



**UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE**

Institute of Continuing Education

Course Management Handbook 2020-21

Courses for non-matriculated students

**Section 4: Information for Internal Assessors, Internal
Examiners and Moderating External Examiners**

Contents

Moderation	3
Evidence required for moderation.....	3
Assessment procedures for undergraduate and postgraduate Certificates and Diplomas and Advanced Diploma summative assignments - overview	3
Conflicts of interest in teaching and assessment.....	4
Internal procedures.....	4
Role of Internal Assessor	5
Subject Moderation Panels.....	5
Award of credit and qualifications	6
Responsibilities of Subject Moderation Panels.....	6
Roles of the Moderating External Examiner and Internal Examiner	6
Selection and appointment.....	7
Period of appointment	8
Suitability for re-appointment	8
Briefing and information for Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners.....	8
Moderation Panel and Examiners' Meetings.....	8
Resolution of differing opinions among Panel members	8
Reports of Internal Assessors, Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners	9
Topics for inclusion in reports	9
Fees and expenses.....	10
Appendix 1 - Studying at different academic levels: level descriptors	11
Appendix 2 - Marking scale for termly units and courses at undergraduate level.....	12
Appendix 3 - Marking scale for termly units and courses at postgraduate level	13
Appendix 4 – Terms of Reference: Academic Policy and Operations Committee.....	14
Appendix 5 – Cover Sheet for Moderating External Examiner's Report	17

Moderation

1. Moderation is the setting and marking of assignments and the implementation of the marking scheme in relation to established standards to ensure consistency of marking assessment. For level descriptors and undergraduate and postgraduate marking scales please see **Appendices 1, 2 and 3**.
2. The quality of assessed work submitted by students on award-bearing courses is assured by internal and external moderation. The annual reports of the Moderating External Examiners are considered by ICE and are sent to the University's Vice-Chancellor's office.

Evidence required for moderation

3. Tutors (or in some instances, Course Directors) are responsible for assessing all work submitted by the students on their course, whatever the level. They are required to mark assignments using the relevant learning outcomes, the academic criteria and marking scales set out in the ICE Handbooks and to provide clear and helpful feedback to students on their performance. In the case of non-written assessment and oral assessment, Tutors are asked to provide a report on the class-based activities undertaken and submit appropriate documentary evidence, such as students' notes, hand-outs and presentations, and give details of the criteria used to assess students.
4. When group-based assessment methods are employed, Tutors are asked to ensure that the contribution of individual students can be identified accurately and assessed. Guidance on appropriate methods of assessment is available to Tutors from their Academic Directors. Oral presentation cannot provide the sole, or indeed principal, method of assessment throughout an award-bearing course.

Assessment procedures

5. The assessment procedure for undergraduate and postgraduate certificates and diplomas and Advanced Diploma summative assignments is outlined below:
 - i) The Tutor assesses the work and provides feedback once the submission deadline has passed. Postgraduate assignments and Advanced Diploma dissertations are double marked (see section 3 of Course Management Handbook).
 - ii) Once a Tutor has assessed all of the work, the Internal Assessor (if applicable) will review a sample of each Tutor's marking to ensure appropriateness (e.g. it is in the right marking band). They **do not** assess the work. The sample should include, where possible, at least three pieces of work across the ability range, and all failed work.
 - iii) If the Internal Assessor is content with the sample of students' work, the Tutor feedback and the provisional marks are made available to students in the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) within three weeks of the assignment submission deadline.
 - iv) If the Internal Assessor believes the assessment sample to have been marked incorrectly, the rest of the cohort's work should be looked at in discussion with the Tutor, though there is no assumption that the Internal Assessor's judgement is superior to that of the Tutor. It is important that individual students' marks are not changed simply by virtue of being in the sample.
 - v) Once the results of the discussion have been agreed between the Internal Assessor and the Tutor, a note of the agreed marks should be sent to the Head of Academic Centre Administration for release to the students.

- vi) The Internal Examiner looks at a sample of the whole cohort's work to ensure comparability with cognate Faculty standards.
- vii) The Moderating External Examiner looks at a sample of the whole cohort's work to ensure comparability with external standards.
- viii) The Subject Moderation Panel reviews the comments of the Internal Assessor (where applicable), Internal Examiner and Moderating External Examiner and discusses whether to approve the recommended marks or to adjust thresholds. The decisions of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee should be noted at this point. For Mitigating Circumstances Committee guidance and Terms of Reference please see Section 3 of the Course Management Handbook.
- ix) The final course mark is calculated based on approved marks, less any penalties incurred by students (for example, for late submission which has not been mitigated).
- x) The Head of Academic Centre Administration submits a report to the Academic Policy and Operations Committee, giving the Subject Moderation Panel's final unit and course marks and the recommendation of awards. APOC approves the final marks which are then released to students.

