ASSESSMENT AND MODERATION PROCEDURE

1.0 PURPOSE

This document articulates the processes for implementing the CG Spectrum Institute (CGSI) *Assessment and Moderation Policy.* It is designed to ensure that staff and students have a clear, explicit and shared understanding of how the principles outlined in the Assessment and Moderation Policy are applied across all CGSI assessment and moderation processes.

2.0 SCOPE

The procedure applies to all assessment and moderation processes and practices conducted as part of CGSI's accredited higher education courses.

3.0 DEFINITIONS

Academic Integrity means upholding high ethical standards of academic conduct. It requires honesty and transparency in the use of information, respect for the knowledge and work of others, responsibility to classmates and colleagues and fairness in the presentation of ideas (visually, verbally or in writing). Academic integrity is a shared responsibility between students and staff.

Formative Assessment is designed to promote, enhance and improve the quality of student learning by providing feedback relevant to subject learning outcomes. Formative assessment is ongoing and can be formal or informal. It measures progress rather than attainment.

Methods of Assessment refers to the diversity of assessment formats employed within a subject in order to assess the identified SLOs. Methods of assessment may include written assignments, quizzes, multimodal presentations, scenario-based roleplays, group tasks, reflections, examinations and/or project-based tasks.

Moderation refers to a process for ensuring that decisions relating to the assessing of students' achievement in a particular task and within a given subject are consistent, fair, valid and comparable between and across student cohorts. Consensus moderation is a process whereby academic teaching staff collaborate to reach general

agreement about what constitutes quality assessment from design through to implementation, marking, feedback and task evaluation.

Summative Assessment is designed to assess students' achievement against the Subject Learning Outcomes (SLOs) using specified criteria that align with the SLOs. Each summative assessment item contributes towards the final grade awarded.

4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

The **Academic Board** is delegated responsibility by the Board of Directors for the academic governance and leadership of CGSI, and is responsible for monitoring the implementation of this procedure.

The **Learning and Teaching Committee** is responsible for the on-going monitoring of quality assurance processes for learning and teaching. It also has oversight of the assessment process and the assurance of academic integrity. The Learning and Teaching Committee reports at the end of each semester/trimester to the Academic Board on the outcomes of moderation processes and approves student results prior to release.

The **Assessment Committee** is responsible for confirming grades and recommending student results for approval by the Learning and Teaching Committee prior to their release. The Assessment Committee also reports the findings resulting from the moderation process to the Academic Board via the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The **Executive Dean** is responsible for the implementation of this procedure in accordance with the principles detailed in the *Assessment and Moderation Policy.*

The **Dean Learning and Teaching** in collaboration with the Learning and Teaching Committee and Faculty Deans/Course Directors, is responsible for supporting the Executive Dean in the implementation of this procedure in accordance with the principles detailed in the *Assessment and Moderation Policy.*

The **Faculty Dean/Course Director** ensures consistency of teaching and assessment processes and procedures within and across subjects and that moderation processes are conducted in accordance with the *Staff Assessment and Moderation Policy*. They are responsible for presenting results to the Assessment Committee with a

recommendation for the final grade for each student in each subject of study in a course.

Academic teaching staff are responsible for consistently and effectively assessing students' responses against the stated assessment criteria. They ensure that all relevant resources required to adequately prepare students for their assessment tasks and for the conduct of assessments are made available to them. This includes ensuring that students 'at-risk' are identified and supported as outlined in the Student at Risk Policy. They are also required to participate in a process of consensus moderation.

5.0 PROCEDURES

5.1 Designing and Re-designing Assessment Tasks

These procedures relate to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 2b, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10

All subjects must provide opportunities for students to engage in formative and summative assessment tasks. When designing summative assessment tasks, subject coordinators are supported by the Course Director and Dean Learning and Teaching. The following guidelines are to be used:

- When a subject has three or more assessment tasks, the first task will be weighted more lightly (e.g. 20%). It should be strategically timed to be completed between weeks 3-6 of the trimester / semester in order to identify students 'at risk' and to ensure students and tutors/mentors are well placed to address potential learning issues before the mid-way teaching point of a subject. This timing will also enable students who might be late enrolments to complete all assessments.
- There is a range and balance of task types across subjects and courses including, but not limited to, written assignments, group work, multimodal presentations, scenario-based roleplays, examinations, and/or practical and authentic assessments.
- All tasks are reviewed and updated annually to ensure they remain relevant, responsive and sufficiently robust.
- Summative assessment tasks are detailed within the subject outlines and easily located on the LMS.
- A standardised template is used for task development to ensure consistency of layout and clarity of task design (see Appendix A).

