



Moderation Policy

Faculty of Education

1 Purpose and Rationale

The purpose of this Faculty policy is to maximise consistency and fairness of assessment decisions and how these are communicated to students. The policy is intended to compliment the University's Assessment Handbook.

Moderation is a quality assurance process where examiners compare judgments about marking to either confirm or adjust them. The process involves collaboration to establish a shared understanding of assessment and grade criteria. The process allows examiners to work towards making judgments about student work that ensure individual examiners are consistent and assessment decisions are comparable within and across courses. Examiners undertake moderation to ensure consistency and comparability of marking standards:

- for assessment within a course
- among courses within a qualification
- among courses within a school programme
- across school programmes within the Faculty

Sound moderation practices:

- establish shared standards among examiners within courses and programmes
- help maintain consistency of standards within the Faculty
- assist in consistency of feedback to students
- support fairness and validity of grades for assessment tasks and courses
- support the evaluation of assessment tasks, marking schedules and grade criteria
- support examiners in self review of marking consistency and judgment
- help create a climate of self review and transparency

Factors that will influence the process include the:

- number of examiners in a course
- experience of examiners
- nature of assessment tasks
- time constraints
- differences in the demands of programmes

2 Organisational Scope

This Faculty policy applies to assessment undertaken in all courses and qualifications offered by the Schools of the Faculty.

3 Definitions

For purposes of this Faculty policy, unless otherwise stated, the following definitions shall apply:

Assessment task	Task students are required to complete that contributes to the final course grade
Grade criteria	Criteria for the achievement of grades A+ to E that are used by all courses in a qualification
Assessment criteria	Criteria specific to each assessment task that are included in the information provided to students about the assessment task requirements
Qualification	Degree, certificate or diploma
Programme	Courses offered by a School
Examiner	Academic staff members with responsibility for assessing student work as per section 6.1A of the Assessment Handbook.
Course Coordinator	The Lecturer with overall responsibility for assessment in a course.

4 Policy Content and Guidelines

4.0 Pre-moderation requirements

Each qualification will have a **guide to grade criteria** so that there is a clearly expressed statement of what is required to achieve each grade level.

Each school will have **processes for record keeping** for moderation of assessment tasks and courses.

For each assessment task, a **set of criteria** will be developed against which the task will be assessed. (These should be made available to the students). Copies of assessment task requirements and criteria should be attached to the course outlines when course outlines are peer reviewed.

Moderation

	What?	When?	Who?	Materials required
4.0	Development of grade criteria	Establishment of programme.	Associate Dean	Current grade criteria.
	Review of grade criteria.	Periodically.		
	Assessment task Criteria	In the development of the assessment task.	Course Coordinator	Criteria for each assessment task.
4.1a	Pre-marking of an assessment	Before each assessment (where there are several examiners)	Examiner / Course Coordinator	Use assessment examples, marking schedule with qualification grade criteria and assessment task criteria.
4.1b	Post-marking of an assessment	After each assessment	Examiner / Course Coordinator	Use assessments being marked, selection to be set by Course Coordinator and include all fail grades.
4.2	Moderation across assessments within a course	At the end of the course	Course Coordinator	Use assessment examples, marking schedule with programme grade criteria and sample of student work. End of course reports.
4.3	Moderation of assessments across courses within a qualification	2 yearly – uneven years	Associate Dean	End of course reports and moderation reports, examples of assessment tasks, sample of student work. Scope to be set by Associate Dean.
4.4	Moderation of assessment across courses within programme	2 yearly - even years	Head of School	End of course reports, moderation reports, examples of assessment tasks, samples of student work. Scope to be set by Heads of School.

