

Moderation of Assessment Policy

Document

Document Name	Moderation of Assessment Policy
Brief Description	This policy sets out the approach of the Sydney Institute Business and Technology to the management of its internal and external assessment moderation practices.
Responsibility	Academic Director
Initial Issue Date	7 April 2009
Date for Next Review:	14 September 2025

Version Control

Date/Approval	Version No.	Summary of Changes	Reviewer Name and Department/Office
07/04/09	1	Use of new template, new reference code, department, and version.	Academic Board
06/10/11	2	Updated formatting in line with UPD. Removed references to AQTF.	Academic Board
19/06/12	3	Added statement - <i>SIBT may commence applicable disciplinary procedures if a person to whom this policy applies breaches this policy (or any of its related procedures).</i>	Academic Board
11/03/16	4	Endorsed by SMT on 5/2/16. Approved by Interim Academic Board 11/03/16.	Academic Board
13/12/17	5	Approved by Academic Board	Academic Board
14/9/23	6	Definitions for external and internal moderation, marking criteria, rubric, marking guide added, all existing definitions updated, Purpose section strengthened. Responsibilities of unit coordinators, program convenors and LTC added to the Policy Statement section. Content where PAC meets every session and moderates assessment practices was removed. Provisions referring to Examination Committee and Assessment Committee removed. Appendices A, B and C added. Details added in relation to pre-, and post-marking moderation activities.	Academic Board

Related Documents

Name	Location
Student Complaints and Appeals Policy	SIBT Website
Academic Integrity Policy	SIBT Website
Assessment Policy	SIBT Website
Program Progress Policy	SIBT Website
Grade Review Policy	SIBT Website
Student Code of Conduct	SIBT Website
Program Development, Monitoring and Review Policy	SIBT Website
Higher Education Support Act 2003	https://www.legislation.gov.au/
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021	https://www.legislation.gov.au/



Contents

1. Purpose.....	4
2. Definitions	4
3. Application	5
4. Policy Statement	5
5. Internal Moderation Practices	5
5.1 Assessment Tasks	5
5.2 Marking Practices.....	6
Pre-Marking Moderation	6
Post-Marking Moderation.....	7
6. External Moderation Practices.....	7
Appendix A: Assessment Peer Review Form	9
Appendix B: Pre-Marking Moderation Form.....	11
Appendix C: Post-Marking Moderation Form.....	13

1. Purpose

- a) The purpose of the Moderation of Assessment Policy is to ensure that SIBT's assessment practices are continuously monitored and improved to ensure assessments:
 - i. Are valid, reliable, fair, flexible; and
 - ii. Address the learning outcomes for the unit to sufficiently demonstrate students' capability at the appropriate AQF level.
- b) This policy should be read and understood in conjunction with SIBT policies listed in the Related Documents section.

2. Definitions

Term	Meaning
Assessment	A process of collecting evidence and making judgements on whether learning outcomes have been achieved.
Peer Review of Assessment	An activity that involves two or more parties (internal or external) participating in concurrent reviews of assessment practices, in selected units, within similar programs. Peer review of assessment includes judgements about grading standards and the appropriateness of the assessment towards attainment of learning outcomes at the level of the unit and the program.
Peer Review Portal	A cloud-based review management system and online community of practice for quality assurance and review by external reviewers. https://peerreviewportal.com/
Valid/Validity	A valid assessment assesses what it claims to assess; evidence collected is relevant to the activity and demonstrates that the learning outcomes have been met.
Reliable/Reliability	Refers to the extent in which 'consistent' outcomes are achieved in assessment regardless of who does the assessment, when it is conducted and in whatever context it is conducted.
Moderation	A process of review in relation to a set of standards to ensure quality and consistency.
Assessment Moderation	The quality review of assessment content and processes, which involves verifying that these produce valid, reliable, sufficient, current evidence and make reasonable judgements as to whether the program and unit learning outcomes are met. It also includes making recommendations for future improvements to assessment content and processes.
Internal Moderation	A process undertaken by SIBT staff where assessment criteria and standards are set, and samples of completed assessment tasks are reviewed against both the criteria and the standards to validate the marking.
External Moderation	A process where SIBT staff exchange information with national and/or international providers of similar units about assessments and the validity of approaches.
Validation	The review, comparison, and evaluation of assessment processes, tools and evidence contributing to judgments made by a range of markers against the same standards.