- Subject Outlines will include assessment task descriptions, conditions, weighting and criteria. These will be made available to students on the Learning Management System (LMS) at the commencement of each trimester/semester
- Within undergraduate courses the ideal minimum number of summative assessment tasks is three per subject, while in post-graduate courses, two summative tasks may be sufficient.
- A rubric describing the standards associated with criterion for each assessment item (with the exception of quizzes and multiple choice exams) will be included in the subject outline and published prior to the commencement of each study period (semester/trimester).
- Assessment weightings take account of the following:

   - No assessment item will be weighted greater than 50%, unless specifically approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee.
   - The maximum percentage of the overall assessment profile assigned to a group task can be no greater than 40%.
   - Where the weighting for a group task exceeds the 40% maximum, an individual assessment component with associated criteria of at least 10% is required.

- As part of the process of moderation, assessments will be continuously reviewed, updated and where necessary, redesigned. Any changes to task type, weighting or criteria must be approved by the Course Director with oversight from the Dean Learning and Teaching.

5.1.1 Reasonable Adjustments

This procedure relates to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 3, 5, 7, and 12)

To ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their achievement through the assessment process, with no group or individual disadvantaged, assessment task requirements and/or assessment timing and conditions can be adjusted. In all cases however, these adjustments must not impact on the alignment of the assessment with the relevant AQF level standards or Subject Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

5.1.2 Promoting Academic Integrity

These procedures relate to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 1a, 2b and 4

- Tasks should be designed with due consideration given to how they may be tailored in ways that mitigate issues associated with academic integrity and misconduct. This includes attention to ways of ameliorating issues associated with AI text generating technologies. Some suggestions for addressing issues associated with student authorship include, but are not limited to, the use of:

    - iterative tasks requiring ongoing feedback loops
    - student reflections
    - increased use of real-time, multimodal and/or oral responses, e.g. roleplays, 'how to' videos, pitches
    - analyses of multimodal documents/sources as a component of a task
    - the linking of tasks to highly nuanced and specific tutorial content and/or contexts
    - acknowledgement on task cover sheets of the use of text/image generating technologies (e.g. chatGPT)

- While the level of knowledge and skills required by a task should always align with specific SLOs for the subject, it is recommended that its subject matter, client brief and/or topic under investigation be regularly updated. This, alongside the scaffolding of assessments to include drafting and ideation processes, the inclusion of reflections, regular internal check-in points, the iterative nature of many of the tasks developed by CGSI's courses and use of electronic text-matching software at point of submission, all work to limit issues associated with academic misconduct and academic integrity.

- Within the Institute some courses include non-proctored exams, e.g. take-home, practical, online tests and quizzes. These assessments require students to maintain the Institute's academic integrity standards as outlined in the *Academic Integrity Policy* and *Academic Integrity Procedure*.

5.2 Student Assessment Submission Processes

These procedures relate to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 3, 5, 10 and 11.

Students are required to submit assessment items and/or presentations as per the instructions included in the Subject Outline including location, time and date. In the case of in-class presentations, students must be ready to present according to the agreed schedule.

5.2.1 Late submission

Assessment items submitted after the due date will be accountable to a penalty as stipulated in the subject outline (which in most subjects will be 10% of the recorded student mark for each 24 hour period the assessment task is overdue following the submission deadline), unless an extension has been approved following consideration by the Subject Coordinator of equity and individual circumstances. All extensions must be approved by the Subject Coordinator prior to the due date and must be accompanied by relevant documentation, including where none is available, a completed statutory declaration.

5.2.2 Special consideration

- Students whose ability to submit or complete an assessment task/s is affected by sickness or other circumstances beyond their control, may be eligible for special consideration.
- No consideration will be given when the condition or event is unrelated to the student's performance in the assessment task.
- Students seeking special consideration will need to notify the relevant Subject Coordinator in writing as soon as is practicable and, preferably, prior to the due date of the assessment task or exam.
- The student will be advised in writing of the final decision regarding the application for special consideration within ten (10) working days.

5.3 Marking and Feedback

These procedures relate to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 1b, 1c, 1e, 3, 10, 14, 15 and 17.

- Clear, accurate, consistent and timely information relating to assessment tasks and their associated criteria is essential. This information must be available to all students at the beginning of each teaching period and included within approved Subject Outlines.
- Rubrics describing the standards associated with each criterion are used to support decision making and achieve consistency of judgement in all assessment

tasks (with the exception of quizzes and exams). These rubrics will be included in the Subject Outline and/or published on the LMS site prior to the commencement of each study period.

- With the exception of quizzes and exams, the marking of student work will involve evaluation of their individual performance with reference to the criteria outlined in the Subject Outline and the standards included in the published rubrics.
- All students will be given constructive and appropriate feedback on assessment tasks within ten (10) working days of the submission date. This timeline applies to tasks weighted at less than 50% as the marking of tasks attracting a higher weighting may take longer to mark.
- All assessment materials, including completed rubrics and other forms of feedback, will be made available to students (with the exception of examination scripts and quizzes).

5.3.1 Academic recovery

- At CGSI, academic recovery procedures such as resubmission and supplementary assessment are available in each subject. They are designed to support student success and wellbeing.
- Where a student marginally fails a subject (i.e. has achieved a score of 45-49%) the student will be offered the option of completing additional assessable work (a supplementary task) which, if completed to the required standard, will result in the student passing the subject.
- Should a student achieve a subject result below 45% in their FINAL trimester of study prior to graduation, academic recovery procedures MAY also be available (subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean in consultation with the Dean Learning and Teaching and/or the Executive Dean).
- Opportunities for academic recovery and their associated processes are articulated in Subject Outlines.
- Upon the successful completion of the required supplementary assessment, students will receive an overall subject result that is no higher than a Pass/Non Graded Pass (depending on the subject grading approach).
- If the student does not take up the opportunity to complete additional assessment work, the grade will resolve to a Fail /Non-Graded Fail.
- Prior to the marking of any supplementary assessment, a temporary grade of Supplementary Pending (SUP) will be awarded.
- All SUP grades shall be finalised before week five of the next semester/trimester session or the grade will resolve to a Fail/Non-Graded Fail.

5.4 Moderation

These procedures relate to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 1e, 2a, 2b, 3, 14 and 16.

CGSI uses a process of consensus moderation to further ensure consistency of judgement across and between student cohorts and subjects. Consensus moderation progresses as follows:

- Early in the teaching trimester/semester, the Faculty Dean/Course Director and teaching staff collaborate to interrogate tasks and reach agreement relating to task expectations of students;
- Prior to the marking of student submissions, the Faculty Dean/Course Director leads a process of collaborative marking with teaching staff. Within this process sample assessment responses are marked by all members of the team in order to reach consensus and clarify expectations about specific criteria and standards. Once marking has been completed, a selection of student responses are double marked using the moderation templates in Appendices B and C to evaluate the application of assessment criteria.
- Student work that has been awarded a fail grade must be double marked.
- Recommendations for changes to assessment practices arising from moderation will be documented and discussed by academic teaching staff within Faculty meetings.
- Recommendations for students' results will be presented to the Assessment Committee for confirmation, together with a report detailing the outcomes of moderation. Points to be considered by the committee include cut-offs, borderline results, and any significant clustering of grades.
- The moderation process is to be used to inform a cycle of continual assessment review and renewal. In addition, this cycle will be informed by benchmarking of assessment tasks from relevant universities and higher education institutes offering similar courses.

  Note: Within the final trimester/semester of a student's degree, assessment decisions which may impact progression or graduation must not depend on judgements made by a single marker.

5.5 Grading

These procedures relate to the following CGSI Assessment and Moderation Policy Principles: 1a, 1d, 3, 13 and 18.

5.5.1 Students' overall performance in each subject shall be graded in accordance with the following guidelines:

High Distinction (7) (HD) Mark range is typically 85% and above	*Broad and comprehensive understanding of the technical and theoretical knowledge and concepts required by the subject; evidence of application of relevant cognitive, technical and communication skills to an outstanding level including interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative. Overall, substantial evidence provided of achievement of all subject learning outcomes.*
Distinction (6) (D) Mark range is typically 75-84%	*Very high level of understanding of the technical and theoretical knowledge and concepts required by the subject; evidence of application of relevant cognitive, technical and communication skills to a very high level including interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative. Overall a mostly comprehensive achievement of all subject learning outcomes.*
Credit (5) (C) Mark range is typically 65-74%	*High level of understanding of the technical and theoretical knowledge and concepts required by the subject; evidence of application of relevant cognitive, technical and communication skills to a high level including interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative. Overall, competence is demonstrated in relation to all subject learning, with a high standard demonstrated for most.*
Pass (4) (P) Mark range is typically 50-64%	*Adequate understanding of most of the technical and theoretical knowledge and concepts required by the subject; evidence of a basic application of relevant cognitive, technical and communication skills including interpretive and analytical ability. Overall, there is sufficient evidence of competence in achieving all subject learning outcomes.*
Non-graded Pass (NGP)	*Successful completion of a subject assessed on a pass/fail basis, indicating satisfactory understanding of subject content; satisfactory development of relevant skills; satisfactory interpretive and analytical ability and achievement in all major objectives of the subject.*
Fail (3) (F) Mark range is typically between 45% and 49%	*Students whose overall results fall between 45% and 49% have come close to demonstrating satisfactory understanding of subject content; developed most relevant skills; provided evidence of interpretive and analytical ability and have achieved most objectives of the subject. All students in this range will be offered academic recovery opportunities as per the Subject Outline. If they are successful in completing these, the highest result possible for the subject overall will be limited to a pass (4).*