Conflicts of interest in teaching and assessment

- 6. The Head of Academic Centre Administration should be informed of a conflict of interest as soon as possible. Anyone who has a relationship (e.g. family, neighbour, business associate) with the person being assessed should, where possible, not assess or moderate the cohort in which the conflict arises. As soon as a conflict of interest becomes apparent, an alternative assessor should be identified. Any impact on the workload of the Tutor(s) will be considered by the Director of Academic Centres (or delegate) with appropriate changes made to contracts and payment.
- 7. Tutors are advised that there is no need to make alternative teaching arrangements, however, it may be advisable to let the cohort know about the relationship.
- 8. Where it is impractical to make alternative assessment arrangements, or where it is important that the person teaching the course is involved in assessment, the Course Director should discuss arrangements with the Director of Academic Centres (or delegate).
- 9. All conflicts of interest should be declared and recorded at the start of relevant committee meetings.

Internal procedures

- 10. Samples of work assessed by the Tutor will be sent to the Institute's subject specialist in the relevant discipline who will act as Internal Assessor if:
 - the course is in its first iteration;
 - the Tutor has not previously marked for ICE;
 - the course has not been internally assessed for 3 years.
- 11. The sample will contain at least three pieces of student work across the ability range. All failed work is included in the sample. The Internal Assessor will also be given the opportunity to review assignment resubmissions due to academic misconduct or a mitigating circumstances claim.
- 12. Internal Assessors are required to prepare a brief moderation report to be sent to the Tutor within 2 working days of receiving the samples of work. A template report and instructions will be provided by the course administration team.

Role of Internal Assessors

13. The Internal Assessor is normally a member of the Institute's academic staff in the relevant discipline. Where no internal member of staff is available, a member of the University's staff in the relevant discipline or a member of the Institute's approved Tutor Panel will be asked to act as Internal Assessor.
14. The responsibilities of the Internal Assessor/Acting Internal Assessor are to:
 - consider the samples of work submitted and ensure that the standard achieved by students is consistent with the stated level of the course;
 - provide a brief report on the work submitted that provides feedback to the Tutor on the comments provided to the student and the marking process. The report is shared with the Tutors and considered by the relevant Subject Moderation Panel.
 - It is not the role of the Internal Assessor to amend marks, but to highlight any discrepancies for discussion with the Tutor. Should marks need to be amended in the sample, the Internal Assessor will then be required to review all work in the unit.

Role of the Internal Assessor for Advanced Diploma dissertation marking

15. For the marking of Advanced Diploma dissertations only, the Internal Assessor acts as a second marker and marks the dissertation at the same time as the Supervisor. The Supervisor and Internal Assessor both complete and return to the Head of Academic Centre Administration separate dissertation feedback forms, though only the Supervisor annotates the assignment.
16. Once both forms have been received by the Head of Academic Centre Administration, the Supervisor and Internal Assessor receive both dissertation feedback forms and are asked to discuss and agree a reconciled mark and produce between them a single dissertation feedback form combining their feedback. Once completed, the final agreed dissertation feedback form and reconciled mark are returned to the Head of Academic Centre Administration and written feedback is provided to the student.
17. In cases where the assessors are unable to reconcile a mark they should contact the Head of Academic Centre Administration who will arrange for a third marker.

Course materials made available to the Internal Assessor

18. The course material made available to the Internal Assessor for consideration consists of:
 - the syllabus for each course;
 - sample of student work as described above;
 - evidence of Tutor feedback to students;
 - a report from the course Tutor, including recommendations relating to the assessment of assignments.
19. The Internal Assessor is required to return the report as soon as possible and **within 2 working days** of being notified by the Head of Academic Centre Administration that the moderation material is available within the ICE VLE.
20. A student whose assignment, in the opinion of the Tutor and Internal Assessor, does not meet the required standard to pass the course, may be offered the opportunity to resubmit (see the resubmission policy in section 3 of the Course Management Handbook).

