moderator is expected to make a report (Appendix 3) to Quality and Standards Sub-committee at least once a year to comment on any issues arising from delivery of the programme and the conduct of meetings of Boards. The Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards provides Moderators with detailed instructions about when and what they must report, and a pro-forma on which their reports should be submitted. This report should include informative comments and recommendations on:

• whether the institution is adhering to the threshold academic standards set for the University of Surrey’s awards within the QAA Framework for Higher Education Qualifications (FHEQ) and using applicable subject benchmark statements
• whether the assessment process measures student achievement rigorously and fairly against the intended outcomes of the programme(s) and is conducted in accordance with the University of Surrey’s policies and procedures
• whether the institutions’ policies and strategies address student experience and student engagement adequately and reflect the expectations of the QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education (Chapters B4 and B5)
• whether any staff development activities have been undertaken by the Moderator to develop good practices, awareness and adoption of University Regulations and academic standards, and identify any potential resource or other issues of concern
• whether issues raised in the previous report(s) have been, or are being, addressed to their satisfaction

41. The Moderator is expected to report on any issues identified as a result of the programme running down during a teach-out period. The Moderator will also report on any issues regarding the duties and functions of the moderator and any items for action and recommendation.

42. The payment of fees for moderatorship and reimbursement of related expenses is undertaken through the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards. The fee for moderatorship will not be processed unless the University has received a written report. The fee for moderatorship comprises two elements: a fixed fee for attendance at the Boards of Examiners and Studies meetings, plus expenses. Fees will be paid annually on receipt of a written report and claim form(s) submitted to Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards. New Claim and Annual Report forms can be downloaded from the University’s website.

Hard copies of the Claim Form and Report Form may be obtained directly from the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards.
43. The payment of fees for attending a periodic or institutional review is undertaken through the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards. The fee for attendance will be processed upon receipt of a claim form and the University has received approval of the event report and the programme’s responses to conditions and recommendations.

44. The Staff Expenses Policy provides further information on reimbursement of travel and subsistence expenses.

45. In accordance with the teach-out agreement, Associated Institutions were permitted to admit students to study for awards validated by the University for the academic year 2013/2014 only and as such the following two requirements will cease as FHEQ Level 4 modules and programmes will in effect not be running:

- a Moderator will receive copies of draft FHEQ Level 4 examination papers, should the external examiner not wish to engage with this Level, to comment on content and style to assist the teaching team (in the early days of running a programme) to meet the requirements of the University
- a Moderator will maintain an overview of the profile of marks at FHEQ Level 4 and advice, at the request of the department concerned, on matters arising from the assessment of particular candidates at FHEQ Level 4 prior to the meeting of the Board of Examiners

Duties and functions of the Co-ordinating Moderator

46. Where there are a significant number of programmes, across a range of subject areas, the University of Surrey may decide to appoint a Co-ordinating Moderator from amongst the individual programme moderators. In addition to the functions indicated in the paragraphs above, the Co-ordinating Moderator is expected to perform a key developmental and enhancement role in terms of:

- co-ordinating staff development activities provide by Moderators
- ensuring consistency in the advice given by Moderators for the various programmes
- ensuring consistency in the procedures between the various programmes
- identifying and sharing good practice between programmes
- providing advice, guidance and support to the individual programme moderators

47. All Moderator's annual reports and claims for fees and expenses should be submitted to the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards:

Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision)
Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards
Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs)
12 SE 03
University of Surrey
Guildford
Surrey
GU2 7XH

Email: collaborative@surrey.ac.uk
Organisational responsibilities

University of Surrey’s responsibilities

48. The University is responsible for:

- approving the nomination of Moderators and inducting approved Moderators (including arranging handover meetings with leaving Moderators and meetings with programme team at the Associated Institution)
- issuing the Moderator with the appropriate documentation to carry out their duties
- reviewing the Moderator reports and producing a summary analysis of comments to the University Learning and Teaching Committee highlighting good practice, areas of concern and ensuring the institution receives a copy of the report for action/response, where applicable
- acting as a point of contact and guidance for Moderators with regards to any area of the collaborative arrangement
- ensuring the Moderator is kept up-to-date with any changes affecting the collaborative arrangements with their particular Associated Institution

49. The Associated Institution is responsible for:

- providing programme specification(s), handbook(s) and any other relevant documentation for the validated programme(s)
- facilitating contact with the supervisor, students and any other relevant members of staff at the institution
- providing the Moderator with the student’s progress reports on a six-monthly basis and the confirmation report
- working with the Moderator to ensure application of and compliance with the Regulations and Codes of practice of the University of Surrey
- respond to the comments made in the Moderator’s report in a timely fashion

Analysis of Moderator reports

50. Once received, the Moderator’s report is logged and recorded by the Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards and the claim form is processed.

