



INTERNAL MODERATION POLICY

Issue Number	Effective Date	Amendments	Reason for Amendments
2	25 Nov 2019	Rebranding of the header, footer and font	Companywide rebranding on all IMI material.

INTRODUCTION

Internal moderation ensures that the decisions of all assessors are consistent and fair to all apprentices.

Internal moderation procedures include the sampling and checking of apprentices work, the standardisation and recording of assessors' decisions, and the mechanism for the internal moderator to feedback to assessors' in order to improve practice.

All moderation relating to end point assessment will be scheduled and recorded within the IMI Smart EPA system (SEPA).

The moderation practices adopted for IMI end point assessment are based on the following general principles. Moderation practices should:

- promote fairness, consistency and meet specified assessment plan requirements;
- ensure assessments are applied consistently for all apprentices and that the final judgement is accurate, reliable and recorded;
- be appropriate and acceptable for the discipline being assessed;
- be clearly evidenced and feedback provided to assessors;
- be retained for audit purposes for a period of six years within the IMI SEPA system.

The internal moderation policy applies to all aspects of apprentice assessment as dictated in the specified assessment plan and against which the apprentice is being assessed. The assessment types may include:

- observation based assessment (undertakes one or more duties in the workplace);
- practical demonstration based assessment (an assessment of skills);
- test based (an assessment taken under controlled and invigilated conditions);
- project based (a defined piece of work undertaken to demonstrate a particular aspect of the occupation);
- presentation based (a presentation to an individual assessor. This will often be followed by questioning from the assessor);
- discussion based (either an interview or a professional discussion).

EXEMPTIONS FROM MODERATION

Where assessment methods are automated (i.e. the answers are machine or optically read), or in quantitative assessments in which model answers are provided to the marker, these assessments are exempt from this policy.

MODELS OF MODERATION

The IMI will be expected to employ one of the forms of moderation indicated below and will also be expected to employ an arithmetical check that the calculation and transcription of marks is correct.

Note: the method of moderation may vary according to the nature of the assessment.

- **Universal Non-Blind Double Marking of the whole cohort**

The first marker provides feedback for the student on the assessment and the second marker assesses the work with this information known. No actual marks are disclosed; or marks are, for example, written on the back cover of an examination book. Second markers may be required or advised not to take into account the first marker's marks in determining their own marks, and will be required to resolve differences in marks for all cases, or within defined ranges, as part of their second marking responsibilities. The provision of written comments by the first examiner makes second marking easier by guiding the second marker.

- **Moderation of the entire cohort as a Check or Audit**

The first marker provides feedback for the student and awards a mark. The role of the second marker is to check that first marking has been carried out correctly, that marking schemes have been properly applied, and that the total mark is arithmetically correct. The first marker leaves a clear trail to be audited. The purpose of second marking is to check on standards for all work and may be extended to reviews or thorough second marking of selected work.

- **Moderation by sampling of the cohort**

The second marker samples work already first marked, with feedback for students and marks attached, in order to check overall standards. This may be used where first markers are less experienced, where there are several first markers and consistency may be a problem or where unusual patterns of performance are expected or observed. It may lead to more extensive marking if problems are detected. The second marker may be the arbiter in such cases or may be responsible for alerting the end point assessment managers (EPAM).

- **Partial Moderation**

Any of the above may be applied to particular types of marks allocated, e.g., fails, pass or distinction.

RESOLVING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MARKERS

Whatever method is used for moderation there must be a method of resolving differences between markers. These are as follows:

- discussion and negotiation between the two markers on all differences;
- discussion and negotiation between the markers on specified differences;
- resort to a third marker. This should be an additional internal moderator.

Differences identified between markers cannot be left unresolved.

STANDARDISATION

All moderators must attend a minimum of two standardisation meetings per year to ensure consistency across all assessment decisions.