Subject Moderation Panels

21. Moderation and examination at all levels are undertaken by Subject Moderation Panels – see Responsibilities of Subject Moderation Panels below. These relate to a single subject or a group of cognate subjects. Each Panel would normally be composed of the Internal Assessor in the subject (if relevant), a Moderating External Examiner and a moderator from

within the University (Internal Examiner). The Panel is chaired by the Director of Academic Centres or his/her nominee. If the Internal Examiner is not a member of the cognate Faculty, the cognate Faculty may be represented on the Panel. A member of the course administration team services the Panel.

22. The Subject Moderation Panels normally meet once a year. The moderation sample contains at least three pieces of student work across the ability range from each unit. All failed work is included in the sample and assignment resubmissions are made available to the Panel.
23. The Subject Moderation Panels may be asked for their comments on programme specifications at their annual meeting and any points raised will be considered by ICE and appropriate action taken.

Award of credit and qualifications

24. All Subject Moderation Panels' recommendations are submitted to ICE's Academic Policy and Operations Committee. The award of the qualification is made by the University of Cambridge, through delegated authority from ICE's Strategic Committee.
25. A student's course mark is based on the unit marks and any penalties applied to the assignment marks as outlined in the Student Handbook. The student's transcript shows the unit marks as well as the overall course mark.

Responsibilities of Subject Moderation Panels

26. The responsibilities of the Subject Moderation Panels are to:
 - consider and comment on the level of work achieved and the appropriateness of the teaching and assessment methods used, to evaluate and compare the standards of individual courses within the subject range and compare the standard achieved with that of other higher education providers elsewhere in the country;
 - consider a moderation sample containing at least three pieces of student work (where available) from each unit across the ability range;
 - consider all failed work. Assignment resubmissions are also made available;
 - consider the application of the assessment scale in relation to student work and reports from the Internal Assessor;
 - note the recommendations of the Mitigating Circumstances Committee and receive information about the context in which these decisions are made;
 - refer to the Chair for resolution of any disagreements relating to the award of marks;
 - prepare a report and recommendations in relation to the achievement of awards for consideration by the Academic Policy and Operations Committee;
 - consider any report or comment referred back from ICE's Academic Policy and Operations Committee or from the Moderating External Examiner via the Director of Academic Centres;
 - request reports on the implementation of any general recommendations the Subject Moderation Panel has made, and on feedback to Tutors;
 - review as requested the appropriateness of each programme specification referring any points arising to ICE for further consideration and appropriate action.

Roles of the Moderating External Examiner and Internal Examiner

27. The main functions of the Moderating External Examiner and the Internal Examiner relate to ensuring comparability and consistency of standards, fairness of assessment procedures and application of the assessment scale at a standard appropriate to the level of the qualification.
28. The Moderating External Examiner and the Internal Examiner must be in a position to take

an independent and critical view of the courses they are moderating.

Selection and appointment

29. Moderating External Examiners shall not hold a University of Cambridge office, or a Fellowship or some office or post in a College, and should not teach any course of instruction which forms part of the teaching programme.
30. Former members of staff of the University shall not be eligible to become Moderating External Examiners until at least five years have passed since their departure.
31. Retirees can be considered provided they have sufficient evidence of continuing involvement in the academic area in question.
32. Reciprocal arrangements between examiners from Cambridge institutions and other institutions should be avoided, wherever possible.
33. An examiner being succeeded by another from the same institution should also be avoided and no more than one Moderating External Examiner for an examination should be appointed from the same institution;
34. Those appointed should normally be persons of seniority and must certainly have appropriate experience and/or knowledge and the ability to command respect in the subject.
35. In certain circumstances, it is appropriate that persons from outside the higher education system, e.g. from industry or the professions, be invited to act as Moderating External Examiners.
36. Internal Examiners shall be members of the University experienced in teaching within the relevant discipline.
37. To avoid potential conflicts of interest, Moderating External Examiners should not be appointed if they are covered by any of the following categories:
 - near relative of a member of staff or student involved with the programme of study or of an examiner on a cognate course in the institution;
 - anyone closely associated with the sponsorship of students on the course, or closely associated with placements or training;
 - anyone required to assess colleagues who are recruited as students to the programme of study;
 - anyone in a position to influence significantly the future of students on the programme of study; or
 - anyone who has been directly involved as an external member of a validation panel for the programme.
38. Any conflict of interest on the part of a Moderating External Examiner or Internal Examiner should be declared to the Head of Academic Centre Administration or the Chair of the Subject Moderation Panel as soon as it becomes apparent.
39. Every Moderating External Examiner will be expected to have:
 - competence and experience in the field covered by the course;
 - academic qualifications/professional qualifications to at least the level of the qualification being externally examined;
 - experience of setting examinations and running assessment procedures (either externally or internally);
 - familiarity with the standard to be expected of students in the course to be examined;
 - fluency in English;
 - met the criteria set out by professional and accrediting bodies;
 - awareness of modern developments in the design and delivery of the flexible curriculum;
 - expertise in the enhancement of the student experience;

