

Assessment Moderation Policy and Procedure

Table of Contents

Policy Statement 3
1. Policy Principles 3
2. Moderation of Assessment Tasks 3
3. Responsibilities 6
4. Release of Marks 7
5. Records Management 8
6. Integration with Course Review and Continuous Improvement 8
7. Review and Evaluation 8
Version Control 9

Policy Statement	
Purpose	Glencoe Institute of Higher Education ('the Institute') *Assessment Moderation Policy and Procedure* ('the Policy') is designed to ensure consistency, fairness, and quality in the evaluation of student learning outcomes. The Policy will guide the Institute to maintain academic integrity, uphold standards of assessment, and foster a transparent and accountable assessment process.
Scope	This Policy applies to all subjects of study delivered by the Institute and all Institute staff involved in student assessment and the administration of student assessment results.
Definitions	For definitions, please refer to the *Dictionary of Terms.*

1. Policy Principles

a) The Institute aligns with Commonwealth and Western Australian legislation, including the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (HESF 2021)*, *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (TEQSA Act 2011)*, *Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act 2000)*, the *National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code 2018),* and relevant Western Australian laws, to ensure lawful, safe, and accountable practices;

b) The Institute is committed to fostering a culture of continuous improvement by regularly reviewing assessment practices and utilising feedback from moderation activities to enhance the quality and relevance of assessments;

c) The Institute will ensure that its assessment processes, including moderation activities, are transparent, accessible, and clear to all stakeholders;

d) Assessment moderation ensures the validity and reliability of assessments, to accurately measure the achievement of student learning outcomes consistent with academic standards;

e) Moderation promotes quality and consistency in assessment practices and ensures that courses and their subjects comply with the *Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)* and the *HESF*;

f) The Institute supports ongoing professional development by providing staff with targeted training in assessment moderation, academic integrity, constructive alignment, and appropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) detection tools to ensure consistent academic standards;

g) Assessment moderation upholds academic integrity by aligning with internal policies and national standards, ensuring that assessment design mitigates misconduct risks and promotes consistency across subjects and delivery modes.

h) The Institute ensures that both internal and external assessment moderation and validation processes are implemented to confirm the consistency, comparability, and appropriateness of assessment design, marking standards, and learning outcomes in alignment with the *AQF* and the *HESF 2021*.

i) Assessment moderation processes will take into consideration the design and sequencing of assessment tasks, including scaffolded approaches, to ensure that assessment supports progressive learning and the achievement of learning outcomes.

2. Moderation of Assessment Tasks

a) Assessment Setting

The Discipline Coordinator reviews the assessment items of each subject by reviewing the subject outline proposed for that semester prior to release to students, ensuring that:

i. Each assessment item fits within the Institute's assessment guidelines;
ii. Assessment timelines are appropriate, comprehensive, clearly specified, and aligned with the graduate attributes of the Institute;
iii. The description of each assessment includes the details of the assessment, the weighting, word/time limits, format, due date, rubrics or marking criteria etc., and any other factors of significance to that assessment;
iv. The linkage between the specified subject learning outcomes and each assessment is clearly demonstrated in the subject outline;
v. Clear instructions for completion and submission of assessments are given to students;
vi. Assessments are designed to address the subject learning objectives progressively, including through appropriately scaffolded tasks that support the development of knowledge, skills, and application across the course;
vii. Moderation ensures constructive alignment between learning outcomes, assessment tasks, and marking criteria, enabling fair and consistent evaluation at the appropriate *AQF* level.

b) Pre-assessment Moderation

i. All assessment items are moderated prior to use in each semester;
ii. The Discipline Coordinator (or delegate) without the requirement for consultation with the Dean, reviews all assessment items within each major or relevant subject to ensure the quality and consistency of assessment tasks before they are distributed to students;
iii. The Discipline Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that assessment documentation is ready for moderation to allow adequate time for review prior to the availability of *Subject Outlines* to students;
iv. The primary focus of pre-assessment moderation is to provide feedback and suggestions to improve the quality of assessment items;
v. The Discipline Coordinator will undertake a full moderation review of all relevant assessment tasks before the semester begins, ensuring the timely availability of *Subject Outlines* and compliance with internal timelines;
vi. All documents submitted for pre-assessment moderation must include comprehensive assessment descriptions, instructions, requirements, and rubrics for all subjects, ensuring a meticulous review to evaluate their validity, accuracy, and reliability;
vii. Pre-assessment moderation will include verification that assessment tasks align with approved institutional templates and requirements, including examination templates, to ensure consistency, clarity, and comparability across subjects;
viii. A tiered approval process applies to changes arising from pre-assessment moderation:
    a. Minor or routine changes (e.g., rewording of instructions, correction of typographical errors, or changes to due dates) will be approved by the Teaching & Learning Committee and ratified by the Academic Board;
    b. Substantive changes (e.g., changes exceeding 20% of assessment weighting or those affecting intended learning outcomes) will be referred to the Course & Industry Advisory Committee for review prior to Academic Board approval.

ix. All changes resulting from pre-assessment moderation that differ from approved *Subject Outlines* must follow the tiered governance process outlined above, ensuring appropriate approval and Academic Board and Academic Board ratification.

c) Examinations

The Discipline Coordinator, in consultation with the Dean will review the Final Examination question papers prior to the end of term ensuring that:

i. The scope, length, and difficulty of the exam questions are suitable in addressing the learning outcomes and the graduate attributes;
ii. Clear instructions are given to students;
iii. Approved and standardised examination templates are used in accordance with the *Assessment Policy and Procedure* to ensure consistency, clarity, and alignment with learning outcomes;
iv. Consistency in the assessment weightage in line with approved *Subject Outlines*.

d) Post-Assessment Moderation

i. The post-assessment moderation process is aimed to ensure that the assessment results align with the established criteria and standards are equitable, fair, and valid and that grading methods are consistent and reliable;
ii. Marking and grading moderation may include:
    a. Comparison checks for consistency between assessment markers;
    b. Sample review against assessment criteria;
    c. Double or blind marking.
iii. In cases where there are multiple markers, a calibration process will be implemented. This process involves a sample of student work being marked by the team to ensure consistent and fair grading across all markers;
iv. Post-assessment moderation applies to assessment tasks weighted at 15% or more, excluding automatically marked multiple-choice quizzes and low-stakes tasks such as individual tutorial submissions or participation activities. At least 10% of submissions or one per grade band, whichever is greater, should be reviewed;
v. On completion of all assessed items, the Discipline Coordinator will review the results of students to identify:
    a. Large numbers of failures or high distinctions amongst students;
    b. Discrepancies between grades of different student cohorts;
    c. Discrepancies between grades allocated to individual students in successive assessment tasks;
    d. Disproportionate distribution of grades according to historical data;
    e. Borderline grades for eligibility for supplementary assessment or passing the subject.

In addition to quantitative analysis of assessment outcomes, qualitative feedback drawn from student subject evaluations and teaching staff reflection reports will be systematically reviewed. This feedback, particularly regarding the clarity, fairness, and perceived relevance of assessment tasks and feedback will inform recommendations for continuous improvement in assessment design, moderation processes, and the provision of assessment-related guidance to students.

vi. Furthermore, the Institute will actively incorporate insights from teaching staff and external examiners involved in assessment and moderation activities. This collaborative approach ensures comprehensive oversight of assessment quality and supports continuous improvement in line with applicable regulatory standards and recognised best practices in higher education. The reviewed results will then be communicated by the Discipline Coordinator to the Institute's Lecturers through an end-of-teaching period exam meeting;

vii. Validation will be undertaken annually, and on a risk basis where required, to review the appropriateness of assessment design, the consistency of marking standards, the alignment of assessment outcomes with subject and course learning outcomes, and the comparability of academic standards across markers, cohorts, delivery modes and campuses, where applicable.

viii. Validation must include documented internal and external referencing activities, which may include peer review, benchmarking with comparable higher education providers, review of marked samples across grade bands, and analysis of student performance trends. The Discipline Coordinator is 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 & Learning Committee for approval;

ix. The outcomes of the review must be documented and presented to the Teaching & Learning Committee. Any recommendations for adjustments to grades must be documented to ensure transparency and consistency;

x. The following approval workflow mirrors the process outlined under *Pre-Assessment Moderation*, reaffirming governance requirements where post-assessment adjustments are proposed for future delivery:
   a. Minor or routine changes (e.g., clarification of task wording or instructions) will be approved by the Teaching & Learning Committee and ratified by the Academic Board;
   b. Substantive changes (e.g., those exceeding 20% of assessment weighting or altering intended learning outcomes) must be reviewed by the Course & Industry Advisory Committee prior to Academic Board approval.

3. Responsibilities

a) Internal Moderation Procedure

Internal moderators are the Discipline Coordinator and/or other suitably qualified nominees as determined by the Teaching & Learning Committee or Academic Board. The responsibilities of internal moderators are as follows:

i. Reviewing the appropriateness of all assessment items as specified in the subject outlines and recommending improvements;

ii. Moderating or endorsing the marked progressive assessments during the term and recommending improvements;

iii. Reviewing the appropriateness of end-of-term assessment (i.e., final exam) during the term and recommending improvements;

iv. Moderating or endorsing the marked end-of-term assessment after the exam period and recommending improvements;

v. Ensuring all assessment items comply with the *Assessment Policy and Procedure*;

vi. Ensuring that assessment design practices, including the use of standardised templates and scaffolded approaches, are consistently applied in alignment with the *Assessment Policy and Procedure;*
vii. All assessors are required to actively participate in moderation processes, including calibration activities and review of assessment samples, and newly engaged assessors must undertake moderation training and participate in calibration exercises prior to marking student work.

b) External Moderation Procedure

The Dean will nominate a sample of two comparable subjects each year to be submitted for independent external review by no fewer than two external benchmarking partners or nominated external reviewers on a confidential basis for an independent review of the assessment practices. The selected subjects will be from the areas of core, and any major as a statistically representative sample of assessments for each study period. All key assessments (i.e., those weighted 20% or more) of the two selected subjects will be reviewed and moderated to ensure:

i. The assessments are aligned with the subject learning outcomes as specified in the subject outlines;
ii. The scope, length, and difficulty of the assessment questions and content are suitable in addressing the learning outcomes and the graduate attributes;
iii. The assessments are marked in line with marking guides and rubric;
iv. The assessment requirements are clearly articulated.

The Dean reports the results of external moderation to the Teaching & Learning Committee and Academic Board outlining recommendations to improve the assessment practices at the Institute.

External moderation forms part of the Institute's broader quality assurance and benchmarking framework. The Dean may extend the scope and frequency of external moderation beyond the annual review of two subjects in response to significant curriculum changes, accreditation requirements, identified academic risks, or targeted benchmarking initiatives. These additional external reviews help ensure that assessment practices remain robust, aligned with industry and disciplinary standards, and responsive to evolving educational and regulatory expectations.

External validation activities will be undertaken through benchmarking with comparable higher education providers or independent academic experts to ensure alignment with sector standards, academic expectations, and best practices, and to inform continuous improvement of assessment design and academic quality, including through benchmarking exercises.

4. Release of Marks

a) All assessment results will generally be released within two weeks of the published submission due date, except where special circumstances inhibit the release of results within the timeframe;
b) Final subject marks are only published after the grades are reviewed and approved by the Teaching & Learning Committee and ratified by the Academic Board;

c) Final subject grades will be determined by addition of the marks of all assessment tasks in the subject, approved by the Teaching & Learning Committee and the Academic Board;
d) Final results will be released to students via the *Student Management System*;
e) Students retain the right to appeal assessment results and final grades in accordance with the *Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure*.

5. Records Management

The Policy will ensure systematic documentation, storage, and retrieval of information related to assessment moderation activities in accordance with the Institute's *Records Management Policy and Procedure*. This involves maintaining a moderation register that captures key details such as assessment titles, moderation dates, and moderator names. Records are securely stored, with defined retention periods and access controls.

All moderation records are subject to internal and external audits to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements and support continuous improvement.

6. Integration with Course Review and Continuous Improvement

Findings from assessment moderation, including identified trends, anomalies, and areas for improvement, will be systematically integrated into the annual and comprehensive course and subject review processes. This practice aligns with the *HESF 2021*, specifically *Standards 5.3 (Monitoring, Review and Improvement), 5.4 (Delivery with Other Parties)*, and *6.3 (Academic Governance)*. Moderation outcomes will be documented and reported to the Course & Industry Advisory Committee and the Academic Board, contributing to evidence-based decision-making and continuous quality enhancement. These processes ensure that academic offerings remain current, credible, and responsive to industry expectations and the evolving needs of learners.

7. Review and Evaluation

The Institute is committed to identifying areas for improvement during the moderation process to ensure that necessary changes can be made in time for the next offering of the subject. To ensure regulatory compliance, operational currency and continuous improvements, this Policy will be reviewed in accordance with the *Policy Review Schedule*.

This Policy will be reviewed at least every two years, or earlier if required due to changes in legislation, regulatory requirements, technological developments within professional and industry sectors, or institutional priorities, to ensure its ongoing relevance, accuracy, and effectiveness.

Version Control

Version	Date of Approval	Approved By	Related Documents
1.2	15 April 2026	Academic Board	Assessment Policy and Procedure Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure Course Development and Review Policy and Procedure Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure Records Management Policy and Procedure Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure Risk Management Plan Staff Code of Conduct
Benchmarking Institutions			King's Own Institute Victoria University
Policy Owner			Dean
Legislations			Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth) (HESF 2021) Australian Qualifications Framework (Cth) (AQF) Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth) (TEQSA Act) Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cth) (ESOS Act) National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (Cth) (National Code) Equal Opportunity Act 1984 (WA) State Records Act 2000 (WA)
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth)			Standard 1.2; Standard 1.3; Standard 1.4; Standard 1.5; Standard 3.1; Standard 4.2; Standard 5.1; Standard 5.2; Standard 5.3; Standard 5.4; Standard 6.3; Standard 7.2.