Fail (2) (F) Mark range is typically lower than 44 %	*Inadequate understanding of the basic subject content; failure to develop relevant skills; insufficient evidence of interpretive and analytical ability; and failure to achieve some or all major and minor objectives of the subject.*
No Assessment Submitted - Fail (1) (F)	*Did not submit any assessment.*
Non-graded Fail (NGF)	*Unsuccessful completion of a subject assessed on a pass/fail basis, indicating unsatisfactory understanding of subject content; unsatisfactory development of relevant skills; unsatisfactory interpretive and analytical ability and/or achievement of subject objectives.*
Supplementary Pending (SUP)	*A final grade is yet to be awarded for the subject. This is a temporary grade only and must be finalised before week five of the following semester/trimester.*
Withdraw with Failure (WF)	*Cancelled enrolment in the subject after the final date for withdrawal without academic penalty.*
Withdraw Without Failure (AW)	*Cancelled enrolment in the subject before the final date for withdrawal without academic penalty. This grade may also be awarded to students who withdraw from a subject after the withdrawal date under special or compassionate circumstances. In these cases, the grade is awarded at the discretion of the Teaching and Learning Committee.* *A subject with the grade of AW does not appear on a student's academic transcript.*
Administrative Withdrawal (ADW)	*An enrolled student who has not attended any classes or communicated with CGSI regarding his/ her absence by the conclusion of week 6 of the session will be administratively withdrawn from the course by CGSI.*
Advanced Standing (AS)	*Credit has been granted for the subject following an application for Advanced Standing.*
Attend only (ATT)	*Classes were attended without intention to submit assignments.* *An enrolled student attended classes for the subject without intending to submit assessments. A subject with the grade of ATT does not contribute to meeting course requirements.*

5.5.2 Rounding of grades

- Individual assessment results shall be rounded to one decimal place.
- Aggregate marks for a subject shall be rounded to a whole number.

5.5.3 Confirmation of grades

- An Assessment Committee meeting will be held at the conclusion of each trimester/semester. As per the Governance Charter, its membership will include representation from each CGSI Faculty.
- The Committee will be chaired by the Dean Learning and Teaching.
- The recommendations of the Assessment Committee shall be presented to the Learning and Teaching Committee for approval then signed off by the Academic Board.

5.5.4 Review of grades

- Students may request a review of assessment results or overall grades awarded, but these requests must be supported by a statement indicating the specific nature of their concern/s and the particular criterion/criteria to which these concerns relate.
- These statements must be sent to the Subject Coordinator and copied to the marker (where this is a different person).
- Requests must be lodged with the relevant Subject Coordinator within five (5) working days of formal notification of the assessment result.
- Any changes resulting from this review process must be approved by the Course Coordinator.

5.5.5 Grounds for review of grades

A student may request a review of a grade and/or result on an individual assessment task on the grounds that:
- the student believes an error has occurred in the calculation of the mark;
- the student contends that their grade/result is inconsistent with the published assessment requirements or assessment criteria.

The following reasons are **not** appropriate grounds for requesting a review:

- close proximity of the result to another level of grade;
- a comparison with the performance of another student or students;
- the student's belief that the result is not commensurate with effort;

- financial difficulties experienced by the student;
- that the result will affect the employment prospects of the student.

Students should note that each review is determined on its own merits without reference to other applications.

The Course Coordinator will respond to the request for a review of a grade in writing within ten (10) working days and may confirm or vary the original decision. All decisions relating to review of grades are sent to the Dean Learning and Teaching who will compile an annual report for review by the Learning and Teaching and Committee.