- appropriate right to work in the UK if from an overseas institution.
40. Summary of points to consider when appointing Moderating External Examiners, as agreed by the Academic Operations and Policy Committee:
- Has the nominee acted as an external or internal examiner for ICE within the past five years?
 - Has the nominee been a Tutor for ICE in any capacity within the past five years?
 - Has the nominee been a UTO in the last five years?
 - Does the nominee have a close professional, contractual or personal relationship with a member of staff or student on the programme?
 - Does the nominee work in the same institution as the previous examiner?

Period of appointment

41. Moderating External Examiners are formally appointed by the Institute's Academic Policy and Operations Committee. Appointments are for one year in the first instance and may be extended for up to a further two years, renewable annually. Renewal of appointment will always be dependent upon satisfactory attendance at meetings and the completion and submission of written reports by the Moderating External Examiner. In exceptional circumstances a case may be made to the Academic Policy and Operations Committee to appoint a Moderating External Examiner for a fourth consecutive year.
42. Internal Examiners are appointed annually by the Academic Policy and Operations Committee, and may be re-appointed at the discretion of the nominating body.

Suitability for re-appointment

43. The Institute's Academic Policy and Operations Committee should review the conduct of Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners before nominating them for re-appointment. In particular it should bear in mind the requirements for the submission of appropriate reports for quality assurance and public reporting requirements. The Committee may choose not to re-appoint a Moderating External Examiner or Internal Examiner who has not fulfilled his/her reporting duties or attendance at meetings.

Briefing and information for Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners

44. On appointment, Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners will be sent the following documents:
- A letter of appointment;
 - A copy of the relevant sections of ICE's 'Course Management Handbook' for non-matriculated students;
 - Details of the course/s which they have been appointed to examine or moderate. These will include course guides which list expected learning outcomes and methods of assessment and the reading list;
 - Other relevant material.

Moderation Panel and Examiners' Meetings

45. Moderating External Examiners, Internal Examiners and Internal Assessors are expected to be present at meetings of Subject Moderation Panels or Examiners' meetings, unless there are exceptional circumstances. These meetings are normally annual to facilitate review of the previous year.

Resolution of differing opinions among Panel members

46. Subject Moderation Panels should normally be able to resolve differences of opinion through discussion. If it is necessary to take a vote, and this still does not resolve the issue, the final decision will be the responsibility of the Chair of the Panel.

Reports of Internal Assessors, Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners

47. Internal Assessors, where used, are required to submit a brief report on each unit within their specific subject areas for consideration by the Subject Moderation Panel.
48. Moderating External Examiners should submit a report on the course, considering each termly unit where appropriate, to the Head of Academic Centre Administration prior to the Subject Moderation Panel meeting. Topics for inclusion in the report are detailed below.
49. The report of the Internal Examiner should consider each termly unit, where appropriate, and submit the report to the Head of Academic Centre Administration prior to the Subject Moderation Panel meeting. Topics for inclusion in the report are detailed below.
50. If the Internal Examiner and Moderating External Examiner's reports refer to the work of individual students, a student identifier should be used to maintain students' anonymity. Principally, comments should apply to the whole course. Please note that the above reports will be made available to students if subject to a Subject Access Request under data protection legislation.
51. The Moderating External Examiner is also required to submit a written report with completed coversheet (**Appendix 5**) within two weeks of the annual Subject Moderation Panel meeting. The report should refer to all the courses reviewed by the Panel during the year and should be submitted to the Vice-Chancellor's Office who will confirm receipt and send a copy to the Quality Governance team at ICE. The report is then passed onto the Director of Academic Centres, the appropriate Academic Director and the Head of Academic Centre Administration to facilitate payment.
52. The annual Moderating External Examiner report will be made available, in full, to all students on the course, with the sole exception of any confidential report which may be made to the Vice-Chancellor. Therefore, reports should be written in a form that avoids discussion of individual candidates by name or number. If a student identifier is included, this needs to be redacted. The Report is made available to students on the course via the ICE VLE.
53. The Moderating External Examiner's annual report is considered by the Academic Director and a draft response is prepared for approval by the Academic Policy and Operations Committee. Once approved the Quality Governance team send the response to the Moderating External Examiner, copying in the Vice Chancellor's Office.
54. The Institute's responses to the Moderating External Examiner's reports are made available to the General Board's Education Committee (via EQPO) and posted on the course VLE alongside the Moderating External Examiner's Report.
55. Any actions from the General Board's Education Committee will be followed up by the Education Quality and Policy Office and ICE.