51. The Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) will review the reports and update the analysis register noting any issues or areas of good practice identified by the Moderator.

52. Any areas of concern are highlighted for either the action of the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) or the Moderator. If the issue is serious it may warrant a report to the University Learning and Teaching Committee and/or its sub-Committee for appropriate review and action.

53. An analysis report will provide an overview of all Moderators’ reports, which will identify issues, and areas of good practice. The report will subsequently be issued to the Quality and Standards Subcommittee/University Learning and Teaching Committee highlighting areas indicated in the review for information or for action.

54. Once the Moderator's report has been evaluated it will be sent to the appropriate institution for action together with the Response to Moderator’s comments form (Appendix 5). The Associated Institution is required to complete Section 1 (general information) and 2 (response to the Moderator’s comments) and return to the Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision) for submission to the Moderator who will complete Section 3 to confirm that all remedial actions has been carried out to the satisfaction of the Moderator and the matter(s) has been dealt with appropriately.
55. The Moderator’s report and associated response form will be held on the University’s records in accordance with the Records Retention Schedules.

56. The Moderator’s report will also be reviewed and referenced as part of the annual review report produced by the Institution and the submission documents for periodic review.
Appendix 1 - Moderator nomination form

Moderator nomination form

Please complete the sections below to enable Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards to recommend the appointment to proceed, and submit the fully completed form to collaborative@surrey.ac.uk, to enable University’s approval by the Quality and Standards Sub-committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Associated Institution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of validated programme:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 1: To be completed by the relevant Faculty Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator’s name and title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty / contact details:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator to be replaced:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed period of tenure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderators shall normally be appointed for a period of three to five years.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>According to the Code of practice, all moderators are expected to possess the following:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad expertise in the subject area/delivery method of the validated programme and an academic qualification at an equivalent or higher level than the validated programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding of the QAA UK Quality Code for the maintenance of academic standards and assurance and enhancement of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient standing, credibility and breadth of experience within the discipline to be able to command the respect of academic peers and, where appropriate, professional peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of current developments in the design and delivery of relevant curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence and experience relating to the enhancement of the student learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience of validation collaborative arrangements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Section 2: To be completed by the nominee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current post:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic qualifications:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualifications:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional body</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status of membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and other relevant experience:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I confirm that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not a member of a governing body or committee of one of the University of Surrey’s Associated Institutions, or a current employee of one of the University’s collaborative partners or Associated institutions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student involved with the validated programme of study.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not significantly involved in recent or current substantive collaborative research activities with a member of staff closely involved in the delivery, management or assessment of the validated programme(s).</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have any other potential conflict of interest which may affect my term of office as Moderator.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am prepared to be considered for appointment as Moderator for the University of Surrey’s Associated Institutions for the programmes/subjects listed in Section 1 and confirm that the details on this form are correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - Induction form

Moderator induction form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator’s name and title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Department and Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Associated Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of validated programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I confirm that I attended an induction/briefing meeting conducted by staff from the University of Surrey and that the duties expected of the Moderator were explained fully to me at this meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any comments/suggestions:
Appendix 3 - Moderator’s annual report

Moderator’s annual report

This report should enable you to provide a summary of your interactions with the teaching team and students as regards delivery of the programme, the process of annual review, the conduct of meetings of Board of Studies and Board of Examiners and the application of University’s Regulations and Codes of Practice

1. DETAILS OF MODERATOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderator’s name and title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Institution (AI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated programme(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderator reports should be submitted within **four weeks of the completion of a visit to an Associated Institution**. Moderators should note that the payment of fees and expenses can only be authorised once the report has been received by the University.