Term	Meaning
Marking Criteria	Marking criteria identify what the task is assessing and what students will be graded on. Marking criteria are aligned to the learning outcomes which allow students to clearly see how they are meeting the learning outcomes. Please also refer to the definition of <i>Rubric</i> .
Rubric	A matrix that serves as a consistent, equitable and transparent assessment tool that clearly identifies achievement criteria across all components of the assessment task. Assessments are marked and graded in accordance with criteria and performance standards defined in rubrics. Rubrics are sometimes called "criteria sheets", "grading schemes", or "scoring guides".
Marking Guide	A marking guide is very similar to a rubric, but it is simpler. For each marking criterion, a comment explains what is being sought, and provides a maximum mark that can be awarded.

3. Application

- a) The Moderation of Assessment Policy applies to all:
 - i. Formal moderation activities regarding weighted assessment tasks conducted at SIBT;
 - ii. Staff involved in assessment moderation practices.

4. Policy Statement

- a) Sydney Institute of Business and Technology undertakes regular internal and external moderation activities as a quality assurance mechanism to ensure validity and reliability of assessment tasks, marking criteria, and final grades.
- b) These activities ensure that the criteria and standards defined for an assessment task consistently reflect a student's ability to achieve the Unit Learning Outcomes.
- c) Internal moderation is designed to ensure that SIBT teaching staff are making consistent and accurate assessment decisions in accordance with the criteria defined for the assessment items.
- d) External moderation is designed to verify the validity of assessment instruments and reliability of assessment decisions made by SIBT teaching staff.
- e) The Learning and Teaching Committee oversees the assessment moderation process, considers moderation reports and recommendations for changes, and approves changes within their scope of delegated authority.

5. Internal Moderation Practices

5.1 Assessment Tasks

- a) SIBT Unit coordinators are responsible for internal assessment moderation activities.
- b) When changes are proposed to an assessment, or a new assessment is introduced, SIBT Unit Coordinators are required to have the assessment task, marking guides and/or marking criteria peer reviewed by another member of the SIBT teaching staff, either from that unit or from another unit within the discipline.
- c) Where there is no appropriate internal SIBT academic staff member, this process will be conducted externally.

- d) The purpose of this activity is to ensure that the assessment task is measuring the student's ability to meet the relevant Unit Learning Outcomes, aligns to the appropriate AQF level for the program, and the marking criteria effectively guide markers when making assessment judgements.
- e) The Unit Coordinator ensures that marking guides and marking criteria allow markers to clarify assessment requirements and ensure consistency of marking. The marking guides and marking criteria also provide a mechanism against which peer reviewers and Program Convenors evaluate marking practices undertaken by SIBT markers.
- f) The SIBT [Assessment Peer Review Form](#) (Appendix A) is used to document the outcomes of all internal assessment peer review activities.
- g) Once an assessment has been peer reviewed, the proposed assessment and completed Assessment Peer Review Form are sent to the relevant Program Convenor for approval.
- h) The Program Convenor is responsible for documenting the outcomes of all internal moderation activities in the SIBT Moderation Register. The completed Assessment Peer Review Form is to be attached to the entry in the Moderation Register.
- i) The Program Convenor is responsible for reporting the outcomes of all internal moderation activities to the SIBT Learning and Teaching Committee at the first meeting after the internal moderation was completed for discussion and recommendations by the Committee.
- j) Unit Coordinators are responsible for completing the SIBT End of Session Unit Report at the end of each teaching session to monitor the success of the assessment strategies for the unit. This report will be discussed with the Program Convenor during the end of the session sign-off meetings and will inform assessment changes (if required) and future moderation activities.