Topics for inclusion in reports

56. Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners are asked in their reports to comment on the topics (i) – (v) below and subsequent topics where applicable:
 - (i) the extent to which standards are appropriate for the relevant level of study or award;
 - (ii) the extent to which standards are comparable with similar programmes in other UK institutions with which they are familiar;
 - (iii) the extent to which processes for assessment and the determination of awards are sound and fairly conducted;

- (iv) any good practice which they feel could be usefully identified for further dissemination;
- (v) whether issues raised in previous report(s) have been addressed.

They may choose to comment further on the following topics:

- the design and structure of the course;
- the quality of teaching and learning which may be indicated by student performance;
- the appropriateness of the teaching and assessment methods used and the appropriateness of assignments to the level descriptors;
- the resources available as they impact upon student performance;
- the marking scheme as deployed by the Tutor;
- the appropriateness of the Tutor's and Internal Assessor's recommendation for the award of credit;
- comparability with work from other units examined in this programme;
- whether their role is appropriate for the examination to which they were appointed, including whether or not they had sufficient access to any material needed to make the required judgements;
- any other matters they wish to raise.

Fees and expenses

57. Fees are paid to Moderating External Examiners and Internal Examiners following attendance at the Subject Moderation Panel or Examiners' Meeting and the submission of all the required reports. Valid expenses will be reimbursed by including the cost of travel to and from the Institute and overnight accommodation where necessary.

Appendix 1 - Studying at different academic levels: level descriptors

For full guidance on level descriptors please see: www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/qualifications-frameworks.pdf

FHEQ Level 4	Undergraduate
<p>Certificate 60 credits at FHEQ level 4</p> <p>Certificate of Higher Education 120 credits at FHEQ level 4</p>	<p>Learning at this level will reflect the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a rigorous approach to the acquisition of a broad knowledge base • employ a range of specialised skills • evaluate information using it to plan and develop investigative strategies and to determine solutions to a variety of unpredictable problems • operate in a range of specific contexts taking responsibility for the nature and quality of outputs
FHEQ Level 5	Undergraduate
<p>Diploma 60 credits at FHEQ level 5</p> <p>Diploma of Higher Education 120 credits at FHEQ level 5</p>	<p>Learning at this level will reflect the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • generate ideas through the analysis of concepts at an abstract level, with a command of specialised skills and the formulation of responses to well-defined and abstract problems • analyse and evaluate information • exercise significant judgement across a broad range of functions • accept responsibility for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes.
FHEQ Level 6	Undergraduate
<p>Advanced Diploma 120 credits at FHEQ level 6</p>	<p>Learning at this level will reflect the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • critically review, consolidate and extend a systematic and coherent body of knowledge, utilising specialised skills across an area of study • critically evaluate new concepts and evidence from a range of sources • transfer and apply diagnostic and creative skills and exercise significant judgement in a range of situations • accept accountability for determining and achieving personal and/or group outcomes.
FHEQ Level 7	Postgraduate
<p>Postgraduate Certificate 60 credits at FHEQ level 7</p> <p>Postgraduate Diploma 120 credits at FHEQ level 7</p>	<p>Learning at this level will reflect the ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • display mastery of a complex and specialised areas of knowledge and skills • employ advanced skills to critically evaluate new concepts and evidence from a range of sources • conduct independent research • accept accountability for related decision making, including via the use of supervisions • develop appropriate personal qualities and professional attitudes • critically evaluate one's own approach to a subject • develop an awareness of a subject in its wider context

