

# Reporting Moderation Activities in the Marks Recording System

The screenshot below shows the section of the Marks Recording System (MRS) that Unit Coordinators are required to complete in relation to progressive consensus moderation activities conducted for the unit during the semester.

Each drop-down box offers an opportunity to select Yes or No. The Comment boxes are available to further describe or explain the activities carried out and the results of those activities.

The screenshot displays the Marks Recording System (MRS) interface for Edith Cowan University. The user is identified as 'User: CRAGGS, David'. The page title is 'MARKS RECORDING SYSTEM EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY'. The interface shows a 'NOT SUBMITTED' section with '0' in two columns and a 'Percentage Passed: 90%' indicator. Below this is a 'Comments' section with a link to 'Find out more about moderation here'. The main area contains three columns of moderation activities, each with a drop-down menu for 'Yes' or 'No' selection:

- Pre-Task Moderation Activities:**
  - Marking criteria for all tasks reviewed by all teaching staff (or peer if single marker)
  - Teaching staff briefed to ensure understanding of alignment between outcomes, assessment tasks and teaching activities
- Pre-Marking Moderation Activities:**
  - A small number of submitted tasks marked by ALL markers and results shared to calibrate judgement before marking begins
  - Annotated samples of student responses distributed to all teaching staff or available for peer review
- During or Post-Marking Moderation Activities:**
  - Exchange marking
  - Double marking
  - Double blind marking
  - Review sample of marked tasks at all grade boundaries

Below these sections are three text boxes for comments:

- Comment on the success of moderation activities in this unit to ensure consistency of standards, with reference to all locations where the unit is offered.
- Comment and explain the grade distribution, with a particular focus on the pass rates and spread of grades, including any differences across locations.
- Please record any further comment you wish to make to the APPROVER regarding your submission of marks.

At the bottom, there are 'Back' and 'Submit' buttons.

Comments in MRS may reference the contexts for moderation, the range of moderation activities carried out in various phases, and student achievement across tasks, across time, and compared with other institutions.

The moderation activities described in the MRS are not a comprehensive list of all possible moderation activities. The Comments box gives you an opportunity to describe other moderation activities that have been undertaken, and the outcomes from those activities.

Please contact the [Centre for Learning and Teaching](#) if you would like further specific recommendations for your particular situation.

Each section of the MRS related to moderation activities is explained in the following pages.

Pre-Task Moderation Activities	Pre-task moderation activities will have been carried out BEFORE the task and marking criteria are made available to students.
Marking criteria for all tasks reviewed by all teaching staff (or peer if single marker)	This means that a detailed marking guide, clearly outlining standards required for each task, was developed and discussed with all teaching staff (or a peer if there is only one teacher). When reviewing the criteria, consider whether the learning outcomes being assessed in the task are clearly recognisable in the marking criteria. Also consider whether all criteria are related to a learning outcome. Ensure marks are not awarded for anything that is not important. If it is important, it will/should be captured in a learning outcome.
Teaching staff briefed to ensure understanding of alignment between outcomes, assessment tasks and teaching activities	How did you ensure teaching staff understood the alignment between outcomes, assessment tasks and teaching activities? Were all staff able to explain the alignment to each other? Are you confident that all teaching staff would be able to explain to students how the teaching activities scaffold their learning towards meeting the requirements of the assessment task?

Pre-Marking Moderation Activities	Pre-marking moderation activities will have been carried out BEFORE teaching staff begin marking student work.
A small number of submitted tasks marked by ALL markers and results shared to calibrate judgement before marking begins	The tasks chosen for marking by ALL markers may be randomly selected. Results of marking should be discussed, including feedback that would be provided (where applicable). If initial results indicate considerable differences between markers, a small number of additional tasks should be marked to confirm that judgement has been calibrated across all markers before further marking is undertaken.
Annotated samples of student responses distributed to all teaching staff or available for peer review	The annotated samples of student responses should clearly indicate where marks are gained or lost and the type of feedback that would be appropriate (where applicable). The samples should represent a range of performances.

During or Post-Marking Moderation Activities	Most of these moderation activities may be carried out at any stage in the marking process. The review of marked tasks at all grade boundaries should be undertaken after marking is completed but before marks are finalised.
Exchange marking	This is where markers exchange student work so that they mark the work of a colleague's students rather than their own students.

During or Post-Marking Moderation Activities	Most of these moderation activities may be carried out at any stage in the marking process. The review of marked tasks at all grade boundaries should be undertaken after marking is completed but before marks are finalised.
Double marking	This is where two markers mark the same piece of work. Comments and marks of the original marker are visible to the second marker. Results of marking are compared and discussed until consensus is reached. This is particularly useful where inexperienced markers are involved as they can be paired with more experience markers to calibrate judgement in relation to marking criteria.
Double blind marking	This is where two markers mark the same piece of work, but do not leave any marks on the work itself so that the second marker does NOT see the comments or marks of the original marker. Results of marking are compared and discussed until consensus is reached.
Review of sample marked tasks at all grade boundaries	This is done by the Unit Coordinator and should include samples across a range of markers. The review of work at different performance standards should be externally. In the case of a single marker, a colleague should be asked to review borderline samples to confirm judgement in relation to standards. Borderline samples should also be compared with archived scripts (where available) to confirm consistent application of marking criteria over time.

## Comment on the success of moderation activities in this unit to ensure consistency of standards, with reference to all locations where the unit is offered.

- Before any tasks were given to students, all marking staff met to mark sample tasks at various levels from previous years. Consensus was reached about the factors differentiating grades, with particular attention paid to pass/fail and distinction/higher distinction. The process resulted in refinement of a number of criteria and standards descriptors.
- Last year the grade distribution had differed across locations and modes, which we discovered subsequently was due to differences in marking rather than student achievement. This year we nominated one person to mark each question or section across all locations and modes. We are confident that grading practices have been applied in the same way across all locations and modes.

### For single markers:

- Before the semester started I asked (a peer in the same discipline) to review alignment of my assessment tasks and marking criteria with unit and relevant course learning outcomes. As a result I adjusted some criteria for the second task to ensure valid assessment of learning outcomes.
- As I am the only marker in this unit, I asked a colleague teaching a related unit to conduct a blind marking exercise on several student responses from last year. I compared her marking to my own and discussed differences. We reached consensus on all but one of the differences, which I then discussed with a colleague at another university. This resulted in a small adjustment to my standard descriptors for Credit and Distinction in relation to the “interpretation” criterion.

## Comment and explain the grade distribution, with a particular focus on the pass rates and spread of grades, including any differences across locations.

- The grade distribution this year was higher than for previous years so I compared samples at grade borders and found that the standard of student work was indeed higher this year than in the past. The performance standard achieved by students matches that of similar work in a comparable unit at (another university).
- The grade distribution was different at (location) so I re-marked 20% of the major assessment and final examination. I adjusted marks as required and provided feedback to the marker at that location to assist in calibrating judgement for future tasks.
- Samples of grades selected from each location and mode were compared with benchmarked standards. We established that the different grade distributions appeared to relate to student and teacher engagement and that different grade distributions were justified due to different performances by students in relation to consistent standards. We intend to investigate reasons for differences in engagement and develop an action plan for next year.
- Samples of marked tasks at grade boundaries were compared, including those from (third party providers), to ensure consistency. It was discovered that the Credit samples from (one location) were similar to Distinction samples from all other locations. All Pass, Credit and Distinction scripts from (that location) were reviewed by another marker.

### For single markers:

- I shared the task requirements and relevant learning outcomes with a colleague and ask them to suggest marking criteria. When I compared my colleague's marking criteria with my own I discovered that some task requirements did not match the marking criteria. Both task and marking criteria will be refined.
- I compared my Fail and Higher Distinction student scripts with those of (a colleague) in (another university) to ensure that our standards are the same. No adjustment to grading was required.

## Please record any further comment you wish to make to the APPROVER regarding your submission of marks.

- We noticed some anomalous results for Task ... Upon reviewing the task we identified that discomfort/unfamiliarity with the technology students were required to use may have disadvantaged some students. Steps will be taken to ensure the technology does not cause disadvantage in the future.

### For single markers:

- I shared the task requirements and relevant learning outcomes with a colleague and ask them to suggest marking criteria. When I compared my colleague's marking criteria with my own I discovered that some task requirements did not match the marking criteria. Both task and marking criteria will be refined.