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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderation of assessment | ‘Quality assurance processes and activities such as peer review that aim to assure: consistency or comparability, appropriateness, and fairness of assessment judgments; and the validity and reliability of assessment tasks, criteria and standards.’ *Notre Dame, Policy: Assessment in Coursework Units*  |
| **Moderation** (of assessment) – ‘the process of establishing comparability of standards, reached through consensus, between assessors to ensure the validity, reliability and practicality of assessment and consistency of grading.’*https://www.flinders.edu.au/flinders/ppmanual/student/assessment-policy.cfm* |
| Consensus moderation | ‘Consensus moderation is commonly used for extended complex assessment responses when course enrolments are large, and when a course is taught on different campuses or in different modes.’ … Qualitative judgements about these works are not reducible to rules that non-experts can apply (Sadler, 1989). Consensus moderation starts with a sample of student responses drawn from the course pool. Working independently, all assessors mark all responses in the sample. For each, they record their provisional judgement and their reasons for it. Markers then convene as a group, individually present their decisions and rationales, and deliberate them until consensus is reached. Abercrombie’s (1969) research demonstrated the advantage of markers recording provisional marks and reasons prior to discussion over simply forming general impressions about individual works. Creating physical records formalises commitment to the decisions so that they can function as concrete data for reaching consensus on marking. Formalisation also has a positive influence on group dynamics, making it less likely for one assessor to dominate discussion. After discussion, assessors mark their allocated batches’ (Sadler, 2013, pp. 7 - 8)[[1]](#footnote-1). |
| Standard: | ‘A definite degree of academic achievement established by authority, custom, or consensus and used as a fixed reference point for reporting a student’s level of attainment’ (Sadler, 2013, p. 13) |
| Calibration | ‘Whereas moderation is relevant for a single assessment task is repeated for subsequent tasks, the ultimate objective is the development of “calibrated” academics … Through engagement with certain calibration procedures, assessors become able to tune their judgement-making ability. Professionally calibrated assessors would accept responsibility for grading against agreed achievement standards, participate in periodic (but not continuous) checking and recalibration, perform the bulk of the decision-making independently, and consistently produce grades with the desired properties without the need for third-party confirmation or adjustment’ (Sadler, 2013, pp. 17 -18). Therefore calibration is the process that occurs before marking takes place, it could be part of pre-moderation processes. |
| Benchmarking | ‘A structured, collaborative, learning process for comparing practices, processes or performance outcomes. Its purpose is to identify comparative strengths and weaknesses, as a basis for developing improvements in academic quality. Benchmarking can also be defined as a quality process to evaluate performance by comparing institutional practices to sector good practice.’ *TEQSA Guidance Note benchmarking http:/www.teqsa.gove.au/sites/default/files/bemchmarkingGNFinal\_0.pdf* |
| External referencing | ‘External referencing means a process through which a higher education provider compares an aspect of its operations with an external comparator(s) e.g. comparing the design of a course of study and/or student achievement of learning outcomes with that of a course from another provider’. *http://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/GuidanceNote\_ExternalReferencing2.1.pdf* |
| Peer review | Peer review refers to a summative process generally conducted against specified standards that have the capacity to illuminate high quality examples of best practice. Increasingly such reviewers are experts ‘with qualifications and standing in the higher education sector who are capable of assessing the worth and value of teaching resources and similar artefacts’ (Philip, Lefoe, O'Reilly and Parrish, 2008, p. 766).[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| Peer | A person considered to be on a similar level or an industry partner with similar level of knowledge and expertise |
| Peer feedback | A voluntary formative and confidential process negotiated between peers for the purpose of generating critical reflection on educational practice to improve student learning an develop staff capacity. The voluntary formative process of *peer feedback* negotiated between peers for the purpose of generating critical reflection on teaching practice and exploration of innovation.  |
| Content expert | A person with knowledge and skills in a discipline or cognate discipline area. |
| Pedagogical expert | A person with expertise in higher education pedagogy |
| **Rubric** | A grading matrix/table detailing the assessment criteria for an assessment exercise and the required performance standards against each criterion to achieve a particular grade. |
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