



## MODERATION POLICY

<b>Authorised By:</b>	Academic Board	Revision: 1.6
<b>Last Amendment Date:</b>	Revision Date: 22 Mar 2023	
<b>Review Due Date:</b>	Next Review: 22 Jun 2025	
<b>Related Documents:</b>	<a href="#">Academic Quality Assurance Systems Policy</a> <a href="#">Assessment Policy</a>	
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Academic Director	
<b>Review:</b>	Academic Quality Assurance Committee	

Any person who requires assistance in understanding any aspect of this document should contact the Responsible Officer

### 1. Overview

Moderation of assessment is an important part of Tabor's quality assurance process. It provides comparability of standards with regard to the judgements made by new and experienced academic staff members and ensures that students' results and assessment tasks are able to be defended within the broader context of the higher education sector.

### 2. Scope and Applications

This policy and its associated procedures apply to assessment in undergraduate and postgraduate Higher Education awards.

### 3. Policy Principles

Moderation embraces continuous improvement of the Institute's subjects, assessment practices and faculty. The Institute uses the following industry recognised principles determined by the National Quality Council (NQC) and upheld by the National Skills Standards Council (NSSC) to underpin the policy, procedure and guidelines.

- 3.1. Transparent - The purpose, process and implications of the various moderation processes should be transparent to all relevant stakeholders.
- 3.2. Representative - A representative sample should be used to moderate assessment standards and practices.
- 3.3. Confidential - Information regarding individuals (i.e. assessors and students) must be treated with sensitivity and discretion.
- 3.4. Educative - Moderation should form an integral rather than separate part of the assessment

process. It should provide constructive feedback, which leads to continuous improvement.

- 3.5. Equitable - Moderation must be demonstrably fair, equitably applied and unbiased.
- 3.6. Include external parties – Moderation which utilizes assessors from other higher education providers (universities or Institutes) ensures the equivalence of Tabor's grading standard and practices with the broader Australian higher education sector.

#### **4. Procedures**

- 4.1. Tabor uses a number of moderation processes to ensure consistency and quality of grading. These include:
  - 4.1.1. An internal, intrasemester moderation process for new academic and adjunct staff members (including markers). This process is designed to calibrate the assessor against the Institute standards and ensure a consistency of marking practice and standards within the faculty. Details of this process are found in appendix A and a template is found in appendix B.
  - 4.1.2. An internal, end of semester moderation process for all academic and adjunct staff members (including markers). This process is designed to ensure comparability of results across student cohorts, across an individual student's profile, and across subjects. Details of this process are found in appendix C.
  - 4.1.3. An external, end of semester moderation process for selected academic and adjunct staff members (including markers). This process is designed to ensure that Tabor's marking practices and standards are consistent with those of other Australian higher education providers. Details of this process are found in appendix D and a template is found in appendix E.
- 4.2. Where markers are appointed to help with assessment in a particular subject the subject lecturer is responsible to provide direction and internal moderation in order to ensure consistency in marking.
- 4.3. Internal moderation processes may lead to a change of the grades assigned to students. If this is the case, students will be notified of the change by the Registrar and will be provided with an explanation of the reason for the change by the Dean of Faculty. The Dean must also present a report to the AQAC explaining why the change was required and what subsequent action has taken place (e.g., the professional development of the assessor).
- 4.4. The Deans of Faculties are responsible for ensuring that assessors undertake professional development whenever their grading is deemed to be inappropriate.

#### **5. Definitions**

See [Global Definitions](#)

#### **6. Communication / Training**

- 6.1. Deans of Faculties are responsible for training their staff in the requirements of this policy the policy will be published in the Tabor Policy Repository

## APPENDIX A – INTERNAL, INTRASEMESTER MODERATION PROCESS

1. The internal, intrasemester moderation of assessment is an important part of Tabor's academic quality assurance process. It ensures that judgements made by new markers (whether permanent or adjunct staff) are consistent with those made by more experienced Tabor faculty members.
2. All new staff with responsibility for marking assignments must have their marking moderated during their first semester by a Head of Program.
3. At the end of week 4, faculty administrators will identify staff that require moderation. This will include:
  - b. New adjuncts
  - c. New permanent (full time or part time) faculty
  - d. New teaching assistants
4. Faculty administrators will ensure that Head of Programs have access to a representative sample of graded assignments from the new marker. These assignments should be drawn from an early piece of work for assessment (to ensure that consistency with Tabor norms is established as soon as possible), which has a sufficient spread of grades to ensure that the Head of Program is able to develop a sense of how the marker is allocating grades across the spectrum.
5. Head of Programs will review the marker's work and complete the internal moderation form.
6. Head of Programs will meet with new markers to discuss grading standards and consistency of practice within the faculty,
7. A finalised version of the internal moderation form will be provided to the Dean for their review.
8. Final internal moderation form to be tabled at AQAC as evidence of moderation.
9. AQAC to archive all final internal moderation forms.