Appendix 2 - Marking scale for termly units and courses at undergraduate level

Mark (%)	Student's work shows:
Excellent	
80 – 100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of exceptional quality over and above the criteria listed below.
70 - 79	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of knowledge and information and evidence of independence of thought. • Appropriate and perceptive reference to relevant academic sources. • A consistent demonstration of powers of critical analysis and synthesis in developing arguments.
Good	
60 - 69	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A thorough grasp of relevant knowledge and information. • Extensive reference to appropriate academic sources. • Clear evidence of an analytical approach to the issues raised by the topic. • The capacity to engage critically with arguments and evidence.
Competent	
50 - 59	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A secure grasp of relevant knowledge and information and evidence of a competent understanding of relevant concepts. • Reference to a reasonable range of relevant academic sources. • Some evidence of an analytical and critical approach.
Weak	
40 - 49	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of assimilation of relevant knowledge, but contains some errors, omissions or irrelevancies. • Limited reference to relevant academic sources. • Little evidence of analysis or a critical approach. • Some weakness in the structuring of assignments.
PASS THRESHOLD	
Fail	
0 – 39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some elements of relevant knowledge but contains significant errors, omissions or irrelevancies. • Evidence of a poor grasp of relevant concepts. • Poorly structured assignments failing to address the issues under discussion. • Work of an extremely low standard, fundamentally failing to address relevant issues. • Incoherent argument, serious errors.

Appendix 3 - Marking scale for termly units and courses at postgraduate level

Numerical scale	Mark awarded	Student's work shows
Excellent		
80-100	Pass with distinction (where programme awards distinction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the exceptional quality in relation to the criteria listed for the award of 70-79% and outstanding critical insights and thought-provoking arguments.
75-79	Pass with distinction (where programme awards distinction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An accessible, accurate and clear account. • Clear assimilation and understanding of the evidence. • Well informed by a wide range of relevant ideas. • Excellent analyses, arguments and explanations. • Exceptionally good structuring of the material with clear progression and development as the work proceeds.
Good		
70-74	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An accessible, accurate and direct account. • Clear assimilation and understanding of the evidence. • Well informed by current ideas. • Very good analyses, arguments and explanations. • Very good insights and personal reflections on the material. • Carefully structured and organised presentation.
Competent		
65-69	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An accessible, accurate and direct account. • Good analyses, arguments and explanations. • Good insights and personal reflections on the material. • Well-organised presentation.
60-64	Pass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An accessible, accurate and direct account. • Fair analyses, arguments and explanation but with some remaining gaps or confusion. • Fair degree of personal insight. • Reasonably well organised presentation.
PASS THRESHOLD		
50-59	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on a restricted range of evidence, or irrelevant material introduced. • Weaknesses of factual description. • Weaknesses in the analyses, arguments and explanations. • Weaknesses in the insights and reflections on the material. • Weakly-organised presentation with a poor progression through the work.
0-49	Fail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited range of evidence or lack of focus. • Weak understanding of the material presented. • Lack of coherent argument. • Absence of personal insight. • Serious weaknesses in the organisation of the presentation.

Appendix 4 – Terms of Reference: Academic Policy and Operations Committee

1. Purpose and Duties

To:

- (i) act as administering body, on behalf of the Strategic Committee, in accordance with the Ordinances for the Master of Studies (MSt) Degree and to act as admitting body for the MSt Degree (including consideration of cases in support of non-standard applications);
- (ii) act as administering body, on behalf of the Strategic Committee, in accordance with the Ordinances for Diplomas and Certificates open to non-members of the University and offered by ICE, including the conferment of such University awards;
- (iii) have quality assurance oversight for ICE-delivered programmes;
- (vi) receive reports and recommendations from:
 - (a) the academic divisions of the Institute
 - (b) Examiners
 - (c) Subject Moderation Panels
 - (d) the Programme Review Panel
 - (e) the MSt Committee
 - (f) relevant Degree Committees (including recommendations for MSt admissions, cases in support of non-standard MSt applications, MSt withdrawals and intermittences, MSt year-1 results including recommendations for exit awards, final MSt results and Examiners' reports)
 - (g) the Assessment Standards Panel / Academic misconduct investigatory meeting
 - (h) Mitigating Circumstances Committee;
 - (i) relevant working groups;
- (v) make recommendations to the Strategic Committee on proposals for new programmes, for recommendation to the University's Education Committee, as appropriate;
- (vi) review and advise the Strategic Committee, where relevant, on issues relating to quality assurance, academic policies, programme development and University awards, panel tutors and academic administration;
- (vii) advise the Director on the matters above and to report to the Strategic Committee as appropriate.

