



Assessment Quality Process (AQP) Survey User's Guide

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----------|
| How to use this guide | 3 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Function of the Assessment Quality Panel | 3 |
| Survey Structure | 3 |
| Assessment Quality Minimum Standards | 4 |
| Section 1: AQ Assurance | 4 |
| Unit Details Questions..... | 4 |
| Assessment Details..... | 5 |
| Assessment Task Questions | 5 |
| Assessment Classification | 5 |
| Section 2: AQ Improvement | 6 |
| Academic Integrity Questions | 6 |
| Moderation Questions..... | 6 |
| Assessment Quality Improvement Plan | 6 |
| Appendix | 7 |
| Section 1 Question Details..... | 7 |
| Section 2 Question Details..... | 11 |
| Definition of Terms | 12 |

How to use this guide

This guide provides an introduction to the Assessment Quality Panel (AQP) survey and an overview of the questions it contains. Throughout the user guide, detail about the response choices is provided through links to the Appendix.

Introduction

Function of the Assessment Quality Panel

- Assessment Quality Panels (AQPs) are integral to Curtin's assessment quality (AQ) assurance process as outlined in section 9 of the [Assessment and Student Progression Manual](#) (ASPM).
- Each School's AQP is responsible for AQ assurance and improvement processes, including a review of moderation and academic integrity processes in each unit.
- The AQP report constructed from your unit's survey data will help identify AQ and policy compliance issues to ensure consistent and fair assessment practices at Curtin.

Survey Structure

All faculties and owning areas now use the same survey and reporting mechanism. This allows consistent data to be collected and analysed to facilitate congruent reporting across the university. The survey is presented in two sections addressing 1) AQ assurance and 2) AQ improvement.

Section 1: AQ Assurance asks questions specific to the policy statements found in the [Assessment and Student Progression Manual](#) (Note: the policy reference numbers in this guide and in the survey refer to the updated 2015 version).

- Questions relate to minimum standards
- Questions are focused at the assessment task level
 - You must answer a set of questions for **each** assessment task in the unit
- All questions are compulsory
 - Skipping a question will result in an outcome of non-compliance for the related standard

Section 2: AQ Improvement allows you to share good AQ practices that exceed minimum standards.

- Questions are optional
- Questions are focused at the unit level

Assessment Quality Minimum Standards

| Standard | Description of Standard | Policy Reference |
|----------|--|---------------------------|
| 1 | All text based assessment artefacts are submitted to <i>Turnitin</i> . | [ASPM 5.1.2] |
| 2 | Steps have been taken to ensure the authenticity of students' work across all assessment tasks in that unit. | [ASPM 5.1.2] |
| 3 | A co-assessor is appointed for the unit, and has performed their duties. | [ASPM 9.4]; [ASPM 9.6] |
| 4 | Requirements for pre-marking moderation have been met. | [ASPM 5.2.1] |
| 5 | Requirements for post-marking moderation have been met. | [ASPM 6.1] |
| 6 | All assessment tasks are submitted electronically to Blackboard where a text-based or electronic artefact is available (e.g. Word, Excel, PDF, image, multimedia, computer program). | [ASPM 5.1.1] |
| 7 | Marks for all summative assessment tasks are entered into the Blackboard Grade Centre, including the final mark. | [ASPM 5.3.1] |
| 8 | All changes to student marks for an assessment task were approved by the relevant unit coordinator, with a reason for the changes recorded in Blackboard Grade Centre. | [ASPM 5.3.2] |

Section 1: AQ Assurance

Unit Details Questions

Describe the unit availabilities grouped and included in the survey response.

- Select the [locations](#) where the unit was delivered
- Select the [modes of study](#)
- Are the assessments the same for the identified availabilities?
 - For example, if a unit is taught in two different modes, are the assessment tasks sufficiently similar for the two unit modes to be combined into one survey?

Co-assessor requirement

- Was a co-assessor assigned for this unit or were suitable arrangements made to manage the co-assessor duties for the assessment tasks in the unit? [Standard 3](#)

Assessment Details

The assessment quality process only considers summative assessment tasks (ie those that contribute to the Final mark or a required task for Pass/Fail units).

To speed data entry, information has been pulled from Student One (note: this data is extracted once only, it is not dynamic and thus not affected by changes in S1 after the date of extraction).

- Confirm that the assessment task names and weightings listed in the table are correct.
- If the assessment names and/or weightings are not correct make the corrections. This will help you to identify the correct assessments as you answer the remaining questions
 - Contact your AQP chair or TSC to ensure that the information in Student One is updated.

