



Assessment Validation and Moderation Policy and Procedure

Assessment Validation and Moderation Policy and Procedure

Modification history

Date	Modification	Person responsible
28/11/11	Addition of section to meet CAP conditions	Dr Ian Whyte
29/11/2012	Addition of the Changes to the Policy section approved by Academic Board meeting 29/11/12	Academic Board approval – IW edit
22/2/2018	Major revision to policy to reflect revised processes	Approved by AB 19/3/2018 Dr George Brown edit

Definitions

Threshold Learning Outcomes – Nationally agreed threshold learning outcomes for Tourism, Hospitality and Events for Higher Education Coursework Programs at AQF Level 7 and 9. Current version maintained at <https://sites.google.com/site/tourismandhospitalitystandard/home>

Peer Review Portal – A central location where de-identified assessment tasks may be externally moderated by both Australian and overseas higher education institutions. Current portal location at <https://peerreviewportal.com>

Peer Review of Assessment – A process of assuring expected learning outcomes are informed by national and international comparators. Further information may be found at http://www.utas.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/986118/GUIDELINES-FOR-PEER-REVIEW-OF-ASSESSMENT.pdf

Preamble

Assessment validation and moderation is an integral part of assessment procedures, designed to ensure common interpretations of criteria and standards are established as they relate to student performance, contributing to reliability in assessment grades whilst acknowledging that human judgement is a significant element in the process. The purpose of this policy is to ensure that assessment briefs, assessment tasks and marking rubrics are valid and reliable. Internal and external moderation are critical to assure validity and reliability of assessment practices including the awarding of grades. The validation and moderation process is conducted each semester on a continual basis and improvement actions are recorded.

Policy

Validating and moderating the relevance and consistency of assessment briefs and assessment judgements is critical to ensuring the assessments meet the accredited program Learning Outcomes and nationally agreed Threshold Learning Outcomes. ICHM will validate its assessment strategies by:

- Reviewing, comparing and evaluating the assessment procedures, tools and evidence contributing to judgements made by a range of assessors against assessment pieces, including the information provided in Learner and Lecturer guides, and
- Documenting action taken to improve the quality and consistency of assessment

A minimum of three subjects from each year of the program must undergo assessment validation and moderation in each semester of a year. All ICHM programs must have had all subjects undergo assessment validation and moderation over a two-year period

Validation and moderation methods may include:

- Validation of assessment briefs
- Internal and external moderation of assessment tools and activities
- An assessment review panel
- An independent external validator
- Benchmarking against evidence from other providers of subjects at the same level

Students acknowledge that by agreeing to the enrolment conditions of ICHM, that a sample of their de-identified work may be used for assessment validation and moderation purposes and may be provided to external parties for this purpose. Where any student assessment is sent externally to ICHM, the Director Academic will advise the receiving institution that ICHM is bound by its Privacy Policy and the assessments cannot be used for any other purpose.

Procedure

ICHM's Assessment Validation and Moderation process consists of three main stages – planning, implementing and reporting.

Planning

The ICHM Director Academic in conjunction with Discipline Stream Coordinators will develop a two-year Assessment Validation and Moderation Review Plan (AVMRP) to determine subjects chosen, the type(s) of validation and moderation methods and frequency of the assessment validation and moderation meetings. This plan may include the use of the Peer Review Portal and any other external benchmarking resources available

The AVMRP will be published and available to all Lecturing staff, outlining the timing of assessment reviews and the dates of the Academic Committee (AC) meetings where results of validation and moderations are to be presented for discussion.