2. Membership

2.1 The membership shall consist of:

- (i) Director of Academic Centres, *ex officio* (Dr Corinne Boz) - Chair
- (ii) Director of Continuing Education, *ex officio* (Dr James Gazzard)
- (iii) Director of International Programmes and Lifelong Learning, *ex officio* (Sarah Ormrod)
- (iv) Assistant Director to Academic Centres (Academic), *ex officio* (Dr Tom Monie)
- (v) Assistant Director to Academic Centres (Student Experience), *ex officio* (Garry Bishop)
- (vi) The Academic Directors (or nominee) of the Institute of Continuing Education (Jenny Bavidge, Gilly Carr, Alexander Carter, Roxane Farmanfarmaian, Midge Gillies, Jane Gregory, Oliver Hadelar, Lydia Hamlett, Nigel Kettle, Thomas Monie, Chris Smith, Samantha Williams)
- (vii) Head of the Quality and Policy Office, *ex officio* (Gemma Long) or delegate
- (viii) Head of Marketing, *ex officio* (Christine Kinally)

- (ix) ICE Admissions Manager, *ex officio* (*Ruth Eddleston*) or delegate
- (x) Four Heads of Academic Centre Administration appointed by the relevant Heads of Division to represent each Academic Centre (*Peter Drew, Zara Kuckelhaus, Gillian Barclay/Shamiso Barnett (shared membership) and Ola Dlugokencka/Sarah Blakeney (shared membership)*)
- (xi) Head of Technology Enhanced Learning, *ex officio* (*Cory Saarinen*)
- (xii) Three student representatives (*one undergraduate, one postgraduate and Lifelong Learning*)

2.2 Except as otherwise provided, members of the Committee shall be appointed/elected in the Michaelmas Term to serve for three years from 1 January following their appointment.

2.3 Members are expected to attend all meetings of which due notice has been given, unless on leave of absence.

3. Attendance

The Committees may invite other individuals to meetings to report on specific items relevant to their objectives.

4. Quorum

4.1 The Quorum shall be 12:

4.2 A duly convened meeting of the Committee, at which a quorum is present, shall be competent to exercise all or any of the authorities, powers and discretions vested in, or exercisable by, the Committee.

5. Frequency

The Committee shall meet monthly during term time, unless otherwise agreed.

6. Reserved Business

No student shall be present, whether as a member or otherwise, at a meeting, for the discussion of, or decision on, any matter which the Chair of the meeting declares to be reserved.

As outlined in Statutes and Ordinances¹ the following matters shall be reserved:

- (i) the employment or promotion, or any matter relating to the employment or promotion, of individuals by the University;
- (ii) the admission and academic assessment of individuals;
- (iii) such other matters as may be specified by Statute or Ordinance in respect of any particular body or class of bodies; and
- (iv) any other matter at the discretion of the Chair;

7. Reporting

The minutes of the Committee shall formally be recorded by the Quality Governance Manager, (*Kirsty Woodgate*) or delegate. Committee minutes shall be submitted to the Strategic Committee, together with a brief report, highlighting key issues for the Strategic Committee's attention, to provide assurance on the responsibilities of the Academic Policy and Operations Committee.

8. Administration

The Quality Governance Manager (*Kirsty Woodgate*) or delegate shall support the Committee by:

8.1 providing timely notice of meetings and forwarding details including the agenda and supporting papers to members and attendees in advance of the meetings;

- 8.2 enforcing a disciplined timeframe for agenda items and papers, as below:
- (i) At least ten working days prior to each meeting, agenda items will be due.
 - (ii) At least seven working days before each meeting, papers will be due.
 - (iii) At least five working days prior to each meeting, papers will be issued to all members and any attendees.
 - (iv) The Secretary, with the agreement of the Chair, shall have authority to reject papers which are late or have been inadequately prepared or do not fall within the Committee's remit;
- 8.3 recording and circulating formal minutes of meetings and keeping a record of matters arising and issues to be carried forward, circulating approved draft minutes within five working days from the date of the last meeting;
- 8.4 advising the Chair and the Committee about fulfilment of the Committee's Terms of Reference and related governance matters.
- 8.5 Reports which do not require discussion shall be starred. Any member of the Committee wishing to discuss a starred item should contact the Secretary at least 3 working days before the Committee meets. Reports will not be un-starred after this time.
- 8.6 Items of Any Other Business (AOB) shall be raised with the Chairman or Secretary by close of play on the day before the Committee meets. Unless at the discretion of the Chair, members shall not be permitted to raise items of AOB on the day of the meeting.
9. Review
- 9.1 The Committee shall undertake a self-assessment on an annual basis and consider its effectiveness in discharging its responsibilities as set out in these Terms of Reference.
- 9.2 The Committee shall review its Terms of Reference at least once a year to ensure it is operating at maximum effectiveness and make any suggestions for alteration to the Strategic Committee.