Assessment Task Questions

- i. [What work](#) is being assessed?
- ii. What does the student [submit](#); what type of [test/exam](#) or [performance](#)?
- iii. What do you do to assure [academic integrity](#) for this assessment? [Standards 1, 2, 6](#)
- iv. Have the [responsibilities of the co-assessor](#) been executed? [Standard 3](#)
- v. Which [pre-marking moderation](#) strategies were applied? [Standard 4](#)
- vi. Which [post-marking moderation](#) strategies were applied? [Standard 5](#)
- vii. What actions were taken to ensure [integrity of student results](#)? [Standards 7, 8](#)
- viii. How many assessors were involved?

Assessment Classification

The same basic set of questions (above) will be applied for **each** assessment task listed for your unit. However, the first two questions in the Assessment Task Question set determine the specific version of the questions that will follow; this is particularly important for the questions relating to Standards 1 & 2. It is critical that the category that **best** represents the assessment should be selected.

First each assessment will be [classified](#) into one of five top level assessment categories: Submission, Examination, Performance, Combination, or Work Integrated Learning (Question i.). Next, each assessment is divided into a second level classification based on what is assessed (Question ii.).

Different questions will be displayed depending on the result of the assessment classification process. Each assessment type has different academic integrity risks and thus specific questions are posed to best evaluate those risks.

Section 2: AQ Improvement

The questions in Section 2 reflect Curtin's AQ improvement efforts and allow you to share 'good practice' beyond the threshold standards requirements with the wider Curtin community.

This section asks open-ended or multiple-choice questions focused on unit level practices rather than those at the assessment level. Since practices may differ between assessments, for the multiple-choice questions, you will be asked to select from one of these unit level options:

- All assessments
- Some assessments
- No assessments
- N/A (not appropriate for assessments in the unit)

Questions marked with a ^ are only shown if appropriate to the unit (as determined based on responses in Section 1 of the survey).

Academic Integrity Questions

- i. Do you know that policy requires specific actions for [assuring academic integrity](#)?
- ii. Are [explicit instructions](#) about academic integrity provided to students for each type of assessment?
- iii. Do the instructions to students include a statement outlining the [expected conditions](#) and/or the [expected student behaviour](#) (as appropriate to the task)?
- iv. ^For school-based tests and examinations are at least two invigilators present in each venue?
- v. ^For school-based tests and examinations are invigilators briefed?
- vi. Are there additional strategies or methods that are used in this unit, related to academic integrity, that you think are worth sharing across the Curtin community as good practice?

Moderation Questions

- i. ^Did the co-assessor participate in moderation activities?
- ii. Were changes to marks for assessment tasks reviewed by the Unit Coordinator (or by the co-assessor where the UC is the only marker)?
- iii. What [Pre-marking](#) moderation activities are used in the unit?
- iv. What [Intra-marking](#) moderation activities are used in the unit?
- v. ^What [Single marker](#) moderation activities are used in the unit?
- vi. ^What [Multiple marker](#) moderation activities are used in the unit?
- vii. Are there any activities designed to foster development of [self-regulated](#) learners?
- viii. Are there additional moderation methods that you used that you think are worth sharing across the Curtin community as good practice?

Assessment Quality Improvement Plan

- i. What academic integrity and moderation strategies are planned for this unit to help assure individual student learning and sound assessment practices?

Appendix

Section 1 Question Details

Location

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Bentley Campus | Margaret River Campus |
| Armadale Centre | Metropolitan College Malaysia |
| BPI Intern'l Group S'pore | Midland Campus |
| Canning College | Miri Sarawak Campus |
| Charles Telfair Inst Mauritius | Perth City Campus |
| Dongbei Uni Econs Fin China | Pilbara TAFE Karratha |
| Esperance Community College | Pilbara TAFE Sth Hedland |
| Fremantle CUSP | Singapore Campus |
| Geraldton University Centre | Sri Lanka Inst Info Tech |
| Great Southern TAFE Albany | Sydney Campus |
| HKU SPACE Island East Campus | Tuart College |
| INTI Intern'l College Penang | Uni Bina Nusantara Indonesia |
| Kalgoorlie Campus | UWA Albany Centre |
| Lim Kok Wing Uni Malaysia | Open Universities Australia (OUA) |
| Margaret River Campus | |

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Study Period

Internal
Partially Online Internal
Fully Online
Area External
Central External

What work is being assessed?

work (an artefact) submitted by the student
responses to a test or exam
performance of a skill or a presentation
combination: a presentation **with** a related submission
clinical, teaching, or work integrated learning practicum (demonstration of integrated knowledge and execution of complex skills and behaviours, often involving the contribution of the industry partner in the evaluation of the work and/or determination of the mark)

[Return to survey question summary](#)

What does the student submit?

