Moderation of Assessment Policy and Procedure

Document

Document Name	Moderation of Assessment Policy and Procedure
Brief Description	This policy sets out the approach of the Sydney Institute Business and Technology (SIBT) to the management of its internal and external assessment moderation practices.
Responsible Officer	Academic Director
Delegated Authority	Academic Board
Initial Issue Date	7 April 2009
Date for Next Review:	19 August 2028

Version Control

Date/Approval	Version No.	Summary of Changes	Reviewer Name and Department/Office
19/8/25	7	Added Procedure to the Policy title. Removed appendices due to a shorter lifecycle/review process. Improved readability. Added Review Clause. Strengthened key definitions	Academic Board

Related Documents

Name	Location
Academic Integrity Policy	SIBT Website
Assessment Policy	SIBT Website
Grade Review Policy	SIBT Website
Program Development, Monitoring and Review Policy	SIBT Website
Program Progress Policy and Procedure	SIBT Website
Student Code of Conduct	SIBT Website
Student Complaints and Appeals 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

a)   The purpose of this Policy is to ensure that Sydney Institute of Business and Technology's (SIBT) assessment practices are continuously monitored and improved to ensure assessments:
  i.   Are valid, reliable, fair, flexible; and
  ii.   Address the Unit Learning Outcomes 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	The methods and processes by which a student's academic progress and standard, at a given time, are measured against the stated learning outcomes of the program of study.
Assessment Task	An activity students undertake to demonstrate (or display) the nature and depth of their learning and to confirm whether they have achieved the learning outcomes as set out in the Unit Guide.
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.
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.
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.
Marking Criteria	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 *Rubric*.
Marking Guide	A document used by those who mark an assessment; similar to but simpler than a rubric. For each marking criterion, a comment explains what is being sought and provides a maximum mark that can be awarded.
Moderation	A quality assurance control process of review in relation to a set of standards to ensure quality and consistency.
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.

Term	Meaning
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/
Reliable/Reliability	Refers to the extent to which 'consistent' outcomes are achieved in assessment regardless of who does the assessment, when it is conducted and in whatever context it is conducted.
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".
Unit Coordinator	A person responsible for the oversight of all units allocated to them and includes the setting and review of assessment tasks, the management of marking including the collation, moderation and reporting of results and finalisation of grades.
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.
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.

3. Application

a) This Policy applies to:
   i. Formal moderation activities regarding weighted assessment tasks conducted at SIBT;
   ii. Staff involved in assessment moderation practices.

4. Policy Statement

a) SIBT 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) Learning activities and assessment are clearly aligned to the stated learning and assessment practices incorporate clearly defined assessment criteria, and are valid, fair, flexible, feasible, culturally and age appropriate.

c) These activities ensure that the criteria and standards defined for an assessment task can be applied consistently when assessing a student's ability to achieve the Unit Learning Outcomes.

d) 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.

e) Internal and External moderation is designed to verify the validity of assessment instruments and reliability of assessment decisions made by SIBT teaching staff.

f) The Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) 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) 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.

c) 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, where appropriate.

d) Where there is no appropriate internal SIBT academic staff member or it is considered advantageous to seek a different view, this process will be conducted externally.

e) 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 that the marking criteria effectively guide markers when making assessment judgements.

f) 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.

g) The SIBT Assessment Peer Review Form (is used to document the outcomes of all internal assessment peer review activities.

h) 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.

i) 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.

j) 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.

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.

5.3   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

    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 task in its entirety.

5.4   Post-Marking Moderation

    a)   The Unit Coordinator is responsible for leading post-marking moderation activities.

    b)   When completing post-marking moderation, the Unit Coordinator will:
        i.   Select a sample of assessments that include a cross-section of grade levels 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.

    c)   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.

    d)   Internal moderation of the marking of weighted assessments will occur prior to publication of results.

    e)   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.

    f)   Where a Unit Coordinator identifies a problem with a particular marker, they should discuss the situation with the marker to validate the marking outcome.

    g)   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.
        iv.   Outcomes of post-marking moderation are to be documented in the Post-Marking Moderation Form

    h)   Unit Coordinators are responsible for completing the SIBT End of Session Unit Report at the conclusion 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.

7. Review

a) SIBT monitors the effectiveness and appropriateness of the terms under this Policy to identify continuous improvement opportunities and risk identification and mitigation and to inform updates to the policy.

b) This Policy will be reviewed by the Responsible Officer and the Quality and Compliance Manager a minimum of every three (3) years, or when there are updates to the regulatory compliance requirements, legislation, regulation, and guidelines.