

Document Name and Version	5.4 Moderation of Assessment Material and Results
Policy Number	5.4
Policies that Interact with Policy 5.4	<p>Policy 5.1 Policy and Procedure: Examinations Board Regulations.</p> <p>Policy 5.2 Assessment Regulations</p> <p>Policy 5.3 External Examiner Policy</p> <p>Policy 5.4 Moderation of Assessment Material and Results</p> <p>Policy 5.5 Learner Information Provision and Feedback in Assessment.</p> <p>Policy 5.6 Learners with Learning Difficulties 293</p> <p>Policy 5.7 Examination Results: Review, Recheck and Appeal</p>
Approval Body	Academic Council
Date of Approval	February 2020
Date Policy Comes into Force	25 th January 2021
Date of Review	2025
Revisions	

1. Preamble.

1.2. Assessments must be subject to moderation and administrative verification checks to ensure the accuracy and reliability of and assessment procedures. This policy sets out IICP College's Moderation and Authentication Policy and Procedures in this regard.

1.3. Moderation and Authentication can be Internal, External or both. Internal moderation is carried out by IICP College staff, and supports the external moderation processes carried out by, for example, External Examiners.

1.4. Moderation of assessment takes place at the key stages of the assessment process, in particular during the design of tasks and marking of assignments.

1.5. Administrative verification checks that the proper procedures are implement, and that there have been no errors in recording of assessment tasks and results.

1. Purpose.

1.1. The purposes of moderation and authentication process are:

1.1.1. Checking that all assessment procedures have been applied;

1.1.2. Checking that assessment procedures have been applied in a manner that is fair, consistent and rigorous;

1.1.3. Checking that the results are accurate and reliable.

2. Policy.

2.1. Assessment and marking practices must ensure that appropriate standards are set, and that consistency of standards is maintained. This occurs through Moderation Procedures intended to ensure that grading practices and assessment outcomes are valid, consistent and reliable.

2.2. The College ensures that there are clear mechanism to safeguard the consistency and validity of assessments through specified internal and external moderation processes.

2.3. Due process is followed as identified in the Quality Assurance Document and the Learner Handbooks. This takes account of the learner's right to appeal and allows for this process to be followed in accordance with the College's academic calendar.

2.4. Moderation is used to ensure consistency and transparency of the assessment and marking processes. Moderation contributes to the continuous improvement of assessment practices and to sharing good practice among colleagues.

2.5. In IICP College, moderation is used for a selection of the assessment of all modules, and in particular high stakes assessments.

2.6. Moderation of assessment material.

2.6.1. Moderation of assessment material is a quality assurance process by which a moderator not involved in setting or marking an assessment confirms that an assessment task is accurate, consistent and fair.

2.6.2. Written assignments are moderated through the moderator reviewing scripts, feedback and marks.

2.6.3. Assessments in IICP College can involve both written assessments and presentations, and different moderation processes are associated with these assessment types.

2.6.4. Presentations are usually moderated through a dual assessment system, where more than one lecturer/tutor is involved in the marking process. Exceptions may apply where senior lecturers are involved. Specific moderation practices are described in Programme Assessment Strategies.

3. Procedure.

3.1. Moderation of assessment tasks.

3.1.1. Moderation of assessment tasks and material is carried out by faculty members who have not had involved in setting or marking an assessment.

3.1.2. The principle tasks of this stage are:

- A review of compatibility of assessments with learning outcomes;
- A review of suitability of tasks, criteria etc.

- A review of equivalence across all variations in application of assessments

3.1.3. This procedure requires that the moderator confirms that an assessment task is accurate, consistent and fair prior to its use.

3.2. Moderation of assessment marks.

3.2.1. Learners are given a percentage mark and feedback on each summative assessment (See QQI (2013) Assessment and Standards, Sectoral Convention 4).

3.2.2. Measurements of levels of achievement in a module occurs with reference to the learning outcomes, assessment instructions, standard grading scale and the module grade descriptors, all of which have been approved by the Academic Council. Learners are required to demonstrate achievement of the learning outcomes in order to obtain a pass grade. The quality of achievement, measured against standard grading scale and the Module Grade Descriptors, determine the actual mark achieved (once the learning outcomes have been demonstrated and a pass has been obtained).

3.2.3. Moderation is not double (second) marking; the moderator acts as reviewer of the standard and consistency of marking against explicit assessment criteria.