Implementation

ICHM's Validation and Moderation process is implemented via two main stages:

- **Pre-assessment – Validation of assessment tools**
 - Validation of Assessment Briefs for all subjects* by the Discipline Coordinators. This process includes verifying the following:
 - Assessment methods and tasks ensure coverage of all subject and threshold learning outcomes
 - Graduate qualities are mapped appropriately

- Timing of assessment in accordance with Assessment Grid
 - Assessment methods and tasks are consistent and gather sufficient evidence
 - Assessment tasks have clear instructions for both the assessor and students
 - Assessment methods and tasks meet the requirements of ICHM Assessment Principles
 - Marking criteria and rubrics meet the subject and threshold learning outcome requirements
- Validation of all Final Examinations by a peer academic. This process includes verifying the following:
 - Validity of questions posed
 - Correct weighting applied
 - Appropriate variety of questioning techniques used
 - Content being assessed links to subject and threshold learning outcomes

**Where, at the Discipline Stream Coordinators discretion, it is deemed that the Assessment Brief has met ICHM requirements for two consecutive semesters, then specific Assessment Briefs may be exempt from systematic review. To ensure maintenance of standards, a random assessment will occur in future semesters.*

- **Post Assessment – Moderation of assessment outcomes**

Once assessments have been marked by the respective Lecturer, three post assessment marking activities are undertaken each semester:

Review of individual assessment points

Prior to the publication of individual assessment points, Lecturers are required to provide the Director Academic with a de-identified graph of the spread of results for each assessment item. Where the results appear to be incongruent with prior and/ or expected trends, the Director Academic will consult with the individual Lecturer to review their interpretation of the marking criteria for the assessment item. If, in the opinion of the Director Academic, the results need further review, then the Director Academic will convene an Academic Committee Meeting.

Review of end of semester provisional results

Immediately following the finalisation of all provisional results for each semester, and prior to review and approval of results by the Academic Committee, the Director Academic (in conjunction with the Discipline Stream Coordinators) will review the provisional results for all subjects. This review will:

- Assess the spread of results, comparing prior semester results, and identify any trends that appear to be incongruent with prior and/ or expected trends
- Consider feedback from the Lecturer provided in the End of Semester Course Report

Where any results appear to be incongruent with prior and/ or expected trends then a report will be prepared by the Director Academic and provided to the Academic Committee for its consideration. The report will contain:

- examples of assessment processes and tools used
- feedback on assessments gained through individual debriefs of Lecturers and students
- samples of graded assessments
- copies of reports from the Peer Review Portal (where applicable)

The Academic Committee will assess this report and determine if further investigation is required.

Scheduled post assessment moderation

In accordance with the AVMRP, a series of post assessment moderation activities will be undertaken to randomly verify the rigour of assessment processes undertaken during a given semester of study. Several scheduled activities are undertaken, and include (but are not limited to) the following:

- Moderation at the margins – Final results centred around the specific mark levels (eg. 50%, 55%, 65% etc). A representative sample of assessments around these marks are reviewed for the appropriateness of the given mark and, therefore, the final grade.
- Multiple markers in the same subject - The distribution of the marks awarded by the various markers is assessed (and if there are multiple questions, then for each question) to ascertain if there are markers who might lie outside of the average or a general trend.

Note, where multiple markers are utilised within a subject, the markers are required to meet on a regular basis during the semester with the purpose of calibrating and moderation assessment outcomes

- Random sampling - An entire subject is chosen, and a sufficient number of randomly chosen assessments is selected to meet the particular confidence level.
- Use of the Peer Review Portal, to ensure external national and international comparators are obtained using the aforementioned moderation methods

Where the Discipline Stream Coordinators identify any situation where post assessment outcomes have the potential to adversely impact the grade distribution in any subject then they may request the Director Academic to invoke a moderation process. Details of the moderation process are to be developed by the Director Academic and presented to the Academic Committee for approval

Reporting

A summary of the assessment validation and moderation activities conducted in accordance with the AVMRP is provided in the AVMRP Report by the Director Academic. Improvement activities are documented in a central register along with the assigned activities to specific people or groups of people and indicates required completion dates. The AVMRP is provided to the Academic Committee, with a summary report provided by the Director Academic to the Academic Board.

Changes to the Policy

The Academic Board must approve any change to this Assessment Validation and Moderation Policy and Procedure.