Please email the completed moderator report form, duly completed, after the final meeting of the Board of Examiners, together with your travel claim(s) to: collaborative@surrey.ac.uk
1. **Nature of visit to Associated Institution**

Moderators are normally expected to visit Associated Institutions (AIs) twice yearly. The University anticipates that the majority of visits will be framed around a Board of Examiners and Board of Studies. It is expected that moderators play a critical role in quality enhancement and student engagement activities, particularly during the Teach-Out Phase and moderators are expected to meet with staff and with students without staff being present on at least one of the two scheduled visits.

Please indicate in the table below the nature of the visit and confirm that the required sections of the *pro-forma* have completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visit</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sections of report Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Examiners only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Examiners and enhancement/student engagement activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement/student engagement activities only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If moderators are making a final, end of term of office visit to an AI please complete Section 10 in addition to the relevant sections noted above.
During the year, were you involved in discussions regarding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modification of the curriculum content and/or scheme of assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme monitoring (including annual programme review), matters raised by the external examiner (verbal or written report)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual students (progress, mitigating circumstances)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. BOARD OF EXAMINERS

2.1 General conduct of the Board(s)

Were you satisfied that the board was conducted properly and in accordance with University of Surrey’ requirements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please comment on the following in text box below:
- the conduct of any internal examining board held prior to the University board;
- the level of attendance and participation of internal examiners;
- the quality of discussion of individual cases;
- where marks were moderated, scaled, normalised as a result of discussion, was a general consensus reached by Board members?;
- responses by AI staff to comments by the external examiner(s).
2.2 Presentation of data

Were you satisfied with the presentation of assessment data?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please comment on the following in text box below:
- was the recommended spread-sheet format followed?
- was the data free from arithmetic (or other) error?

2.3 Standards demonstrated by the students

Were you generally satisfied with the general quality of the students’ work in reflecting the level of the qualification and the aims and objectives of the programme?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please provide a rationale for your answer in the text box below:

2.4 Comparability of standards

Were the standards of student performance comparable with the standards of similar programmes in other UK higher education institutions?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below:
2.5 University Regulations and Codes of practice

Were you satisfied that the University Regulations and Codes of practice were applied in full by the institution?

Yes | No

3. ASSESSMENT

3.1 Design and marking of assessments

Were you satisfied with the standard of assessment material and associated marking criteria produced by the AI?

Yes | No

Please comment below on the opportunities which you were given to engage in the preparation of this material.

3.2 Procedures for assessment and examination

Were you satisfied that marking criteria were applied with consistency, rigour and impartiality, and that internal marking was conducted in an appropriate manner?

Yes | No

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below:


### 3.3 Effectiveness of the assessment process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were you generally satisfied with effectiveness of assessment in relation to the intended learning outcomes of the programme(s)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide a rationale and evidence for your response in the text box below:

---

### 3.4 Administration of the assessment process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were University of Surrey procedures followed, and were the administrative arrangements effective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did you receive copies of all relevant papers, including the programmes of study and marking criteria?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide details below of any issues or concerns.

---
4. ENGAGEMENT WITH STUDENTS

4.1 Arrangements for meeting students

Were you satisfied with the opportunities you were given to meet students?

| Yes | No |

Please comment in the text box below on the following:
- whether the meetings were private;
- the number of students you met;
- the extent to which they were representative of the programme cohort as a whole;
- whether they included nominated student representatives.

4.2 Arrangements for student representation within the AI

Were you satisfied that adequate arrangements are in place in the centre to allow the student voice to be heard?

| Yes | No |

Please provide a brief description of the arrangement that are in place, and comment, with evidence, on their effectiveness.
4.3 Student satisfaction

What did the meeting(s) with students reveal about their overall level of satisfaction with their learning experiences at the AI, and with the resources (including staffing) which are provided?

How far does the student experience meet the expectations of the most recent QAA UK Quality Code chapters on the student experience and student expectation?

What have you been able to do to help the AI meet QAA expectations in this respect?

Does the AI’s policies and strategies address student experience and student engagement adequately and reflect the QAA expectations in the QAA UK Quality Code (Chapters B4 and B5)?

4.4 Student issues

Did students raise issues that they wished to draw to the attention of the University?

Yes | No

Please provide details of any such issues with any recommendations for action which you might wish the University to consider.
5. **ENGAGEMENT WITH STAFF**

5.1 **Arrangements for meeting staff**

Did you have any opportunities (other than at the Board of Examiners) to meet staff during the visit?

- Yes
- No

Please provide details below of any such meetings.

5.2 **Staff issues**

Did staff raise issues that they wished to draw to the attention of the University?

- Yes
- No

Please provide details of any such issues which you might wish the University to consider.

5.3 **Staff development**

Did you provide any staff development activity during your visit?

- Yes
- No

Were they at the AI’s request, or on your own initiative?

- Yes
- No

Please provide details in the text box below.
5.4 **Staff resources**

Were you satisfied that adequate staffing resources are being applied to the programme(s)?

| Yes | No |

Please provide details in the text box below.

---

### 6. LEARNING RESOURCES

#### 6.1 Resource provision

Were you satisfied that adequate learning resources are being provided for the programme(s)?

| Yes | No |

Please comment below on any changes you observed in respect of resource provision.

---

### 7. PREVIOUS ISSUES

If issues were raised in your last report, or in the last report submitted by your predecessor, do you feel that they have been addressed appropriately and successfully?

| Yes | No |

Please comment below on any recommended action required by either the AI or the University of Surrey.
8. GOOD PRACTICE

Please identify any distinctive or innovative elements of the programme(s), and any features of good practice that you have noted.

9. ITEMS FOR ACTION

9.1 Teach-out issues

Were there any particular issues related to the University’s teach-out agreement for the AI which you would wish to draw to the attention of the University?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, please provide details below.

9.2 Duties of the Moderator

Were there any particular issues regarding the duties and functions of the Moderator which you would wish to draw to the attention of the University?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please provide details below:
9.3  Management and communication by the University of Surrey

Please comment on the University’s processes for managing and communicating with its Moderators and list any recommendations you have for improvement?

9.4  Items for action: required

Please identify any items you require the AI and/or the University of Surrey to take action on. It would be helpful if you could prioritise these requirements.

9.5  Items for action: recommended

Please identify any items you recommend that the AI and/or the University of Surrey takes action on. It would be helpful if you could prioritise these recommendations.

Moderator’s signature: 
Date: 

Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards use

Received: 
Date: 
Analysis: 
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10. END OF TERM OF OFFICE OVERVIEW

If this is the final visit to the Associated Institution at the end of your term of office as Moderator, you are asked to provide an overview of the whole of that period.

The University is particularly interested in the following points:

i. whether there is evidence that the quality of provision of programme(s) for which you have been Moderator has been enhanced (or otherwise) during your period of appointment;

ii. whether you are confident that standards of programme(s) for which you have been Moderator can continue to be secured.

Moderator’s signature:  
Date:  

Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards use

Received:  
Date:  
Analysis:
Appendix 4 - Moderator’s renewal form

Moderatorship renewal form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION A – MODERATOR’S CONTACT DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Moderator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty / School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION B – INSTITUTION’S DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Associated Institution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of validated programme(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I confirm that I agree to continue my role as Moderator for the above Associated Institution and validated programme(s) until the end of the teach-out agreement:

| Moderator’s signature:                  |
| Date:                                   |

Please complete this form and return it:

By post to: Academic Quality Officer (Collaborative Provision)
Directorate of Quality Enhancement and Standards
Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs)
12 SE 03
University of Surrey
Guildford
Surrey GU2 7XH

By email to: collaborative@surrey.ac.uk
Appendix 5 - Response to Moderator’s comments

Response to moderator comments

A member of the Associated Institution should complete Section 2 within two weeks of the Board of Studies and submit it to the moderator for further comment, copying to collaborative@surrey.ac.uk.

The Moderator will review the response and confirm to the University of Surrey, with further comment if appropriate, whether or not they are satisfied that their concerns have been addressed. The completed form should be sent to collaborative@surrey.ac.uk.

Section 1: General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Associated Institution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of validated programme:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Moderator comments and AI response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report reference</th>
<th>Nature of recommendation / concern</th>
<th>Associated Institution response following Board of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Insert section reference point from the Moderator’s report</em></td>
<td><em>Insert a summary of each of the Moderator’s comments/issues</em></td>
<td><em>Insert your response to each of the Moderator’s comments/issues</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name and position of member of the Associated Institution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 3: To be completed by the Moderator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you satisfied that your concerns have been sufficiently addressed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space below to make any further comments:

---

Moderator’s name:  
Signature:  
Date: