

Assessment and Moderation Procedures

Table of Contents

1.	Overview	2
2.	Scope	2
3.	Assessment	2
3.1	Assessment and Rubric Design	2
3.2	Assessment Validation and Approval	3
3.3	Publication of Assessment Requirements	3
3.4	Submission of Assessment Tasks	3
3.5	Feedback on Assessment	4
3.6	Grading and Result Approval	4
3.7	Late Submissions and Penalties	4
3.8	Extensions	5
3.9	Special Consideration	5
3.10	Accessibility Support and Reasonable Adjustments	6
3.11	Supplementary Assessment	6
3.12	Appeals	6
4.	Moderation	7
4.1	Pre-marking	7
4.2	During Marking	8
4.3	Post-Marking	8
4.3.1	Internal Post-Marking Moderation	8
4.3.2	External Post-Marking Moderation	9
4.4	Reporting	9
5.	Related Documents	9
6.	Version Control	9

1. Overview

These Procedures operationalise the *Assessment and Moderation Policy* and describe the processes and actions that implement the assessment lifecycle at Asia Pacific International College (APIC).

They outline the requirements for designing, conducting, marking, moderating, and reporting on assessment to ensure fairness, validity, consistency, and compliance with the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021*.

2. Scope

These Procedures apply to all students and staff involved in the delivery, design, administration, or moderation of assessment in coursework programs offered by APIC. They apply across all delivery modes and locations.

3. Assessment

3.1 Assessment and Rubric Design

- a) Assessment tasks must be designed to:
 - align explicitly with Unit and Course Learning Outcomes;
 - reflect the appropriate AQF level and discipline context;
 - support authentic and meaningful demonstration of knowledge, skills, and application;
 - provide a balance of formative and summative opportunities; and
 - promote academic integrity and minimise opportunities for misconduct, including misuse of Generative AI.
- b) Normally, a unit will include a minimum of two and a maximum of four graded assessments distributed across the study period.
- c) Assessment tasks must comply with the *Assessment Load and Equivalency Guide*, which prescribes indicative word counts (or equivalent workload) and corresponding weightings appropriate to the unit level.
- d) An early, low-stakes assessment must be scheduled no later than Week 5 to support early identification of students at risk and provide timely feedback.
- e) The maximum weighting for any individual assessment task will not normally exceed 40% of the total unit grade unless approved by the Dean (Academic) (except in approved capstone units).
- f) Group work assessments will not normally exceed 30% of the total weighting for a unit unless approved by the Dean (Academic).
- g) Sub-assessment series (e.g., journals or quizzes) are limited to a maximum of three, unless a clear pedagogical rationale is provided.
- a) Rubric criteria must directly align with the relevant learning outcomes and provide transparent guidance for students and markers.
- b) Rubrics should:
 - describe what constitutes performance at each grade level;

- specify marks or weightings for each criterion; and
- provide a foundation for meaningful feedback.

3.2 Assessment Validation and Approval

- a) All new or substantially revised assessment tasks must undergo peer validation before delivery to ensure quality, fairness, and alignment with learning outcomes and institutional standards.
- b) The peer reviewer (usually another academic in the discipline or related field) reviews the Assessment Brief using the *Assessment Validation (Peer Review) Checklist*.
- c) Revisions are made as required, and the finalised assessment is submitted as a Course Variation to the Course Coordinator for review and approval and recorded in the Course Variation Register.
- d) A summary of validation activities and outcomes must be recorded in the Unit Report for review by the Board of Examiners.

3.3 Publication of Assessment Requirements

- a) The Unit Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that assessment information is published accurately and consistently in the approved Unit Study Guide, Assessment Brief, and assessment section in the LMS (Canvas).
- b) The Assessment Brief must follow the approved template and include:
 - assessment type and task description;
 - relevant learning outcomes;
 - weighting and word count (or equivalent workload measure);
 - due date and submission method;
 - marking criteria and/or rubric;
 - collaboration requirements (individual or group work);
 - approved use of Generative AI tools; and
 - guidance on learning resources and support.
- c) Unit Study Guide and Assessment Brief must also state any mandatory requirements to pass the unit, including hurdle tasks or requirements that must be passed.
- d) Any variation to published assessment tasks may occur only in exceptional circumstances with the Dean (Academic)'s approval and must be communicated in writing to all affected students.

3.4 Submission of Assessment Tasks

- a) Unless otherwise approved:
 - all text-based assessments must be submitted electronically via the Learning Management System (LMS) with Turnitin enabled;
 - video submissions must clearly show the student presenting to camera; and

- submissions must include a signed Assessment Cover Sheet incorporating the Academic Integrity Declaration and AI-use declaration.
- b) All deadlines are stated in Australian Eastern Standard Time (AEST) or Australian Eastern Daylight Time (AEDT) (as applicable).
- c) Students must retain a copy of all submitted work until final grades are released.
- d) Students are strongly encouraged to use version control when preparing assessments.

3.5 Feedback on Assessment

- a) Feedback must be:
 - informative, constructive, and timely;
 - aligned to the marking criteria and rubric;
 - specific about strengths, weaknesses, and strategies for improvement; and
 - designed to promote students' ability to self-assess and apply feedback to future work.
- b) Unit Coordinators must ensure feedback is provided within 14 days.
- c) Staff are expected to be available for consultation regarding feedback during published office hours.

3.6 Grading and Result Approval

- a) Academic staff must assess work objectively and consistently against the approved criteria and rubric.
- b) Markers must be alert to potential bias and apply the same standards across cohorts and delivery modes.
- c) Feedback and marks for all assessment tasks (except final assessments) must be released via the LMS within 14 calendar days of the due date.
- d) Feedback and marks for all final assessment tasks should normally be available within 7 days of the end of the study period.
- e) In capstone units involving substantial written projects ($\geq 15,000$ words), marks and feedback may be provided within 28 calendar days.
- f) Overall unit marks and grades are released to students after approval by the Board of Examiners.

3.7 Late Submissions and Penalties

Except where an approved extension or Special Consideration applies:

- Assessments submitted after the due date will incur a penalty of 10% of the total mark per day (24 hours or pro-rata) for up to five days.
- Assessments submitted more than five days late will not be accepted and will receive a mark of zero.

3.8 Extensions

- a) Students may request a short extension of up to two (2) calendar days for minor circumstances directly from the Unit Coordinator before the assessment due date. Requests must be made in writing and include a brief explanation of the reason for the extension.
- b) If a student has not received a response within two working days after the assessment due date, the student should launch a formal request for Special Consideration.
- c) Extensions beyond two days require a formal Special Consideration application with supporting evidence.
- d) Unit Coordinators must respond promptly to direct extension requests and retain a record of the decision.

3.9 Special Consideration

- a) Students whose performance is significantly affected by circumstances beyond their control may apply for Special Consideration using the *Special Consideration Application Form*.
- b) Special Consideration may be granted for a single assessment task or for a defined period of time up to and including the maximum time to completion of their course.
- c) Applications must:
 - be lodged as soon as possible, and no later than one week (7 days) after the assessment due date;
 - include appropriate supporting evidence (e.g., medical certificate, statutory declaration, or other documentation); and
 - be assessed by the Course Coordinator in consultation with relevant staff.
- d) Adverse circumstances beyond the student's control can include:
 - medical conditions (physical and/or psychological);
 - severe financial hardship;
 - substantial disruption to employment and/or living arrangements; and/or
 - other compassionate and/or compelling grounds.
- e) Routine demands and circumstances such as those below will not normally be considered as grounds for Special Consideration:
 - regular academic workload;
 - employment workload;
 - recreational travel;
 - planned personal, sporting and social events (e.g. weddings); and/or
 - computer or Internet difficulties.
- f) Possible outcomes of an application for Special Consideration include:
 - extension of assessment due date (normally up to seven calendar days);
 - alternative or supplementary assessment;
 - withdrawal without academic penalty; or
 - an alternative solution following negotiation with the student and relevant staff; or
 - application is denied.