4.1 Moderation of a single assessment task in a course

a. Pre-marking:

In courses where there are several examiners for an assessment task, there should be communication among examiners to discuss the criteria for the task (and the marking schedule, if one is being used). At this meeting, it could be helpful to distribute two or three completed assessment tasks that examiners can assess against the criteria. A discussion can then take place about discrepancies in marks and grades allocated to these samples, and differences in interpretation of the criteria or the samples can be discussed and resolved before marking commences.

b. Post-marking:

In courses where there are several examiners there should be communication among examiners after marking is completed to discuss any issues that arose during marking and to compare the grade/mark allocation of examiners.

How many examples are selected and how they are selected will depend on the number of students and examiners and the consistency of agreement in pre-marking moderation. Examples may be selected randomly or each assessor could submit a copy of an assessment task at the A, B and C level for comparison with others. Alternatively, assessment tasks at the cusp of grades may be reviewed. Examiners may also have assessment tasks that they are unsure about grading that they may wish to submit for discussion. In addition, an example of the A+s and **all** fail grades should also be submitted for moderation.

The process may involve blind remarking in which the grade/mark that has been allocated to the assessment task is not disclosed or it may involve confirmatory review in which the mark/grade is disclosed.

During this process, if there are discrepancies among examiners that indicate differing interpretation of the grading and assessment criteria, the course coordinator may need to examine further the allocation of grades by examiners who are at variance with others. This process should be done in consultation with the assessor and some agreement reached about final grades. If no agreement has been reached and the course coordinator considers, based on the moderation exercise with other examiners, that an assessor has allocated grades that are too high or too low, there may be a need to scale the grades to be consistent with other examiners.

In courses where there is only one assessor, the course coordinator (who may be the assessor) needs to ensure that the assessor has undertaken a moderation process with another colleague who should mark a sample of assessment tasks and compare grades and marks with the assessor. In addition, an example of the A+s and **all** fails should be included in the sample. If a discrepancy occurs, the colleagues will need to discuss the reasons and it may be necessary for the assessor to review grades allocated to other assessment tasks.

4.2 Moderation across assessments within a course

Course coordinators should consider a process for moderation of the marking of the different assessment tasks of the course, especially in courses where each assessment task may have different examiners. This process is one that requires judgment on the part of the coordinator and moderators about the comparability of the assessment tasks. As assessment tasks may require different skills (e.g., written essays versus oral presentation) and content, students may not be consistent in their performance, but the moderation process should attempt to determine that the application of the grade criteria to the specific criteria for each assessment task is consistent. This may involve moderators in comparing assessment task requirements, assessment criteria and the grade distribution of each assessment task and tracking the performance of some students.

A two-year cycle of review (4.3/4.4) will ensure that moderation of qualifications and programmes is undertaken.

4.3 Moderation of assessment across courses within a qualification

The purpose of moderation of assessment is to determine that the application of the grade criteria is consistent among courses—an A in Course X is equivalent to an A in Course Y within a qualification. In addition, the process should enable programme directors and course coordinators to ensure that courses within a qualification make similar demands on students (i.e., that assessment tasks are not comparatively too hard or too easy). This process could be undertaken by similar activities to the moderation of assessment tasks within courses: by an examination of the assessment requirements and assessment criteria, grade distribution for assessment tasks within each course, distribution of final course grades, and tracking of some students' assessment results and examination of the moderation processes undertaken in each course. Another process that could be undertaken is to make a comparison of the requirements and criteria for similar assessment tasks that are used in different courses (e.g., literature reviews, oral presentations, written examinations). An analysis of the types and progression of assessment tasks within qualifications could also help to determine that expectations of students are realistic. This analysis could also show that assessment tasks within the qualification develop and support students to undertake increasingly demanding and complex tasks.

In uneven years the Associate Deans will convene internal panels to review assessment practices in the qualifications for which they are responsible. The panel will include the appropriate programme director. As the scope of reviews is potentially wide, the AD should determine a specific focus for the review, (e.g., progression of assessment tasks in courses in the qualification).

The Associate Dean will report back to the Faculty Learning and Teaching committee with results and findings.

4.4 Moderation of assessment across courses within programmes

The purpose of this process is to determine that there is comparability in standards within the programmes. There are obviously differences in demands in undergraduate and postgraduate qualifications, and in 100-level, 200-level and 300-level courses in undergraduate degrees. However, a shared understanding among our programme examiners about grade criteria and standards of student performance assists in ensuring a consistent application of the grade criteria.

In even years Heads of Schools will convene an internal review panel of personnel from within the school to review assessment practices within the school. As the scope of reviews is potentially wide, the HOS should determine a specific focus for the review, (e.g., range of assessment tasks in courses offered by the school).

The Head of School will report back to the Faculty Learning and Teaching committee with results and findings.

5 Appendices

Appendix A: Moderation record sample

Appendix B: Course outline approval form (BA&PG, Teacher Ed)

Appendix C: Grade criteria for qualifications (PG, BA, Grad Dips/ BTeach)

Appendix D: End of Course Report

6 Approval Agency

Academic Committee

Faculty Board

7 Approval Dates

This Faculty policy was originally approved on:	20 October 2010 FoEFAC
	8 February 2011 FoEFB

This version was approved on:	[9 th July 2013]
-------------------------------	-----------------------------

This version takes effect from:	9 th July 2013
---------------------------------	---------------------------

This Faculty policy will be reviewed by:	July 2015
--	-----------

8 Policy Sponsor

Associate Dean (Academic)

9 Contact Person

The following person may be approached on a routine basis in relation to this Faculty policy:

Associate Dean (Academic)

Assignment PRE-Marking Moderation Form

Course Code: _____ Assignment: _____

	Student Name	Initial Grade	Check Grade (moderation)	Moderated Grade (as agreed by moderation team)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

Comments:

Course Coordinator: _____

Moderating Lecturer: _____

Date: _____

Use this form for your Moderation Meeting minutes and return to the Administrator.

Assignment POST–Marking Moderation Form

Course Code: _____ Assignment: _____

	Student name	Initial Grade	Check Grade (moderation)	Moderated Grade (as agreed by moderation team)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				

Comments:

Course Coordinator: _____

Moderating Lecturer: _____

Date: _____

Use this form for your Moderation Meeting minutes and return to the Administrator.

Course Outline Approval Form

Faculty of Education

This form should be completed and submitted with the course outline to the School Office before the commencement of the course to show that it has been checked and verified.

Course Code: EPOL Circle and add number EPSY KURA FEDU Trimester taught: T1 T2 T3 full-year tick

Course Title: _____

Tick to confirm information is provided:

Course Information	Staff	Course Lecturers	Names
Points	Course Coordinator	Comments	
Prerequisite (as per course description)	Names		
Co-requisites / Restrictions	Office		
Points Value	Hours		
Trimester	Phone		
Year	Email		
Dates	School Administrators		
Withdrawal Date	Names		
Prescription (as per course description)	Office		
Image (as per QIB)	Hours		
	Phone		
	Email		

Course Details

Course Details		tick/comment
Course Learning Objectives (CLOs)	Brief statement. (as per course description)	
Links to NZ Teachers Council GTS	Details of how the CLOs relate to NZTC GTS (or deleted if not applicable)	
Course content	Outline of topics and schedule of order.	
Student Learning Experiences	Description of how the course will be taught	
Student Access Time Details	Time and location of lectures, tutorials, studio times etc.	
Expected Workload	Number of hours of work expected per week from a student during the course, with a breakdown according to type of work.	
Assessment requirements	Assessment items for course (as per course description) Clear statement of assessment requirements, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Method of assessment including information about exams • Links between learning objectives and items of assessment • Marking criteria for each assessment task • Weighting for each assessment task • Due dates for each piece of work • Word limits/time lengths of exams/assessment tasks • Details of special requirements • Are the assessments appropriately scheduled during course? 	
Mandatory Course Requirements	Clear statement of any requirements for passing the course other than obtaining an overall pass mark or grade.	
Group Work	Details of any Group activities (or deleted if not applicable)	
Assignment Submission	Details of deadlines and method of submission allowable	
Assignment Cover Sheets	Requirements	
Penalties	Penalties for late submission of work or exceeding word limits.	
Texts, Student Notes and Resources	Key texts, readings or other materials that should be obtained; eg Reading list.	
Practicum Arrangements	Responsibilities for practicum arrangements (or deleted if not applicable)	
Class Representatives	Details of role (or deleted if not applicable)	
Academic Integrity and Plagiarism	Policy details	
Use of Turnitin	Details of expectations of use for this course	
Communication and Additional Information	Methods for conveying additional information or changes to students.	
General Course Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing assignments • Late work and extensions • Reconsideration of Marks • Moderation of Marks and Grades 	
University Processes and Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aegrotats • Assignments in te Reo Maori • Students with Impairments • Student Support • Course Evaluation • Ethics • Referencing • General University Policies and Statues 	

Comments

We confirm that the Outline for the above course meet Faculty requirements.

	Name	Signature
Course Coordinator:		
HoS appointed Scrutineer/Associate Dean:		
Head of School:		

End of Course Report

Course Code: _____ CRN: _____

Trimester: _____ of 201 _____

Course Name: _____

Course Coordinator name: _____

Qualification (eg GradDip, MEd): _____

1. Grade Distribution (Please include numbers for WD and K)

	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	D	E	WD	K
Freq												

2. Attach copies of moderation records for each assessment task, list here:

3. Attach a copy of the C.A.D evaluation report. Tick to confirm:

4. If the grade distribution is unusual, the evaluation unsatisfactory or the moderation is incomplete; please explain why. Outline any intended changes to address these issues for the next time the course is offered.

Signatures

Course Coordinator: _____ Date: _____

Associate Dean: _____ Date: _____

Head of School _____ Date: _____

Grade Descriptions for Faculty of Education **Graduate Diplomas of Teaching and Bachelor of Teaching** courses

GRADE (grade point) (% band)	Label	Grade description (To be interpreted in conjunction with the criteria for the assessment task under consideration)
A+ (9) (85-100%)	Excellent	The work submitted by a student demonstrates a <i>very high standard of performance/professional competence</i> in relation to <u>all</u> the assessment criteria/learning outcomes (A+) or <u>almost all</u> the assessment criteria/learning outcomes (A) for an assessment task. Critical and/or creative thinking is evident through synthesis, evaluation and/or critique that effectively incorporates a range of appropriate sources and/or evidence (readings, classroom observations, experiences, personal reflection etc.) The student demonstrates a thorough understanding of concepts central to the course.
A (8) (80-84%)		
A- (7) (75-79%)	Very Good/ Merit	The work submitted by a student demonstrates a <i>high standard of performance/professional competence</i> in relation to <u>most</u> of the assessment criteria/learning outcomes for an assessment task. Critical and/or creative thinking are evident through synthesis, evaluation and/or critique that effectively incorporate a range of sources and/or evidence (readings, classroom observations, experiences, personal reflection etc.)
B+ (6) (70-74%)		
B (5) (65-69%)	Good/ Competent	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of the assessment criteria/learning outcomes are met to a <i>good standard</i> , <u>some</u> of it may even be at a <i>high standard</i> ,. An element of critical and/or creative thinking is present within the student's work. Professional competence is met at minimal level for all aspects and some met at a higher level.
B- (4) (60-64%)		
C+ (3) (55-59%)	Satisfactory/ Adequate	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of the assessment criteria/learning outcomes are met to an <i>adequate standard</i> . Despite some limitations, there is evidence that indicate that professional competence is met at minimal level for all aspects.
C (2) (50-54%)		
D (1) (40-49%)	Unsatisfactory	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of it is at a <i>satisfactory level</i> in relation to the assessment criteria/learning outcomes but there are major deficiencies or omissions in some aspects of professional competence.
E (0) (0-39%)	Poor	Some or most of the work does not meet the criteria/learning outcomes. The work clearly does not meet the minimal level of professional competence.