3.2.4. To avoid the existence or perception of bias, assessments are moderated internally by a member of the Academic Team (Registrar, the Head of Academic Studies, Programme Leaders, Programme Co-Ordinators) and subject to verification and authentication processes.

3.2.5. Moderation of assessment processes and outcomes may also occur through discussion, as well as checking and appeal of assessment results.

3.2.6. A selection of assessments is moderated externally (by the External Examiner). The Registrar is the key internal moderator of the process of grading all assessments in order to help ensure that there is a consistency in grading standards and practice.

3.2.7. *Responding to results of moderation:*

3.2.7.1. The fairness and accuracy of results is the primary aim of moderation in assessments. Where moderation indicates that results do not reflect the high level of fairness and accuracy required by the College, then methods

of adjustment are considered prior to examination board and if necessary at the examination board, or at an earlier stage if so required. The methods of adjustment include scaling and calibration.

3.2.7.2. In the exceptional case where no agreement can be reached the Head of Academic Studies examines the situation and determine a course of action, such as:

- Arrangement of a second moderator to review the scripts;
- Arrange to have scripts second marked. Double or second marking, while not a moderation process, provides an extra layer of evidence that assessments are fair and accurate, and an extra check for when inaccuracy of marking occurs. Therefore this marking strategy aids the moderation process. Where double or second marking displays a substantial difference in marks, then the markers review the assessment criteria and their interpretation of them. If this does not resolve the difference, then the Registrar is involved as a moderator. He or she may:

- Include the external examiner;
- Make recommendation to the board of examiners.

3.2.8. *Feedback on Results:* The College may arrange a specific date or dates on which faculty are available to review with learners their examination results. These meetings are held prior to the expiry of dates for recheck and reviews.

3.2.8.1. *Review, Rechecks and Appeals.* These processes are detailed in the College's quality assurance document and in learner handbooks. These processes take into account all moderation activities, as well as communications between learners and faculty that may have relevance to learner's results.

3.2.8.2. The procedure for application and review is set out in the College's Quality Assurance document and in the learner handbook. Requests for recheck and review usually occur prior to an appeal being lodged.

3.3. Verification checks for the administration of examination results

- 3.3.1. IICP College takes considerable care to ensure the safe, accurate and reliable dissemination of learner's assessment feedback and results, as well as the accuracy and security of its data collection, storage, retrieval and analysis in relation to examination results.
- 3.3.2. Examination results are subject to verification at regular established stages prior to examination boards.
- 3.3.3. Verification checks are recorded, and the results made available to the Registrar at an early stage.
- 3.3.4. The verification steps are as follows:
 - 3.3.4.1. A final date for submission of assessments by learners is notified to them via their programme documentation. This date is called the Final Submission Date. Any assessments received after this date, whether or not mitigating circumstances of extension of submission dates have been granted, will not be considered until a subsequent examination board.
 - 3.3.4.2. A final date for submission of marks and feedback on all assessments by assessors is established in good time prior to the examination boards. At this stage guiding dates for verification checks are established.
 - 3.3.4.3. Marks and feedback from the faculty are sent to the Registry on or before this date.
 - 3.3.4.4. A member of faculty or registry as appropriate places copies of feedback with Examination Board Documents.
 - 3.3.4.5. Prior to the Examination Board the Examination Board file is checked at regular intervals by the Registrar, to ensure that it is up to date and contains all relevant information.
 - 3.3.4.6. Marks are recorded by the Registrar on a Provisional Examination BROADSHEET. This is the master document for all mark until the production of a broadsheet for Examination Boards.
 - 3.3.4.7. Prior to the Examination Board feedback and marks are subject to a quality control check. The following steps are carried out in this regard:
 - All inputted marks are checked to ensure that they have been correct entered on the Provisional broadsheet.

- All outstanding marks are checked to ensure that they relate to outstanding assessments only.
- All feedback is checked to ensure that absent feedback relates to outstanding assessments only.
- Any discrepancies are brought to the attention of the Registrar as soon as possible.

3.3.4.8. When it is clear that all marks are correctly entered into the broadsheet this file is saved as the pre-examination board provisional broadsheet. This is presented to the Examination Board.

3.3.4.9. The recording of marks in the provision examination broadsheet is carried out in accordance with Examination Board Procedures.

3.3.4.10. Following the Examination Board, the Registrar arranges for the final transcribing of results from Examination Board Broadsheet, into the final QQI broadsheet.

3.3.4.11. This broadsheet is submitted to QQI in accordance with their administrative procedures.