- g) Where a student is dissatisfied with the outcome, they may appeal through the *Student Academic Grievances and Appeals Policy and Procedure*.

3.10 Accessibility Support and Reasonable Adjustments

- a) In accordance with the *Student Welfare and Support Policy*, students who experience disability, learning difficulty, or ongoing physical or mental health condition may request reasonable adjustment to ensure an equal opportunity to successfully complete their assessment tasks.
- b) Applications for reasonable adjustments should be submitted as early as possible, and must be supported by appropriate documentation as specified in the *Student Welfare and Support Policy*.
- c) Adjustments may include:
- extended time for assessments or in-class tasks;
 - alternative formats or response modes;
 - ergonomic or technological support; and/or
 - alternative assessment arrangements.
- d) All decisions are made collaboratively between Student Services, the Course Coordinator, and the Unit Coordinator, ensuring adjustments remain reasonable and do not compromise learning outcomes.

3.11 Supplementary Assessment

- a) Students who meet the eligibility criteria specified in Section 6.8 of the *Assessment and Moderation Policy* may be considered for supplementary assessment.
- b) The Board of Examiners reviews all students with final marks of 45-49% and determines eligibility based on available evidence of engagement and attempt.
- c) Alternatively, supplementary assessment may be approved as an outcome of a Special Consideration application under Section 3.9.
- d) Students are notified in writing of their eligibility and the supplementary assessment requirements within 5 working days of the Board of Examiners meeting.
- e) If the student passes the supplementary assessment, the final result for the unit will be recorded as 50% with a grade of Pass (Supplementary Assessment) or PS.
- f) If unsuccessful, the original final mark and grade stand.

3.12 Appeals

- a) Students may appeal a mark for an assessment task or a final grade for a unit of study.
- b) Appeals must be based on at least one of the following grounds:
- assessment criteria or requirements were not clearly provided;
 - assessment requirements were varied without approval;
 - assessment was applied unreasonably or prejudicially;

- an approved Special Consideration was not properly considered; or
 - a clerical or computational error occurred.
- c) Students must follow the process outlined in the *Student Academic Grievances and Appeals Policy and Procedure*. As per Section 6, of the Policy, students should first attempt to resolve the matter following the informal internal appeal process by contacting their Unit Coordinator or Course Coordinator. If the issue is not resolved, the student may lodge a formal appeal within ten working days after the decision of the Unit Coordinator or Course Coordinator using the *Student Appeal Form*.

4. Moderation

- a) Moderation is required in every unit, including units with a single marker.
- b) Unit Coordinators, with support from the Course Coordinators, are responsible for leading validation and moderation of assessment tasks.
- c) Moderation must be undertaken for all assessment tasks that make up at least 20% of the total marks for a unit. Tasks that require non-interpretive marking, such as standardised multiple-choice quizzes, do not require moderation.
- d) For assessments that are conducted in-situ, such as presentations, debates or lab work, it is desirable to have more than one marker and to reach consensus through discussion.
- e) The moderation process can be facilitated using the [Moderated Assignment feature in Canvas](#).

4.1 Pre-marking

- a) Pre-marking moderation ensures common understanding of assessment standards before marking begins. This process includes marking a sample of assessments to calibrate standards, discussing criteria and expectations among markers, and deciding how feedback will be provided to students.
- b) When multiple markers are involved, the pre-marking moderation procedure is as follows:
 - The Unit Coordinator selects and distributes up to three student assessment tasks to markers for independent marking according to the marking rubric.
 - Each marker independently marks the assessment tasks and returns the marked assessments and rubrics to the Unit Coordinator.
 - The Unit Coordinator reviews the marks and rubrics for consistency and organises a meeting with the markers to discuss and compare the application of criteria, adjusting as necessary for consistency.
- c) When the Unit Coordinator is the only marker, the pre-marking moderation procedure is as follows:
 - The Unit Coordinator pairs up with a colleague for peer moderation. The colleague does not need to be an expert in the content but should have general discipline knowledge. Alternatively, a small group of staff may jointly moderate assessments for several units.