Grade descriptions for Faculty of Education **Bachelor of Arts – Education Major** courses.

GRADE (grade point) (% band)	Label	Grade description (To be interpreted in conjunction with the criteria for the assessment task under consideration)
A+ (9) (85-100%)	Excellent	The work submitted by a student demonstrates a <i>very high standard of performance</i> in relation to <u>all</u> the assessment criteria (A+) or <u>almost all</u> the assessment criteria (A) for an assessment task. Note 1: The phrase “a very high standard of performance” cannot be interpreted uniformly across all tasks or for all courses; in some situations it may be indicated by work that significantly exceeds the task brief; in another situation it might be interpreted as work at a “professional level”. Lecturers within the same course should discuss and agree on what might indicate a “very high standard of performance” in relation to student work on the task.
A (8) (80-84%)		
A- (7) (75-79%)	Very Good/ Merit	The work submitted by a student demonstrates a <i>high standard of performance</i> in relation to <u>most</u> of the assessment criteria for an assessment task. There may be one or two weaker aspects in a student’s answer, but overall the work stands up very well to scrutiny in terms of the task criteria. Some of the work may even contain elements that are “excellent” but overall the work is not consistently at this higher level. An A- grade should be awarded to work that overall is closer to “excellence”, and a B+ to work that is further from this higher level. Note 2: Depending on the task and course, a “high standard of performance” might suggest work that exceeds the task brief in one or two significant ways, or with some enhancements could be interpreted as a “professional” standard of work.
B+ (6) (70-74%)		
B (5) (65-69%)	Good/ Competent	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of the criteria are met to a <i>good standard</i> , <u>some</u> of it may even be at a <i>high standard</i> , but there may be several minor deficiencies or even a major deficit or omission that prevents the work from being graded higher. On balance the work suggests that the student has a good, if not complete, understanding of the topic or issues being assessed; in some contexts the work might suggest the notion of “competence”. Overall the work is clearly a pass; it is well clear of being considered borderline in relation to the pass/fail boundary. Work graded as B should lean more towards the “very good/merit” label than work graded as B-.
B- (4) (60-64%)		Note 3: Although significant enhancements would be needed to meet descriptions such as “exceeded the brief”, or “at a professional level”, the student has still demonstrated understanding and skills that are consistent with the assessment criteria; “up to standard without being noteworthy” might be a suitable description of much of the work at this level.
C+ (3) (55-59%)	Satisfactory/ Adequate	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of the criteria are met to an <i>adequate standard</i> , but there are clear deficiencies and one or two major deficiencies or omissions. Some ideas and skills are sufficiently developed, but others are limited or absent; understanding is incomplete in relation to most criteria. Work at this level should be considered “borderline”, more so for work classified as C than C+. However, despite the limitations, there are enough strengths/positives in the work to outweigh the weaknesses/ negatives.
C (2) (50-54%)		Note 4: The work falls a long way short of descriptions such as “exceeds the task brief”, or “at a professional level”.
D (1) (40-49%)	Unsatisfactory	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of it is at an <i>unsatisfactory level</i> in relation to the assessment criteria although the work may be of an acceptable level for one or two of the criteria. There are major deficiencies or omissions, and the work shows little evidence of any development in ideas or skills. While the work has some positive features, the weaknesses outweigh the strengths.
E (0) (0-39%)	Poor	Some or most of the work required to be submitted as part of the task brief is missing or completely ignores the criteria without presenting any useful material to judge against the criteria. The work is a clear failure.

