

Assessment Moderation Procedure

Procedure Category	Academic		
Document Owner	Dean		
Responsible Officer	Dean		
Review Date	8/08/2022		
Related Documents	<i>Assessment Policy</i> <i>Examinations Procedure</i> <i>Benchmarking Guidelines</i> <i>Information for Students Policy</i> <i>Information for Students Procedure</i> <i>Program Review Policy</i> <i>Program Review Procedure</i> <i>Quality Assurance Framework</i>		
Version	Authorised by	Approved	Effective Date
1.3	Academic Board	8/08/2019	8/08/2019

This Procedure implements the Australian Institute of Business Intelligence’s (the ‘Institute’) *Quality Assurance Framework* and supports the Institute’s promotion of quality and consistency in its assessment processes and approach to maintain academic standards.

1. Scope

This Procedure applies to all Institute academic staff and contractors.

2. Definitions

Assessment: a process to determine a student’s achievement of identified learning outcomes and may include a range of written and oral methods and practice or demonstration.

Assessment moderation: the process of establishing comparability of standards in student performance across for example, different markers, locations, units, programs and/or providers. It assures judgements made of student performance are consistent or comparable, appropriate, and fair. It also assures the validity and reliability of assessment tasks, criteria and standards.

Assessment validation: the quality review of the assessment process. It involves checking that assessment tools produce valid, reliable, sufficient, current and authentic evidence to enable reasonable judgements to be made as to whether the learning outcomes or requirements of a program are met. It includes the review of a statistically valid sample of the assessments and making recommendations for future improvements to the assessment tool, process and/or outcomes and acting upon these recommendations.

Criteria: specific performance attributes or characteristics that the assessor takes into account when making a judgement about the student response to the different elements of the assessment task.

Moderation: is a quality assurance process comprised of a set of specific tasks and actions aimed at ensuring that assessments are accurate, consistent and fair.

Program: a course of study, comprising units of study, the successful completion of which results in the awarding of a qualification, such as a bachelor’s degree.

Unit: a separate subject of study which, in combination with other units, make up a program.

3. Procedure

Moderation activities take place at all stages of the assessment lifecycle (pre- and post-assessment).

3.1. Pre-assessment moderation

The Program Coordinator is responsible for coordinating pre-assessment moderation for all program units, including ensuring that staff and contractors involved in pre-assessment activities have the required expertise.

3.1.1. Setting or modifying assessment criteria

The moderation of assessment criteria addresses:

- the relevance to unit learning outcomes, including knowledge and skills;
- the level of clarity; and
- the appropriateness to differentiating achievement.

3.1.2. Designing and modifying assessment rubrics and tasks

Each assessment task is evaluated and validated for appropriateness, relevance and value to the unit and program learning outcomes. Factors to be considered include:

- cumulative workload;
- timeframes for completion;
- availability of necessary resources;
- validity of tasks set to demonstrating achievement; and
- clarity of instructions and task requirements.

Each assessment task is accompanied by a clear and comprehensive rubric setting out how marks are apportioned against specific questions or criteria.

3.1.3. Pre-marking

Moderation may include meetings between markers and the Program Coordinator to ensure shared understanding of requirements for the task, discussion of the application of criteria, informal analysis of individual questions, or trial marking. The objective of pre-marking moderation is to ensure that:

- all markers are familiar with assessment standards and requirements;
- that assessment standards are clear and unambiguous; and
- that the application of criteria is consistent for any given task and across assessment tasks.

3.2. Post-assessment

The Dean and the Program Coordinators are responsible for ensuring that the allocation of marks is consistent, accurate, and fair. This will occur prior to the grades being forwarded to the Teaching and Learning Committee for ratification and release. Marking and grading moderation may include:

- comparison checks for consistency between markers;
- double or blind marking; or
- sample review against assessment criteria.

3.3. Monitoring

Moderation outcomes will be used to inform the ongoing development of assessments, learning and teaching practice, units and programs, as follows:

- Program Advisory Committee regarding curriculum related advice on improvements to accredited programs;
- Teaching and Learning Committee regarding the quality of teaching activities including assessment; and
- Academic Board regarding monitoring the outcomes of accredited programs and continuous improvements in learning and teaching.

Refer to the Institute’s *Program Review Procedure*, which can be accessed from the Institute’s website, for more information on program review processes.

4. Breaches

If a staff is found to be in breach of this Procedure, she or he may be subject to disciplinary action according to the *Staff Code of Conduct and Staff Misconduct Procedure*.

5. Appeals

Appeals concerning any decision taken in relation to this Procedure should be made under the *Staff Complaints and Appeals Policy*.

6. References

Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021– Part A, Standards 1

Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021– Part A, Standards 5

7. Acknowledgements

In developing this Procedure, the Institute acknowledges:

- *TEQSA Guidance Note: Course Design (including Learning Outcomes and Assessment)*;
- *TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Quality Assurance*.

Document History:

Version	Date	Author	Reason	Sections
0.1	03/06/2017		Amended following review by Academic Board	All
0.2	29/05/2018	Julien Marechal	Revised as per Academic Board’s comments from 16/05/2018 meeting	All
1.0	12/07/2018	Julien Marechal	Revised as per Academic Board’s comments at 09/07/2018 meeting	All
1.1	8/08/2019	Julien Marechal	Revised in response to TEQSA feedback and approved by the Academic Board.	3.2
1.2	17/12/2019	Philippa Ryan	Amended to reflect new trading name ‘Waratah Institute’.	All
1.3	04/01/2022	Zoe Williams	Amended to reflect new corporate name Australian Institute of Business Intelligence; abbreviated to the Institute and new logo; and updated references to the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021.	All