Appendix 5 – Cover Sheet for Moderating External Examiner’s Report



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE REPORT FORM FOR MODERATING EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Name and Title:	
Email:	
Home institution:	
Award or subject area examined:	
Associated University of Cambridge Faculty/Department:	Institute of Continuing Education

Please tick the statement which most closely reflects your views of the award.

TICK HERE

The standards set for the award(s) or subject area(s) above were appropriate. The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards were sound and fairly conducted. Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the course and its assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/>
The standards set for the award(s) or subject area(s) above were appropriate. The processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards were sound and fairly conducted. HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future assurance of the course and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the standards set for the awards or subject areas above and/or the processes for assessment, examination and the determination of awards. These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next available offering.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please tick as appropriate:	Yes	No	N/A
Are you satisfied that you received sufficient programme materials (programme handbooks, regulations, and marking criteria)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are you satisfied that you were consulted adequately on draft examination papers, and that the level of questions was appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Were you given sufficient opportunity to scrutinise the general standard and consistency of marking of examination scripts and/or coursework?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Have issues raised in previous report(s) been addressed to your satisfaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please return this form, with your full report, to: vcexternalexaminers@admin.cam.ac.uk

Or: The Vice-Chancellor, University of Cambridge, The Old Schools, Cambridge, CB2 1TN.

This form can be downloaded from the Tutor guidance site in the VLE.

Please also forward a copy of the form to the Quality Governance Manager at qa@ice.cam.ac.uk

Please comment on the following areas:

The extent to which standards are appropriate for the assessments and the qualification.

The extent to which standards are comparable with similar programmes in other UK institutions with which you are familiar.

The extent to which processes for assessment, and the determination of awards were sound and fairly conducted.

Any good practice which you feel could be usefully identified for further dissemination.

You may also wish to include commentary on the following topics:

the assessment (*the design, structure and marking of the assessment; the procedures for assessment, including the basis and rationale for any comparisons of standards made; the strengths and weaknesses of the students as a cohort; whether your role is appropriate for the course to which you were appointed, including whether or not you had sufficient access to any materials needed to make the required judgements*)

the course (*the curriculum, its aims, content and development; resources as they impact upon student performance; the quality of teaching and learning, which may be indicated by student performance*)

NOTES FOR EXTERNAL EXAMINERS

Submitting reports to the University

1. All External Examiners are required to submit a written report at the conclusion of their involvement with the award, and may comment on any aspect of the award, including the fairness of the assessment and the standards of the candidates for the part of the assessment that they are involved with.
2. Reports should be addressed to **the Vice-Chancellor of the University**; payment of the fee and expenses is conditional on receipt of the report.
3. Full guidance on the roles and responsibilities of External Examiners is provided on appointment, in the Course Management Handbook. All External Examiners will receive feedback on their full report in line with University policy.
4. The written report is made available for discussion by the Institute of Continuing Education and by the General Board's Education Committee. Reports are considered by the Academic Policy and Operations Committee. Reports should be written in a form that avoids discussion of individual candidates by name or candidate number.

General points

5. Submitted reports will only be used in accordance with General Board policy (for the monitoring of academic standards within the institution) and in line with current legislation.
6. In line with UUK recommendations, all External Examiners' reports will be made available, in full, to all students, with the sole exception of any confidential report which may be made to the Vice-Chancellor.
7. The University shall own the copyright in the reports made to them by External Examiners; in accepting the appointment, External Examiners assign all present and future rights relating to the reports and any other materials created in relation to their appointment. External Examiners will also waive any rights including moral rights in connection with those materials.
8. The University will take reasonable endeavours to ensure the accurate reproduction of material and information provided by External Examiners; all other warranties and undertakings are excluded, including liability for direct or indirect loss to an External Examiner.
9. External Examiners are advised that, under the Data Protection Act 1998, the University will process personal information on its External Examiners.
10. External Examiners are also advised that, under the Freedom of Information Act, the University may be obliged to disclose details of their report on request.