Grade descriptions for Faculty of Education **postgraduate** taught courses

GRADE (grade point) (% band)	Label	Grade description (To be interpreted in conjunction with the criteria for the assessment task under consideration)
A+ (9) (85-100%)	Excellent	The work submitted by a student demonstrates a <i>very high standard of performance</i> in relation to <u>all</u> the assessment criteria (A+) or <u>almost all</u> the assessment criteria (A) for an assessment task. Note 1: The phrase “a very high standard of performance” cannot be interpreted uniformly across all tasks or for all courses; in some situations it may be indicated by work that significantly exceeds the task brief; in another situation, it might be interpreted as work that, apart from minor editorial changes, would be suitable for a conference paper at a national level; in yet another situation it might be interpreted as work at a “professional level”. Lecturers within the same course should discuss and agree on what might indicate a “very high standard of performance” in relation to student work on the task.
A (8) (80-84%)		
A- (7) (75-79%)	Very Good/ Merit	The work submitted by a student demonstrates a <i>high standard of performance</i> in relation to <u>most</u> of the assessment criteria for an assessment task. There may be one or two weaker aspects in a student’s answer, but overall the work stands up very well to scrutiny in terms of the task criteria. Some of the work may even contain elements that are “excellent” but overall the work is not consistently at this higher level. An A- grade should be awarded to work that overall is closer to “excellence”, and a B+ to work that is further from this higher level. Note 2: Depending on the task and course, a “high standard of performance” might suggest work that exceeds the task brief in one or two significant ways, or contains important ideas or content that with some reworking could be converted into a conference paper at a national level, or with some enhancements could be interpreted as a “professional” standard of work.
B+ (6) (70-74%)		
B (5) (65-69%)	Good/ Competent	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of the criteria are met to a <i>good standard</i> , <u>some</u> of it may even be at a <i>high standard</i> , but there may be several minor deficiencies or even a major deficit or omission that prevents the work from being graded higher. On balance the work suggests that the student has a good, if not complete, understanding of the topic or issues being assessed; in some contexts the work might suggest the notion of “competence”. Overall the work is clearly a pass; it is well clear of being considered borderline in relation to the pass/fail boundary. Work graded as B should lean more towards the “very good/merit” label than work graded as B-. Note 3: Although significant enhancements would be needed to meet descriptions such as “exceeded the brief”, “suitable for presentation at a national conference”, or “at a professional level”, the student has still demonstrated understanding and skills that are consistent with the assessment criteria; “up to standard without being noteworthy” might be a suitable description of much of the work at this level.
B- (4) (60-64%)		
C+ (3) (55-59%)	Satisfactory/ Adequate	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of the criteria are met to an <i>adequate standard</i> , but there are clear deficiencies and one or two major deficiencies or omissions. Some ideas and skills are sufficiently developed, but others are limited or absent; understanding is incomplete in relation to most criteria. Work at this level should be considered “borderline”, more so for work classified as C than C+. However, despite the limitations, there are enough strengths/positives in the work to outweigh the weaknesses/ negatives. Note 4: The work falls a long way short of descriptions such as “exceeds the task brief”, “suitable for a conference presentation”, or “at a professional level”. Note 5: In order for a student to progress to thesis research, an overall average grade of B or better must be obtained on the courses undertaken for the Postgraduate Diploma in Education and Professional Development with a B+ grade or better for EPSY 501.
C (2) (50-54%)		
D (1) (40-49%)	Unsatisfactory	The work submitted by a student indicates that <u>most</u> of it is at an <i>unsatisfactory level</i> in relation to the assessment criteria although the work may be of an acceptable level for one or two of the criteria. There are major deficiencies or omissions, and the work shows little evidence of any development in ideas or skills. While the work has some positive features, the weaknesses outweigh the strengths.
E (0) (0-39%)	Poor	Some or most of the work required to be submitted as part of the task brief is missing or completely ignores the criteria without presenting any useful material to judge against the criteria. The work is a clear failure.