**Faculty of Computing, Engineering and the Built Environment**

## Verification - EXAM SETTING

**Refer to the Academic Manual** *section L3.1 http://hub.bcu.ac.uk/sites/tee/am*

The module verifier should review examination papers to ensure they confirm to faculty standards. This form should be uploaded to the School SharePoint. If there are concerns they should be documented here and the module tutor advised. Any changes should be reviewed and additional comments provided. When the verifier is satisfied the form should be updated and flagged as verified.

| MODULE TITLE: | **CMP5215 - Software Design UG2** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PROGRAMME: | Postgrad / **Undergrad** / CPS / etc | | Level: | `3 / 4 / 5 / 6 / 7 |
| SCHOOL: | **CTN** | DMT | EDMS | BSBE |
| MODULE COORDINATOR: | Zhiming Liu | | | |
| VERIFIER: | Jonathan Bowen | | | |
| Assessment No: Deliverable No: | Type : **Written Exam** / Practical Exam / On-Line/ Multi-Choice | | | |
| Deliverable weighting: (of total module marks, e.g. 50%) | | | ASSESSMENT Period: | |

| ▼ | Refer to Guidelines | TICK |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Rubric completed with instructions and list of what is provided. | ✔ |
| 2 | For open book exams, what the candidates may themselves provide is appropriately specified. | **N/a** |
| 3 | The exam duration should accord with faculty standard (or Associate Head of School Academic approved alternative – if alternative tick here ☐). | ✔ |
| 4 | The number and choice of questions accord with faculty standard (or HoS approved alternative - if alternative tick here ☐).). | ✔ |
| 5 | Questions are of an appropriate level, cover and relate appropriately to the Learning Outcomes in the syllabus and are suitable for the duration allocated. | ✔ |
| 6 | Confirm that the examination questions will meet the need of a range of student abilities at the level of study. | ✔ |
| 7 | Questions have been proof-read and are appropriately structured, clear, unambiguous and without grammar and spelling errors. | ✔ |
| 8 | Total marks for each question are consistent with faculty standard. | ✔ |
| 9 | The format, font, numbering, etc, follow faculty standard template. | ✔ |
| 10 | Question sub-section marks are shown in right hand margin and total correctly. | ✔ |
| 11 | There is a completed marking scheme on the standard template for each question. | ✔✘ |
| 12 | Marks allocated in the marking scheme are consistent with those of the questions. | ✔✘ |

**Verification: Enter Comments here and date. If amendments need to be made subsequent verification comments by verifier and tutor should be documented here.**

**The exam paper included a number of minor typographical issues that were given to the examiner as a marked up copy of the exam paper. The marking scheme included some similar issues and an updated version has been provided. There could be a better breakdown of marks in places. As a suggestion, a breakdown to 5 marks maximum would**

**be good to aid consistency of marking. Question 1 seems to have had part 1(d) removed and marks reallocated since I looked at the exam paper itself. For questions 4 and 5, some question parts do not include a marking scheme. Hence guidelines 11 and 12 above are only partially complete, but could easily be completed without formal rechecking. 29/12/14**

**Verification Complete** by ....Jonathan Bowen..…    Date ....29 December 2014……..…

Form to be uploaded to SharePoint