5.2 Marking Practices

- a) Internal moderation of marking practices allows for scrutiny of all marks generated by the marking team to verify the appropriateness of their decisions and to bring a second judgment, particularly in relation to very good or poor performances.
- b) Internal moderation tools include, but are not limited to:
 - i. Detailed and agreed upon marking criteria, rubrics, and marking guides as required;
 - ii. Detailed and agreed upon examination solutions;
 - iii. Cross or shared marking between classes;
 - iv. Sample marking of assessments; and/or
 - v. Any other suitable method that allows moderation of marks awarded within a team situation.
- c) The Unit Coordinator ensures that marking guides and marking criteria allow markers to clarify assessment requirements and make consistent assessment judgements.

Pre-Marking Moderation

- a) Where there are multiple markers involved in the marking of the assessment tasks within a unit, all markers will:
 - i. Meet and discuss the assessment tasks and the marking criteria;
 - ii. Complete the SIBT [Pre-Marking Moderation Form](#) (Appendix B).

- b) Where there are multiple markers for an assessment in one unit, the assessment will be split amongst the markers by question so that individual markers are marking the same question/s for all students, not by a student's completed assessment.

Post-Marking Moderation

- a) The Unit Coordinator is responsible for leading post-marking moderation activities.
- b) Outcomes of post-marking moderation are to be documented in the [Post-Marking Moderation Form](#) (Appendix C).
- c) When completing post-marking moderation, the Unit Coordinator will:
 - i. Select a sample of assessments from the student cohort (minimum 3 student samples to be moderated, if class size allows);
 - ii. Complete the SIBT Post-Marking Moderation Form;
 - iii. Provide feedback to the Program Convenors on their processes and any recommended changes.
- d) Where the Unit Coordinator is the only marker for a specified assessment, the Program Convenor will select a sample of marked assessments from the student cohort to be moderated by another teacher and provide feedback to the Unit Coordinator on the outcome of the moderation activity.
- e) Internal moderation of the marking of weighted assessments will occur prior to publication of results.
- f) SIBT Unit Coordinators are initially responsible for examining the distribution of marks awarded by each of the markers. This process identifies where teachers are awarding marks outside of the average or general trend within the unit.
- g) Where a Unit Coordinator identifies a problem with a particular marker, they should discuss the situation with the marker to validate the marking outcome.
- h) The Unit Coordinator will report the situation to the relevant Program Convenor(s) if there is no valid explanation for the marking discrepancies. The Program Convenor(s), in consultation with the Unit Coordinator and Academic Director will decide on a course of action that may include:
 - i. Remarking of assessments;
 - ii. Scaling of marks;
 - iii. Additional supervision of the marker in subsequent assessments.
- k) Unit Coordinators are responsible for completing the SIBT End of Session Unit Report at the end of each teaching session to monitor the success of the assessment strategies for the unit. This report will be discussed with the Program Convenor during the end of the session sign-off meetings and will inform proposed assessment changes (if necessary) and future moderation activities.

6. External Moderation Practices

- a) External moderation of assessment is conducted annually using a sample of units from within each program to:
 - i. Maintain standards and integrity of SIBT assessment processes;
 - ii. Review the alignment of assessment tasks and unit learning outcomes;
 - iii. Review the validity of the assessment tasks;
 - iv. Determine if the assessment tasks adequately and effectively test the students' achievements in meeting the learning outcomes;
 - v. Review marking standards.