- The Unit Coordinator selects and distributes up to three student assessment tasks to the colleague for independent marking according to the marking rubric.
- The Unit Coordinator reviews the marks and rubrics for consistency and organises a meeting with the peer moderator to discuss and compare the application of criteria, adjusting as necessary for consistency.

4.2 During Marking

- a) During-marking moderation involves the overseeing the standard agreed upon in the pre-marking stage.
- b) The Unit Coordinator monitors consistency of standards during marking (before marks or grades are finalised) by implementing various mechanisms such as, but not limited to:
 - Double marking of all Fail and High Distinction grades
 - Interim reporting by markers of grade distributions
 - Spot checking marked assessments at random
 - Requiring markers to identify assessment tasks that they found challenging to grade for double marking
- c) The Unit Coordinator may arrange a follow-up moderation meeting with markers, or the peer moderator if there is only one marker, to validate marking consistency, discuss any challenges encountered when making judgments, and adjust approaches as necessary.
- d) The Unit Coordinator may counsel markers who are inconsistent in applying standards and may request re-marking of assessment tasks where necessary.

4.3 Post-Marking

Post-marking moderation involves reviewing the grading of assessment tasks to ensure consistency of standards across units and courses. Post-marking moderation does not affect the marks or grades given to students; instead, it is aimed at evaluating assessment processes to identify areas for improvement in the future.

4.3.1 Internal Post-Marking Moderation

- a) At the end of the teaching period, the Unit Coordinator evaluates the consistency of marking and application of standards. This process may involve, but is not limited to:
 - Reviewing the grade distributions of the whole unit and/or discrepant grade distributions among markers.
 - Collecting feedback from markers or peer moderators about suggested changes to assessment instructions, marking rubrics or moderation procedures.
 - Providing guidance or feedback to markers.
- b) The Course Coordinator evaluates the consistency of grades across units within a course and may provide guidance to Unit Coordinators where there are grade discrepancies or concerns about assessment and moderation.
- c) The results of moderation and any actions arising are documented in the Unit Report and/or Course Reports presented to the Board of Examiners (see Section 4.4).

4.3.2 External Post-Marking Moderation

- a) The Dean (Academic), in conjunction with the Deputy Dean (Programs) and Course Coordinators, will ensure assessment standards in all courses undergo yearly external moderation.
- b) External moderation occurs annually for selected units identified by the Board of Examiners.
- c) A senior academic in the same discipline, external to APIC, reviews a sample of graded work across grade levels and provides a written report.
- d) Findings are considered by the Dean (Academic) and the Learning and Teaching Committee.

4.4 Reporting

- a) The Unit Coordinator must record all moderation activities and outcomes in the Unit Report submitted to the Board of Examiners each study period.
- b) The Course Coordinator, Dean (Academic), and Deputy Dean (Programs) are responsible for implementing any actions or recommendations arising.
- c) External moderation outcomes are summarised in the Benchmarking Report and recorded in the Benchmarking Register.

5. Related Documents

- Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure
- Assessment and Moderation Policy
- Award of Grades Policy
- Student Academic Grievances and Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Student Progression Policy
- Student Welfare and Support Policy
- Special Consideration Application Form
- Student Appeal Form

6. Version Control

Document ID	Assessment and Moderation Procedure
Category	Academic
Document Owner	Dean (Academic)
Endorsed by	Learning and Teaching Committee

Version	Summary of changes	Endorsed date
1.0	New procedure	Learning and Teaching Committee: 1 February 2024
1.1	Revised as part of Assessment Review Project.	Academic Board: 28 November 2025