

Moderation and Results Policy and Procedure

Version 1.0

Overview

This policy establishes a consistent, fair, and transparent approach to the moderation and review of student assessment results at AIM Institute. It ensures the academic integrity, accuracy, and comparability of results across courses, cohorts, and assessors.

Scope

This policy applies to:

- All higher education courses and units delivered by AIM Institute
- All summative assessment tasks contributing to final grades
- All academic staff, sessional staff, and external moderators

Policy and Procedure

Policy Principles

AIM Institute commits to assessment that is:

- Valid: Measures intended learning outcomes
- Reliable: Produces consistent results across assessors and cohorts
- Fair: Provides equitable opportunity for all students
- Transparent: Clearly communicated expectations and processes
- Defensible: Decisions supported by evidence and documented processes

Definitions

- Moderation: Processes that ensure consistency and comparability of assessment design and grading
- Calibration: Activities to align assessor judgments prior to marking
- Pre-Assessment Moderation: Review of assessment tasks before delivery
- Post-Assessment Moderation: Review of marking decisions after grading
- Validation: Periodic review of assessment effectiveness and alignment with standards
- Academic Review (Appeal): Formal student request for reconsideration of a result

Roles and Responsibilities

Academic Board / Academic Director

- Oversight of academic quality and integrity
- Approval of policy and major outcomes

Course Coordinators

- Ensure assessment design aligns with learning outcomes
- Lead moderation and calibration activities

Academic Staff (Assessors)

- Apply marking criteria consistently
- Participate in moderation and calibration

Independent Moderators (Internal/External)

- Provide objective review of assessment standards and grading
- Benchmark against sector expectations where possible

Quality Assurance / Administration

- Maintain records and audit trails
- Monitor compliance with TEQSA requirements

Moderation Framework

Assessment Design (Pre-Assessment Moderation)

Before delivery, all assessment tasks must be reviewed to ensure:

- Alignment with unit learning outcomes and AQF level
- Appropriate academic standards and workload
- Clear instructions and marking criteria (rubrics)
- Academic integrity safeguards

Documented approval is required prior to release. The assessments will be reviewed by either the Course Advisory Committee, or the Teaching and Learning Committee for any meaningful changes. For minor edits and updates, the course coordinator has this authority. If there is any doubt, the Academic Director must be consulted.

Assessor Calibration

- Conducted before marking begins
- Includes:
 - Review of marking rubric
 - Discussion of sample responses (if available)
 - Agreement on grading standards

If changes are required, given that this calibration often happens with limited lead time prior to marking, approval is through the Course Coordinator.

Post-Assessment Moderation

- Conducted after results have been finalised.
- Includes sampling of assessments:
 - Range of grades (HD, D, C, P, F)
 - Borderline and fail cases
- Moderation checks:
 - Consistency of grading decisions
 - Alignment with rubric and learning outcomes
 - Quality and sufficiency of feedback
- The review will include but not be limited to:
 - Review of assessment results per student number, individual assessment task components, total mark and proposed grade;
 - Attention to students who have failed two or more units;
 - Consideration of units showing distribution of grades: HD, D, CR, P, F, WD, WDF
 - Assessments with missing student results are adequately explained giving reasons for no result cited;
 - Confirmation that students were assessed according to the task details in the unit outline;

Outcomes may include:

- Identification of assessor inconsistencies
- Changes to marking criteria, including rubrics
- Changes to assessments to strengthen clarity and alignment to outcomes

All decisions must be documented and justified.

Results Review Panel

Results are reviewed at the completion of a teaching period for all higher education courses by the Results Review Panel. This ad-hoc panel is chaired by the Academic Director, with administrative support provided by the operations team. This support will act as Secretary. The panel consists of the following members:

- Academic Director
- Course Coordinator
- Unit Coordinators

The Academic Director may invite other members of staff to attend panel meetings.

The Results Review Panel will review the results for all units to monitor distribution for component assessments and final assessment.

Amendment of marks and/or grades where results fall outside reasonable distribution, having given due consideration to any plausible explanations provided by academic staff on the unit in question as to why results fall outside reasonable norms.

Where results fall outside reasonable distribution regarding any aspect, the Unit Coordinator must provide a explanation. The Panel may seek an explanation from the staff member responsible for assessment in the unit in question. If the Panel determines that a set of results falls outside reasonable norms, or are inequitable, it may amend the results.

This procedure requires tight turnaround time and smooth coordination between academics marking assessments and the academic leadership of the course. The objective of this procedure is to minimize time between final exams and assessments being due, and the release of moderated results.

External Referencing (Benchmarking)

Where applicable, AIM Institute will:

- Compare assessment standards with similar providers
- Use external moderators or peer review
- Participate in sector benchmarking activities

This supports TEQSA expectations for comparability of academic standards.

Validation and Review

- Conducted at least annually
- Includes:
 - Analysis of grade distributions
 - Review of assessment effectiveness
 - Student feedback (e.g., surveys)
- Outcomes inform continuous improvement actions

Grade Approval and Release

- Final grades must be reported through academic governance processes.
- Results will only be released after the Results Review Panel has confirmed the outcomes.

Student Results Review and Appeals

Informal Review

- Students may request clarification from the assessor within 5 working days
- Feedback and explanation provided

Formal Academic Review (Appeal)

- Lodged within 10 working days of result release
- Must include:
 - Grounds (e.g., marking inconsistency, procedural error)
 - Supporting evidence

Review Process

- Conducted by an independent academic not involved in original marking
- Includes:
 - Re-marking or blind review
 - Evaluation against rubric and standards

Outcomes

- Result upheld
- Result amended
- Further assessment opportunity (where appropriate)

Final Appeal

- Students may escalate under the Institute's formal grievance policy

Academic Integrity Considerations

- Moderation processes must ensure detection of:
 - Plagiarism
 - Contract cheating
- Any suspected breaches are managed under the Academic Integrity Policy

Record Keeping and Audit

AIM Institute will maintain comprehensive records including:

- Moderation plans and reports
- Samples of assessed work
- Grade distributions
- Records of changes to marks
- Student appeals and outcomes

Records must support TEQSA audit and evidentiary requirements.

Continuous Improvement

- Moderation findings are reported to Teaching and Learning Committee and, if deemed necessary, the Academic Board
- Trends are analysed (e.g., grade inflation, failure rates)
- Actions may include:
 - Staff development
 - Assessment redesign
 - Policy refinement

Policy Review

- Reviewed annually or as required
- Approved by Academic Board
- Updated in response to TEQSA guidance and sector best practice

Legislative and Regulatory Context	This policy supports compliance with the following HESF domains: 1.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment (validity, reliability, fairness) 1.3 Orientation and Progression (student understanding of assessment) 3.2 Staffing (qualified staff conducting assessment) 5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement (systematic quality assurance)
Related Policies and Procedures	Student Progression Appeals and Grievances

Document Approval

Endorsed by:	Academic Board		
Date endorsed:	16/06/2026		
Effective date:	26/06/2026		
Version number:	1.0		
Last amendment date/by:	26/06/2026,		
Review due date:	16/06/2029		
Related documents:			
Alignment to HESF	1.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment	5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement	5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement
Responsibilities:			
Contact:	info@aiminstitute.nsw.edu.au +61 02 4505 1924		

Document Change and Review log

Version	Updated by	Approval date and body	Details
0.1	TWEIR	Choose an item.	Draft version
1.0	TWEIR		Updated following AB review