- b) External peer review of assessment may be conducted by:
 - i. Another comparable higher education provider; or
 - ii. External reviewers appointed by SIBT, if the unit/s offered at SIBT cannot be matched with another comparable higher education provider. SIBT may engage external reviewers through the Peer Review Portal <https://peerreviewportal.com>.
- c) Units chosen for external moderation each year will be determined by the Program Convenor. Units may be chosen for external moderation resulting from (but not limited to):
 - i. Unit performance;
 - ii. Student satisfaction survey results;
 - iii. Complaints;
 - iv. Academic misconduct;
 - v. Program review.
- d) The relevant discipline Program Convenor, in consultation with the Academic Director, is responsible for identifying potential external moderation partners, appointing external reviewers to complete peer review of SIBT assessments, and managing the external peer review process.
- e) External reviewers will be appointed based on their qualifications and expertise in the relevant discipline or program.
- f) External reviewers are not involved with the original marking of the assessments or examination papers. The reviewer will provide a moderation report to the relevant SIBT Program Convenor outlining the findings of their review. The SIBT '[Assessment Peer Review Form](#)' is used to document the outcomes of all external peer review activities.
- g) The Program Convenor is responsible for documenting the outcomes of all external moderation activities in the SIBT Moderation Register. The completed Assessment Peer Review Form is to be attached to the entry in the Moderation register.
- h) The Program Convenor is responsible for reporting the outcomes of external moderation activities to the SIBT Learning and Teaching Committee at the first meeting after the external moderation report has been received for discussion and recommendations by the Committee.
- i) Outcomes of external moderation activities in this context do not affect final grades but are acted upon to shape future assessment practices and program design.

Appendix A: Assessment Peer Review Form

Assessment Peer Review Form
<p>Important Note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Quality Assurance process is to be used for all units. • Unit Coordinators are to choose a peer(s) who is (are) either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a fellow teacher(s) on the unit; OR b. a unit coordinator on a unit in a similar discipline; OR c. a colleague in the same discipline from another institution. • When conducting the peer review, the peer reviewer is to be given a copy of the assessment/exam, marking criteria/rubric and the constructive alignment (i.e., mapping which demonstrates the alignment of the assessment to the relevant Unit Learning Outcome/s). • The peer reviewer will consider all aspects of the proposed assessment, including the ability of the task to assess the Unit Learning Outcome/s, whether language is appropriate for the program/AQF level, formatting, grammar, and spelling and document their findings below.

Assessment Details (to be completed by Unit Coordinator)	
Year and Session: Unit Name: Unit Code: Unit Coordinator: Phone Number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Final Examination <input type="checkbox"/> Final Assessment Task <input type="checkbox"/> Supplementary <input type="checkbox"/> Other Week of Assessment:

Peer Reviewer Details	
Peer Reviewer Name:	
Phone Number:	
Position / Education Provider:	
Teaching Discipline:	
Reviewer suitability for performing the review (e.g., briefly outline teaching experience in discipline / unit)	

Outcome of Peer Review of Assessment	
<i>Does the assessment adequately assess relevant the Unit Learning Outcomes as per the constructive alignment mapping?</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If NO , please provide further details below and recommendations:
<i>Is the assessment pitched at the appropriate AQF level for the program?</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If NO , please provide further details below and recommendations:
<i>Is the assessment current and relevant to the discipline?</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If NO , please provide further details below and recommendations:
<i>Does the marking guide / marking criteria clearly identify the assessment requirements to ensure consistency of marking?</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If NO , please provide further details below and recommendations:
<i>Do you have any other feedback or suggestions regarding this assessment?</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	If YES , please provide further details below and recommendations:
Date:	Signature:

Unit Coordinator Response / Recommendations:	
Date:	Signature:

Program Convenor	Acknowledgement and Approval
Date:	Signature:

Appendix B: Pre-Marking Moderation Form

Pre-Marking Moderation Form			
Important Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This form is to document the moderation of assessments in units of study where there are multiple markers of the same assessment task and to ensure accuracy and consistency of marking. 			