5.5.6 Record of results

All grades, including grades for repeated subjects, with the exception of AW, will appear on the student's Record of Results. AW grades will not appear on the student's Record of Results. The student's Record of Results will include the approved grade for each subject.

5.5.7 Appeals

A student may appeal against a decision made under this policy. Appeals must be made as outlined in the Grievance Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.

RELATED
Assessment and Moderation Policy
Quality Assurance Framework
Course Design Development and Approval Policy
Course Design Development and Approval Procedure
Course Evaluation and Review Policy
Course Evaluation and Review Procedure
Benchmarking Policy
Benchmarking Procedure
Students at Risk Policy
Students at Risk Procedure
Student Progression Exclusion and Graduation Policy
Student Progression Exclusion and Graduation Procedure

Version Control

Document:	Assessment and Moderation Procedure	
Approved by:	Academic Board & Governing Board	**Date: March 2023** **Next Review: March 2026**
Version: 5.1	Minor change to procedure only to enhance academic recovery options for graduating students	This minor change to procedure is alignment with the existing policy and was made by the Executive Dean (May, 2024)
V5.0	Complete revision of procedure	
V4.0	Changes to approvals of grades	
V3.1	Further refinements	

Appendix A: Assessment template

[INSERT SUBJECT CODE] - [INSERT SUBJECT NAME]

Assessment Task #   [Insert #]

Assessment Title: *[INSERT TASK TITLE]*

Assessment Type: [INSERT TYPE]

Length: [INSERT TYPE]

Weighting: [INSERT TYPE]

Due Date: [INSERT SPECIFIC **UTC** DUE DATE]
(Convert UTC to your timezone [here](#))

Subject Learning Outcomes (SLOs) addressed by this assessment task:

- [LIST SLOs]

Context/Rationale

[INSERT A BRIEF CONTEXTUAL STATEMENT OF HOW THE ASSESSMENT RELATES TO THE SUBJECT AND/OR INDUSTRY]

Assessment Task Instructions

[INSERT INSTRUCTIONS]

Assessment Criteria:

- [BRIEFLY INTRODUCE CRITERIA]

Note: The complete Assessment Rubric is included at the end of this document.

Submission Details

Students are required to use the following naming convention when saving their file:

Subject code_Task number_year_Student number_Student first nameStudent last name

For example:

MTW100_2_2023_S4763976_JaneSmith

For written assignments students should use font size 11 with 1.5 line spacing.

Assessment is to be submitted with a completed CGSI cover sheet found here

[INSERT SUBMISSION DETAILS]

Referencing

All sources must be acknowledged using the APA 7th style.

Academic Integrity

Students are reminded of their responsibilities to act with academic integrity. The Academic Integrity Policy can be viewed here.

Student Assessment Policy

Students can view the CGSI Assessment Policy here

Assessment Rubric

Appendix B:

Student Results and Moderation Template for Assessment Committee

This template should be completed by the subject coordinator in conjunction with the marker/s and moderator prior to the relevant Assessment Committee meeting. There are two sections to be completed.

Section A (To be completed by the Subject Coordinator)

Course Name:

Course Director:

Subject Title:

Subject Code:

Trimester and Year of Offer:

Subject Co-ordinator:

Marker/s:

Gradebook							
Subject Name and Code							
Subject Co-ordinator:							
Marker/s:							
Moderator:							
	%	%	%	100%			
Student	**Title**	**Title**	**Title**	**Total**	**Override**	**MARK**	**Recommended GRADE**
Where override column has been used, please provide a statement justifying its use:							

Signature:

Section B (To be completed by the Moderator)

Name of Moderator:

Academic Position:

1. Are the assessments in this subject aligned with the subject
   learning outcomes?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

   Comments:

2. Do the stated criteria and associated standards align with the
   subject learning outcomes?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

   Comments:

3. Are the assessment criteria and standards outlined within the rubrics clear and
specific?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

   Comments:

4. Have the markers in this subject applied the stated marking criteria
   in a fair and consistent way across the sample of assessment
   items?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐

   Comments:

6. Does the feedback provided by the marker/s align with the marks

given?

　　Yes □
　　No □

　　Comments:

7.　Does the feedback provided by the marker/s demonstrate to the
　　student how to improve performance in future assessments?

　　Yes □
　　No □

　　Comments:

8.　Would any students benefit from learning support?

　　Yes □
　　No □

　　If so, provide details:

9.　Please comment on the marks distribution for this subject:

10.　Please provide any other comments/feedback relevant to the assessment
　　within this subject:

Signature: