



## Moderation of Assessment Policy

### 1. Purpose

King's Own Institute (KOI) is committed to high standards in teaching with a strong focus on effective assessment. This policy seeks to promote quality in assessment by ensuring that assessment supports learning, is fit for purpose and allows students to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes for their course. It also seeks to provide assurance that assessment marking is fair, valid and consistent and that marks achieved by students reflect their performance against the desired standards for the discipline and level of the course.

Broad standards for quality are set out in the Australian Qualifications Framework 2013 (AQF) and in the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021. The AQF sets expectations for the knowledge, skills and application of knowledge and skills that graduates of each course level will be able to demonstrate. The Higher Education Standards require:

- methods of assessment consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed and capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment
- regular interim monitoring of the quality of teaching, student progress and the overall delivery of subjects within each course of study
- regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts including the assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses of study.

Moderation addresses these requirements and provides evidence to confirm the quality of KOI's courses and teaching.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the

- Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy and Assessment Guidelines
- Course Development and Review Policy
- Subject Outline Policy

### 2. Scope

This policy applies to all subjects offered by KOI and to all academic staff involved in the assessment of these subjects,

### 3. Definitions

The definitions describe the four types of moderation undertaken by KOI:

- *Pre-delivery moderation* is the review of learning resources and assessment tasks prior to delivery of the subject
- *Moderation of marking* is the process to confirm that marking is reliable, consistent and in accordance with the marking criteria
- *Internal moderation* is verification by a KOI subject expert not directly involved in setting and marking the assessment that the marks awarded are fair and in accordance with the expected learning outcomes



- *External moderation* is a review of the assessment and the standards achieved by the students by an external subject expert.

#### **4. Policy details**

The aim of moderation is to review the standards in all subjects on a regular basis and confirm their currency, relevance and performance against discipline standards and comparable subjects offered by other higher education providers. Moderation serves to ensure that assessment is aligned to learning outcomes and confirms the integrity and coherence of KOI's courses.

##### ***Stage 1. Pre-delivery moderation*** (see the Subject Outline Policy)

The subject coordinator and the teaching team prepare the subject outline which includes an overview of the subject, subject learning outcomes, summary of subject content, details of the assessment tasks and outline of learning resources.

The Head of Program reviews the subject outline and confirms that the assessment tasks and marking criteria are clear and align with the subject learning outcomes and that the subject makes a meaningful contribution to the course(s) in which it is offered.

The Vice-President (Academic) is responsible for the integrity of the subject outlines. The Vice-President (Academic) discusses the subject outlines with the Head of Program, approves minor variations and recommends major variations to the Academic Board. Wherever possible, the Academic Board will seek advice from the relevant Course Advisory Committee(s). Refer to the Subject Outline Policy for further details.

##### ***Stage 2: Moderation of marking***

Moderation of marking is designed to confirm that marking is reliable, consistent and in accordance with the marking criteria. That is, marks awarded by different markers agree within a small tolerance and marks are consistent with the learning outcomes, the desired performance standards and the marking criteria.

Moderation of marking will occur:

- before marking assessment tasks to ensure markers have a shared understanding of standards
- during and after marking to ensure markers have applied standards consistently – this may include
  - spot checking marked scripts at random;
  - double marking
  - reviewing borderline results.

In subjects where marking involves a team of markers, the subject coordinator ensures that the markers adopt a common standard in accordance with the marking rubric (for example, by circulating a sample of scripts for cross-marking by the team, or by checking a sample of scripts from each marker, or other means that ensure consistency between different markers). This procedure is not required in small subjects where only one marker is involved.

It is expected that written assignments are submitted through Turnitin to facilitate online marking and ensure a record of the assignment is retained. Appropriate records should be kept of marking of oral presentations (including date and time of the assessment, as well as marks awarded against a rubric).

Moderation of marking is part of the examination process for all subjects in each trimester. When submitting the marks and grades for their subject, the subject coordinator should report on the assessment results and any significant inconsistencies or unusual patterns which have been observed. The brief report should:

- outline procedures used for moderation of assessment



- comment on high fail rate (F>20%, FA>10%) and skew grades (D+HD>P+Cr) if these occur
- comment on any anomalies noted in the distribution of marks on each assessment task, or variations between results for different assessment tasks, or assessment tasks with a significant number of non-attempts
- comment on the incidence and handling of any academic misconduct (refer to the checklist).

The report is submitted through the Head of Program to the Board of Examiners.

The Board of Examiners reviews the marks and grades in each subject in the light of the reports from the subject coordinators and may moderate marks where necessary and justified.

### **Stage 3: Internal moderation**

Internal moderation of subjects is designed to confirm that the assessment aligns with the learning outcomes and provides a check that marks and feedback to students are appropriate. Internal moderation of each subject is undertaken once a year. The detailed moderation schedule is maintained by the Learning and Teaching Coordinator.

The following materials are collected for each subject which requires moderation:

1. Subject outline
2. Full details of all assessment tasks including all instructions and guidelines for students and marking rubrics (if not provided in subject outline)
3. Samples of student work (at least three samples representing excellent, good and borderline pass but more may be appropriate for large classes with several tutors) for each of the following which applies to the subject:
  - a. each assessment task with a weighting of at least 20%
  - b. mid-trimester exam
  - c. final exam

The Head of Program nominates an academic reviewer (not the subject coordinator) to prepare a report based on the materials collected for the subject. The academic reviewer should be a member of the academic staff who is qualified to teach the subject. The academic reviewer:

- Verifies that the assessment tasks and marking rubrics align with the subject learning outcomes as shown in the subject outline
- Verifies that the assessment tasks allow students to demonstrate the relevant learning outcomes identified in the subject outline
- Verifies the marks on each assessment task in the samples provided are reasonable and feedback to students is appropriate
- Suggests possible improvements for the next offering of the subject.

A reviewer report template is provided to assist the academic reviewer. The moderation exercise is expected to take 1-2 hours per subject. The Head of Program may add further comments to the report, especially where changes are being proposed for the next trimester. The Head of Program then prepares a separate report after reviewing the academic reviewer report. This report is presented to relevant Course Advisory Committees.

Learning and Teaching Coordinator collects moderation reports and associated documents and prepares a consolidated report and discusses with Vice-President (Academic) who reports to the Academic Board.

The Vice-President (Academic) ensures that suggestions for improvement are considered by the Heads of Program in the next review of the subject outlines.



**Stage 4: External moderation**

External moderation of subjects is designed to provide external referencing of assessment methods and standards of student work in comparison to similar offerings by other higher education providers (based on the experience of the external moderator). External moderation of each subject is undertaken once every five years. The detailed moderation schedule is maintained by Learning and Teaching Coordinator.

External moderators are appointed by the Vice-President (Academic) after consultation with the relevant Head of Program.

External moderators/reviewers review the materials collected for the assigned subjects and prepare a report for the respective Head of Program, who then provides responses to the Learning and Teaching Coordinator. Head of Program will share external moderation outcomes with relevant Course Advisory Committees.

Based on the external reviewer's reports and HOP's responses, The Vice-President (Academic) prepares a consolidated annual report for the Academic Board.

**5. Roles and responsibilities**

	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
<b>Review of subject outlines</b>		
Preparation of variation request	Subject Coordinator	Week 7
Review of variation requests	Head of Program	Week 8-10
Consultation with Course Advisory Committee	Head of Program	Week 10
Approval of minor changes	Vice-President (Academic)	Week 11
Approval of major changes	Chair, Academic Board	Week 12
<b>Moderation of marking</b>		
Coordination of standards	Subject Coordinator	During marking
Consistency checking	Subject Coordinator	During marking
Assessment report provided to Head of Program	Subject Coordinator	Week 15
Review of marks and grades	Board of Examiners	Week 16
<b>Collection of moderation materials</b>		
Assignments and mid-trimester exams		
Final exams		
<b>Internal moderation</b>		
Academic reviewers nominated	Head of Program	Week 3
Academic reviewers complete reports and provide to Head of Program	Academic reviewers	Week 16
Head of Program submits moderation items and reports to the Learning and Teaching Coordinator	Head of Program	Week 16
Learning and Teaching Coordinator prepares a consolidated report and discusses with Vice-President (Academic)	Learning and Teaching Coordinator	
Vice-President (Academic) reports to the Academic Board	Vice-President (Academic)	
<b>External moderation</b>		
Appointment of external moderators	Vice-President (Academic)	
External moderation conducted	External moderator	
Learning and Teaching Coordinator prepares a consolidated report and discusses with Vice-President (Academic)	Learning and Teaching Coordinator	



Vice-President (Academic) reports to the Academic Board	Vice-President (Academic)	
Academic Board reviews internal and external moderation	Chair, Academic Board	

**6. Guidelines**

- Appendix A. Checklist for marking report by Subject Coordinator
- Appendix B. Internal moderation report template
- Appendix C. Internal moderation report template for HOP
- Appendix D. External moderation report for external moderator/reviewer



**Document control**

Policy title	Moderation of Assessment Policy
Policy owner	Vice-President (Academic)
Policy approver	Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board
Version date	6 June 2024
Date approved	Academic Board 12 June 2020; 30 January 2023; 24 May 2024
Date of next review	6 June 2026
Changes in this version	Update Section 3 Internal Moderation; Section 4 External Moderation; Section 5 Roles and Responsibilities; Section 6 Guidelines.

\*\*\*\*\* END OF POLICY \*\*\*\*\*

**Appendix A. Checklist for marking report by Subject Coordinator**

The marking report is prepared at the end of each trimester to advise the Board of Examiners on the distribution of marks in the subject. It should address the following aspects of assessment (with modifications where appropriate to take account of the approach to teaching and assessment).

1. Subject name and trimester of offering
2. Subject coordinator and teaching team
3. Procedures used to ensure markers understand the marking criteria and apply the same standards in marking assignments and exams and comments on any difficulties encountered
4. Rationale for adjustment of marks for individual students and for the whole class (if applicable)
5. Comments on high fail rate (F>20%, FA>10%) (if applicable)
6. Comments on skew grades (D+HD>P+Cr, D+HD<10%) (if applicable)
7. Comment on any anomalies noted in the distribution of marks on a major assessment task (for example, poor performance on the exam, or variations between results for different assessment tasks, or assessment tasks with a significant number of non-attempts)
8. Comment on the incidence and handling of any academic misconduct.



**Appendix B. Internal Moderation Report Template (Academic Reviewer)**

**KOI Internal Moderation Review Report**

Subject Code/Name:

Trimester:

Head of Program name:

Marker name:

Reviewer name:

Sample Material	Student Name	Student ID	Group: High/Middle/Low	Given Mark (0/50)	Reviewer Mark (0/50)
MTE Samples <input type="checkbox"/>  or  Final Exam Samples <input type="checkbox"/> (please indicate)					
Assignment Samples  (major assignment with more than 20% weight in total assessment )					

Subject Outline is provided to the reviewer

Yes

No

Marking Rubric /Guidelines are provided to the reviewer:

Yes

No

Model answers for exam/assignments questions are provided to the reviewer:

Yes

No



Please evaluate and provide thorough comments on the following:

	Criteria for assessment:	Criteria met satisfactorily		Reviewer Comments:
		YES	NO	
1.	Confirm the marks on each assessment task are equitable.			
2.	Confirm that feedback to students is provided and is constructive and appropriate.			
3.	Confirm that the assessment tasks and marking rubrics align with the subject learning outcomes as shown in the subject outline			
4.	Confirm that the assessment tasks allow students to demonstrate the relevant learning outcomes identified in the subject outline. Is the assessment suitable and manageable?			
5.	Is the assessment workload appropriate for students?			
6.	Is the assessment task clearly described (is it written in plain English)? Does it include clear guidance as to the required content and format?			
	<b>Additional Comments:</b>			



**Assessment Decision:**

**Recommended improvements for the next offering of the subject:**

*(Note – for continuous improvement this is a critical section of the report to complete)*

**Internal Moderation Results:**

**The provider may:**

Apply for external moderation

Correct identified gaps

**Time spent in preparing this report**

**Do you have any suggestions for improving this moderation process?**

**Declaration by the Internal Moderator**

I declare that this moderation was conducted by me, without any influence of the second person. The provider's assessment and moderation policies were used as a guide during this moderation.