Please see Appendix B for a template for internal review

## APPENDIX B – INTERNAL MODERATION OF ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

Faculty:		Semester & Year:	
Unit Code & Title			
Mode of Delivery (tick one)	<input type="checkbox"/> On-campus <input type="checkbox"/> Intensive <input type="checkbox"/> Online <input type="checkbox"/> Blended (online + face-to-face)		
No. of Students	Level 5/7:	Level 8/9:	
Unit Lecturer			
Marker (leave blank if same as lecturer)			
Moderator (leave blank if same as lecturer)			
Title of Moderator			
Type of Assessment			

<b>Comment on assessment</b>
Were the students in this unit provided with: a) clear information about what the assessment is and what it requires b) a set of marking rubrics or a set of marking criteria

<b>Comment on the allocation of grades to the individual assessments:</b>	
Tabor HD Paper	
Tabor DN Paper	
Tabor CR Paper	
Tabor P Paper	
Tabor F Paper	

<b>Do you have any recommendations for the assessor regarding their allocation of grades?</b>
Are the assigned grades consistent with other markers in the faculty? Are they consistent with the rubric or marking criteria? Should the assessor increase or decrease the grades they are assigning?

<b>Comment on the adequacy (content, scope and tone) of the assessor's feedback:</b>
<p>Only one response is required for all of the papers.</p> <p>Are the margin/in-text comments regarding structure, content, referencing, grammar, and spelling, valid and constructive?</p> <p>Does the feedback align with the rubrics or criteria used?</p> <p>Has the assessor adequately justified/explained their choice of grade and identified appropriate areas for improvement?</p> <p>Is feedback appropriate and sensitive where required?</p> <p>Do you have any recommendations for the assessor regarding the feedback they are providing the student?</p>

<b>Any other comments:</b>

<b>Assessor's reflections on review:</b>

<b>Dean's Declaration</b>
Suggested wording: I have read this review and am happy with the assessor's performance/am requesting further professional development of the marker...
[insert name]
[insert date]

## APPENDIX C – INTERNAL, END OF SEMESTER MODERATION PROCESS

1. All academic staff are required to have subject results completed by the date set by the Academic Registrar.
2. Each Faculty will meet as soon as possible after results have been completed in order to review the results. This process will take place each semester.
3. If an academic member is unable to attend the meeting they should provide a brief written report explaining the grade distribution for their subject/s.
4. [Academic Registrar](#) will provide a copy of the following to each member of the committee:
  - a. A copy of the grade distribution for the faculty as a whole. This should include grade distribution for the following cohorts:
    - i. Adelaide on campus students;
    - ii. Perth on campus students (where relevant);
    - iii. Online students (where relevant);
    - iv. Undergraduate and postgraduate students (where subjects are parallel taught).
  - b. For those subjects with 5 or more students, a copy of the grade distribution for each subject taught within the faculty. This should include grade distribution for the following cohorts:
    - i. Adelaide on campus students;
    - ii. Perth on campus students (where relevant);
    - iii. Online students (where relevant);
    - iv. Undergraduate and postgraduate students (where subjects are parallel taught).
  - c. A list of students and their grades for students who completed two or more subjects.
  - d. The Dean of Faculty may request further information (e.g., a copy of the grade distribution for a particular assignment within a subject).
5. Meeting discussion should focus on issues such as:
  - a. Comparability of results across student cohorts;
  - b. Comparability of results across an individual student's profile;
  - c. Comparability of results across subjects;
  - d. Examples of grade distributions which may be considered 'abnormal'.
6. The Faculty Administrator will take minutes of the meeting, including recommendations regarding any changes to grading practices within the faculty.
7. If the Dean decides that the assigned grades for a specific subject are inappropriate, he / she may have these changed. The Dean should notify the Registrar, who is responsible for ensuring the corrected grades are published on Paradigm. The Dean should provide affected students with an explanation of the reason for any change in their grade.
8. The minutes will be tabled at the next meeting of the Academic Board along with a brief report from the Dean summarising the key outcomes of the meeting.

## APPENDIX D – EXTERNAL, END OF SEMESTER MODERATION PROCESS

1. The external moderation of assessment is an important part of Tabor's academic quality assurance process. It provides comparability of standards with regard to the judgements made by academic staff members and ensures that students' results are able to be defended within the broader context of the higher education sector.
2. At the end of each semester, the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC) will, in consultation with faculty program heads, identify a number of units, normally two from each faculty, to be externally moderated.
3. The AQAC will also identify, on the basis of advice from the Faculty Meeting, appropriate external moderators. These persons should hold (i) an AQF level 9 or 10 award in a relevant discipline and (ii) current or recent experience in the public or private higher education sectors.
4. The AQAC Administrator will distribute copies of a representative sample of anonymised assignments (preferably one from each grade range), the subject description (and any other relevant information), and the external moderation of assessment template (APPENDIX K) to the external moderators.
5. In addition to reviewing the assignment of marks and the quality of marker feedback, the external reviewer will be asked to review the subject description as a whole (including the subject learning outcomes, content, texts / references, and work for assessment) as a means of externally benchmarking the subject.
6. The external moderator will be required to complete their review within a 2 month time frame and be offered a small honorarium (suggested \$100), in recognition that they are providing the Institute with their professional services.
7. The Academic Director will table the external moderation reports at the AQAC for discussion. Depending on the results of the review process, the Committee may recommend:
  - 7.1 An affirmation of the assessor, or
  - 7.2 A process of education for the assessor re. their assessment and grading practices (to be overseen by the Dean of Faculty), and / or
  - 7.3 If overarching or systemic issues are identified, a process of education for the Faculty / Institute as a whole (to be overseen by the Director of Scholarship through the Scholarship Committee)
8. The Committee's deliberations and recommendations will be minuted, and thereby reported to the Academic Board. In the case of 7.2 a report will also be provided by the Dean. In the case of 7.3 a report will also be provided by the Director of Scholarship.

### Educative Approach

1. The Dean/AQAC delegate will connect the assessor with an experienced, senior academic (usually a Head of Program) from their faculty.
2. The Dean/AQAC delegate will meet with the assessor and senior academic to
  - (i) work through the feedback that has resulted in the recommendation for further education and
  - (ii) identify an appropriate professional development pathway.
3. The professional development pathway will normally involve the process described as "Internal, Intrasemester Moderation" in the Institute's Moderation Policy.
4. The Dean/AQAC delegate will provide a report of the educative process undertaken and outcomes to the next meeting of the AQAC.

## APPENDIX E – EXTERNAL MODERATION OF ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

External Review of [insert subject code and title]

Comment on the allocation of grades to the individual assignments:	
Tabor HD Paper	
Tabor DN Paper	
Tabor CR Paper	
Tabor P Paper	
Tabor F Paper	

Comment on the adequacy (content, scope and tone) of the assessor's feedback:
<i>Only one response is required for all of the papers</i> <i>Has the assessor adequately justified / explained their choice of grade and identified appropriate areas for improvement?</i>

Comment on the appropriateness of the subject learning outcomes:
<i>Are these set at the right level?</i> <i>Do they cover the right content for the subject?</i> <i>How could the learning outcomes be improved?</i>

Comment on the content of the subject:
<i>Is there any key content missing that you would expect to see in a subject of this nature?</i> <i>Is there any included content that could be omitted?</i> <i>Is the content clear, sequential, coherent and appropriate for the level?</i>

Comment on the texts and references:
<i>Is the textbook (if specified) appropriate for the level and content of the subject?</i> <i>Are other resources / references current and relevant?</i> <i>Are there any key texts / resources missing?</i>

Comment on the work for assessment:
<i>Do the assessment tasks adequately address the subject learning outcomes?</i> <i>Are these set at the right level?</i> <i>How could the assessment tasks be improved?</i>

This review was completed by:
Insert Name
Insert Academic Position
Insert Institution
Insert Date



# TABOR Internal Moderation & Supervision Process

