Assessment Procedure

Definitions of 'Moderation'

Moderation is a quality assurance process that is used to ensure assessment judgements are made with consistency.

The national Vocational Education and Training (VET) regulator, the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA) defines moderation as:

"… a quality control process aimed at bringing assessment judgements into alignment. Moderation is generally conducted before the finalisation of student results as it ensures the same decisions are applied to all assessment results within the same unit of competency".

Moderation versus Validation

Although validation is also a quality assurance process, it differs from moderation in two main ways:

1. **Timing**

   Validation is an ongoing process of reviewing Greenwich Management College's assessment practices. It can occur before, during and after assessment. Moderation is about the consistency of assessment judgement and should be conducted after assessment has been completed by a student but before the assessment decision is handed down to the student

2. **Standards for RTOs 2015**

   This legislation mandates systematic validation of assessment judgements but does not require an RTO to conduct moderation as an activity to comply with the Standards, however Greenwich Management College conducts moderation on a regular basis.

What would Moderation typically look like?

Given that the purpose of moderation is about confirming the consistency of assessment judgements, a typical moderation session should include the assessors who have marked the assessment tasks in question. This is conducted at the end of each term. As this is a quality assurance process, appropriate records are kept.

Moderation Form Template		
Moderation assessor names		
Participant qualifications		
Date of moderation		
Unit(s) of competency		
Unit(s) code(s)		
As part of qualification		
Qualification code	**AQF level**	
Evidence reviewed in moderation exercise	*List what was reviewed. E.g. knowledge questions, skills observation reports, portfolio, verification reports, case study responses etc.*	
Support documents used in moderation session	*List support documents e.g. unit of competency, assessment tool, assessment instructions, benchmarking documents/answer key etc.*	
Student identification(s)	*List identifiers e.g. student ID # for the assessment evidence under moderation*	

Agreed outcomes required from assessment task(s)

Make a note of what it is the moderating assessors expect to see as an outcome from the assessment task(s). Assessment should be designed to provide outcomes that are relevant to the workplace and industry. Here is space for a consensus to be noted on what 'assessment should look like'. This will help with the moderation process as it provides a benchmark within the group to determine if marking decisions are consistent with what is expected to be seen from the assessment evidence.

Questions related to the overall evidence being moderated	Yes	No
Directly related to the unit(s) of competency being assessed?		
Consistent with what the unit(s) of competency require?		
Based on the knowledge evidence and performance evidence required for the unit(s) of competency?		
Appropriate for the AQF level of the qualification in which the unit(s) sit?		
Appropriate for the AQF level of the qualification in which the unit(s) sit?		
Fully completed?		
Correct in its content?		
Recent enough to show currency?		
Taken from more than one source?		
Supporting the final unit of competency decision?		
Displaying the agreed outcomes required from the assessment task(s)?		

Questions related to the knowledge evidence being moderated	Yes	No
Knowledge answers have all been fully completed by the student?		
Assessor has made a mark for each answer to show their evaluation of the student response?		
Feedback has been written for the student about the knowledge component of their assessment?		
This component of the evidence is at the appropriate AQF level?		

Questions related to the knowledge evidence being moderated	Yes	No
Any checklists contain sufficient detail to understand skill(s) being observed?		
Assessor has made a mark against each criteria to show their evaluation of the student performance?		
Feedback has been written for the student about the skills component of their assessment?		
This component of the evidence is at the appropriate AQF level?		

Questions related to the portfolio evidence being moderated	Yes	No
Portfolio evidence is genuine evidence confirming the student's ability?		
Assessor has made a mark for each portfolio piece to show their evaluation of the student submission?		
Feedback has been written for the student about the portfolio component of their assessment?		
This component of the evidence is at the appropriate AQF level?		

Questions related to the verification evidence being moderated	Yes	No
Verification report has been fully completed about the student?		
Verifier has noted the student's name on their report to confirm the information is about the student?		
Details about the verifier are recorded? i.e. Who they are		
Details about the verifier are credible? i.e. they are in a relevant position to verify student skills		

Administrative components of the assessment documentation	Yes	No
Student declaration has been signed and dated by the student ("this is my own work")		
Student has acknowledged they are ready to begin assessment, including acknowledging they understand requirements		
Student request for special consideration (if any) has been noted		
Assessor has entered their name, contact details etc. on the assessment documentation		
Evidence types submitted have been correctly recorded by the assessor		
Final unit(s) of competency decision has been selected		
If required, clear instructions are ready for the student regarding resubmission		

Moderation Decision

The evidence judgements and unit decision are accepting as meeting the unit(s) requirements and AQF qualification requirements

Yes   **No**

Suggestions for improvement

Comments regarding this moderation activity