**Signature of the Reviewer:**

**Date:**



## Appendix C. Internal Moderation Review Report Template (HOP)

Subject Code/Name:

Trimester:

Head of Program name:

Marker name:

Reviewer name:

**Head of Program final report - recommendations and actions:**



## Appendix D. External moderation Report Template

KOI has adapted peer review of assessment as a component of the external referencing to benchmark the expected learning outcomes for its courses and subjects and to confirm that “methods of assessment are consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed, are capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment”.<sup>1</sup>

This template<sup>2</sup> has been prepared to guide reviewers in the assessment. Information relating to the courses and student work is provided on a confidential basis and only for the purpose of participating in the referencing process.

The following material is provided for your review:

- Course rationale and structure for the [relevant course(s)]
- Subject outlines for the [relevant subject(s)]
- Marking criteria (if not provided in the subject outline)
- Samples of student work [add description of assessment items and standard (eg good pass/ pass/ marginal fail)]



<b>Unit reviewed</b>			
<b>Institution of unit reviewed</b>			
<b>Date of review</b>			
<b>Section A: Reviewer Details</b>			
<b>Family name</b>		<b>Email</b>	
<b>Given name(s)</b>		<b>Mobile</b>	
<b>Current position and institution</b>			
<b>Qualifications</b>			
<b>Relevant experience</b>			
<i>Based on the material provided, please answer the following questions relating to the unit's assessment tasks and strategies.</i>			
<b>Section B: Assessment Tasks</b>			
<b>Q1 - Does the assessment task enable students to demonstrate attainment of the relevant Unit Learning Outcomes?</b>			
<b>YES</b>	<b>YES, BUT</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO,BUT</b>
<b>Q2 - Is the description of the performance standards (e.g. marking guide/marketing criteria/assessment rubric/annotated work samples) appropriate to the specified Unit Learning Outcomes?</b>			
<b>YES</b>	<b>YES, BUT</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO,BUT</b>
<b>Q3 - Is the assessment rubric for this assessment question appropriate to the specified Unit Learning Outcomes and assessment method?</b>			
<b>YES</b>	<b>YES, BUT</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO,BUT</b>
<b>Q4 - Do you agree that the feedback provided to the student for this assessment was relevant and constructive to assist the student address future assessment requirements?</b>			
<b>YES</b>	<b>YES, BUT</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>NO,BUT</b>



<b>Q5 - Do you agree that the grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment?</b>			
YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
<b>Q6 - Please provide any other areas for improvement that can be made for this assessment based on your observations.</b>			
<b>Section C: Assessment Strategy</b>			
<b>Q1 - Are the methods of assessment consistent with the Unit Learning Outcomes being assessed?</b>			
YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
<b>Q2 - Are the methods of assessment capable of confirming that all Unit Learning Outcomes are achieved?</b>			
YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
<b>Q3 - Are the methods of assessment capable of confirming that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment?</b>			
YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
<b>Q4 - Do the methods of assessment and for monitoring progress within the unit validly assess student progress?</b>			
YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
<b>Q5 - Does the assessment strategy include a variety of types of assessment (e.g., written, oral, project, practical, research)?</b>			
YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
<b>Q6 - Do formative assessments provide students with timely feedback that assists in their achievement of the Unit Learning Outcomes?</b>			



YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
-----	----------	----	--------

--

**Q7 - Are the assessments scaffolded to develop knowledge, skills and the application of knowledge and skills, i.e., arranged to foster progressive and coherent achievement of Unit Learning Outcomes (including in relation to other units)?**

YES	YES, BUT	NO	NO,BUT
-----	----------	----	--------

--

**Section D: Other**

**Q1- If possible, please share the average pass rate for a comparable unit from your institution for the past 2 years.**

Unit title		Pass rate	

**Q2 - Are there other matters not covered that you wish to draw to the attention of the review team?**

--