Year & Session	Unit Code	Unit Name	Unit Coordinator

Details of Assessment (from Section 2.5 of the SIBT Unit Guide)

Assessment Task	Week of Assessment	Assessment total "marks out of"	Assessment Weighting (%)

Pre-Marking Moderation

This section is to be completed by the Unit Coordinator *prior to* marking an assessment task.

Pre-Marking Moderation Meeting Details

Date	
Location	
Meeting Start & End Time	
Meeting Attendees	

Moderation Marking Table

Script	Mark (Marker 1)	Mark (Marker 2)	Discrepancy*	Comments (If discrepancy is >10%, briefly describe the process undertaken to reach agreement).	Final Agreed Mark
Student A			<input type="checkbox"/> 10% or less <input type="checkbox"/> Greater than 10%		
Student B			<input type="checkbox"/> 10% or less <input type="checkbox"/> Greater than 10%		
Student C			<input type="checkbox"/> 10% or less <input type="checkbox"/> Greater than 10%		

*Note “base mark” procedure definition to be used in calculating discrepancies sections: The base mark is calculated from the total mark of the assessment, e.g., if the total script mark is out of 120, then the base mark is 10% of 120 = 12 marks.

Pre-Marking Moderation Meeting Checklist

Task	Completion Status (check when complete)
A detailed marking guide/rubric has been provided to, and discussed with, all markers.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussed & clarified approach for plagiarism/AI generated cases	<input type="checkbox"/>
A moderation marking sheet has been provided to, and discussed with, all markers.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Marking timeframe and student feedback expectations have been discussed with all markers.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Details for the Post-Marking Moderation Meeting have been confirmed.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Additional Comments:

Appendix C: Post-Marking Moderation Form

Post-Marking Moderation Form			
Important Note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This form is to document the moderation of assessment marking to ensure accuracy and consistency of assessment judgements. 			

Year & Session	Unit Code	Unit Name	Unit Coordinator

Details of Assessment (from Section 2.5 of the SIBT Unit Guide)

Assessment Task	Week of Assessment	Assessment total "marks out of"	Assessment Weighting (%)

Post-Marking Moderation

This section is to be completed by the Unit Coordinator or Program Convenor ***after*** marking an assessment task.

Marking Team

	Name	Job Title and Relevant Experience
Marker 1	<input type="checkbox"/> SIBT teacher (internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SIBT teacher (external)	Job title: Unit name: Name of education provider (if external): Qualifications and brief experience overview (if external):

	Name	Job Title and Relevant Experience
Marker 2	<input type="checkbox"/> SIBT teacher (internal) <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SIBT teacher (external)	Job title: Unit name: Name of education provider (if external): Qualifications and brief experience overview (if external):

Moderation Marking Table

Script	Mark (Marker 1)	Mark (Marker 2)	Discrepancy*	Comments (If discrepancy is >10%, briefly describe the process undertaken to reach agreement).	Final Agreed Mark
Student A			Select >>		
Student B			Select >>		
Student C			Select >>		

*Note "base mark" procedure definition to be used in calculating discrepancies sections: The base mark is calculated from the total mark of the assessment, e.g., if the total script mark is out of 120, then the base mark is 10% of 120 = 12 marks.

Post-Marking Moderation Meeting Checklist

Task	Completion Status
Moderation of results for all sample student submissions were discussed, moderated and calibrated.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussed & clarified any changes to the marking rubric/guide as a result of moderation activities with all unit markers.	<input type="checkbox"/>
Any suspected plagiarism was reported for investigation via the Allegation of Academic Misconduct Form .	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moderation marking sheets and Form were saved in the Unit Folder. Documented outcomes of moderation activities and lodged this with the relevant Program Convenor.	<input type="checkbox"/>



Additional Comments:

Moderation Completion

This section is to be completed by the Program Convenor **after** the moderation process has been completed.

Task		Completion Status
Program Convenor has lodged this form and accompanying documents in the sessional folder for Program results.		<input type="checkbox"/>
Name:	Signature:	Date:

Additional Comments: