**ASSESSMENT REPORT MAY 2021**

Paper Number: MATH431

Paper Title:

Number of Students:

1. **Summary of assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Assessment components | Contribution (%) | Moderated required  (Y/N) | Moderation confirmed the criteria for the assessment was applied (Y/N) | Raw average mark (%) |
| Class test | 50 | N |  | 79 |
| Final Exam | 50 | Y | Y | 89 |
|  |  |  |  | 84 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Comments if needed: Class test and final were both 1 hour on task.*

**Signed by Examiner: Alon Faraggi**

**Date:**  **8/6/2021**

**Signed by Checker:** **Radu Tatar**

**Date: 8/6/2021**

1. **Benchmarking**
2. Were there any problems associated with any individual pieces of assessment? NO

If YES, please specify.

1. Has benchmarking been proposed on the overall module mark? NO

If YES, specify the proposed scaling algorithm.

40 –> 40, 50 –> 50, 60–> 60, 70–>70, 90–>90

Overall average raw mark (%):

Overall average scaled mark (%):

Comments:

The exam was taken by a small group of students. The module is considered by the students to be one of the most challenging, if not the most challenging. The cohort is therefore typically highly motivated. It is also likely that some further adjustment may be needed in the unusual mode of taking the exam, it it repeats in the future. In a challenging module such as this, it is very easy to design an exam that all students will fail abysmally. Striking the right balance typically worked in normal setting. On this occasion it might have erred, reflected in higher marks, which given the circumstances (student isolation) is the preferable situation.

I confirm that the final marks are consistent with the marking descriptors given in Section 3.3 of the Staff Handbook.

**Signed by Examiner: Alon Faraggi**

**Date: 8/6/2021**

Scaling/no scaling agreed by the Board of Examiners acting as the Informal Module Review Board.

**Signed by representative of the BoE:**

**Date:**

1. **Comments on benchmarking procedures**
2. Please provide a brief report on the assessment for the benefit of the Meeting of the Examiners. You may wish to comment on some or all of:

\*Quality of sample of submissions;

\*relation to the Qualitative Marking Descriptors;

\*cohort average on other modules;

\*special circumstances in the teaching of the module;

\*special circumstances in student performance.

1. (For non-service modules only.) For MATH2\*\*, MATH3\*\*, and MATH4\*\* undergraduate modules, what is the overall average of the cohort of students who were in year 1, and how does it compare with the same cohort’s average from year 1? For MATH3\*\* and MATH4\*\* undergraduate modules, what is the overall average of the cohort of students who were in year 2, and how does it compare with the same cohort’s average from year 2?
2. Where benchmarking has been implemented, please indicate how the main benchmarks at 40, 50, 60 and 70 have been set. You may wish to base your arguments on your comments in 1 and 2 above.
3. Where no benchmarking has been implemented and the class average is >68 or <55, please justify why no benchmarking is required. You may wish to base your arguments on your comments in 1 and 2 above.
4. Please confirm that you have reviewed all marks of 39, 49, 59, and 69 (and marks of 34 for MATH1\*\* and MATH2\*\* modules).

1. Where the module has subsequently been benchmarked or re-benchmarked by an Informal Module Review Meeting, please indicate the reason for this (such as a different interpretation of the above, or the availability of additional data).

1. **Feedback to students**