Text document (a digital document that is primarily text but may include images, diagrams or embedded media)
Handwritten document (A text-based or formula/symbol based document, workbook, lab report or field report that by the nature of the task MUST be handwritten)
Physical artefact (a physical object such as a model or a piece of artwork)
Digital artefact, formula/symbol based document, or media file (.xls, .ppt, cad, software application or program, or other, that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically; document that primarily contains formulas or symbols, LaTeX script, or computer code that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically; image, video, audio, or other, that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically)

Electronic link (piece of work hosted in a specialised system that cannot readily be exported, eg Youtube/Vimeo/Echo360 video, website, blog)

→The linked work is predominantly: 1) text 2) media

Physical portfolio (compilation of physical artefacts or hard copies of work)

Electronic portfolio (compilation of artefacts or pieces of work, or reflections and evidencing of work, stored in a digital environment)

→The linked work is predominantly: 1) text 2) media

Other (specify)

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Indicate the type of test or exam

Centrally scheduled exam

School based exam

In-class test

Lab test

Invigilated eTest (at the Assessment Centre)

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Invigilated eTest (in a computer lab, or in-class using BYOD)

Non-invigilated eTest via Blackboard (or other LMS tool or elearning object)

Take-home test or exam

Other (specify)

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Indicate the type of performance

In-class presentation

Online presentation

Studio presentation

Practical test, demonstration of clinical skill

Creative performance

Other (specify)

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Assessment Classification

[Return to survey question summary](#)

| Top Level Classification | Q1 What work is being assessed | Q2 what is submitted or what type of test/exam or performance | Full Classification |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| Submission Type | work (an artefact) submitted by the student | text document handwritten document digital artefact physical artefact electronic link electronic link physical portfolio electronic portfolio electronic portfolio | Submission: Document:Text-based:Digital artefact Submission: Document:Text-based:Handwritten artefact Submission: File:Non-text:Digital artefact Submission: Object:Physical artefact Submission: Link:Text-based Submission: Link:Non-text:Media Submission: Portfolio:Physical:Physical-Portfolio Submission: Electronic portfolio:Text-based:Digital artefact Submission: Electronic portfolio:Non-text:Digital artefact |
| Examination Type | responses to a test or exam | Centrally scheduled exam School based exam In-class test Laboratory test Invigilated eTest in Assessment Centre Invigilated eTest Non-Invigilated eTest Take-home test/exam Take-home test/exam Take-home test/exam | Examination: Exam:Central-invigilated:Central venue Examination: Exam:School-invigilated:School venue Examination: Exam:School-invigilated:In-class Examination: Test:School-invigilated:Labtest Examination: Central-eTest Examination: eTest:School-invigilated:Invigilated Examination: eTest:Non-Invigilated:Digital Submission: Takehome exam:Non-Invigilated:Digital artefact Submission: Takehome exam:Non-Invigilated:Handwritten artefact Submission: Takehome exam:Non-Invigilated:Physical artefact |
| Performance Type | performance of a skill or a presentation | Practical test, demonstration of clinical skill Creative performance In-class presentation On-line presentation Other | Performance: Skill Performance: Skill:Creative Performance: Presentation:In-class Performance: Presentation:Online Performance: Presentation:Other |
| Combination Type | a presentation with a related submission | In-class presentation In-class presentation On-line presentation On-line presentation Studio presentation Other Other | Combination: Presentation +Document:Inclass +text-based:Digital artefact Combination: Presentation +File:Inclass +non-text-based:Digital artefact Combination: Presentation +Document:Online +text-based:Digital artefact Combination: Presentation +File:Online+non-text-based:Digital artefact Combination: Presentation +Object:Studio+non-text-based:Physical artefact Combination: Presentation +Document:Other+text-based:Digital artefact Combination: Presentation +File:Other+non-text-based:Digital artefact |
| WIL Practicum | clinical or work integrated learning practicum | | WIL-Practicuum: Integrated knowledge-skills-behaviours:Performance evaluation |

Academic integrity for Submission: Text-based-digital type assessments

Students submit an electronic file to Turnitin

For each submission, the Turnitin Originality Report is reviewed as part of the marking process

Students do not submit an electronic file and text-matching is not used

Academic integrity for Examination: School type assessments

Student identity is verified

The test/exam is invigilated

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Co-assessor responsibilities

They reviewed the assessment task and marking guide prior to release to students (for Submission, Performance, Combination and WIL assessment types)

They reviewed the questions and marking key prior to the test/exam (for Examination assessment type)

They confirmed that the results were correctly entered into Blackboard Grade Centre

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Pre-marking moderation strategies

Assessment task details are provided to students in the unit outline or prior to the assessment task

Marking criteria are made available to students in the unit outline or when the assessment task is assigned (for Submission, Performance, Combination and WIL assessment types)

Assessors are provided with rubric/marketing guide and sufficient information to ensure fair and consistent evaluation of student work (not displayed for eTests)

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Post-marking moderation strategies

Second marking of student work samples near grade boundaries

Second marking of borderline student work

Second marking of outlier samples

Analysis of the variances between markers and locations, or analysis of validity for eTests

Second marking of a random sample to check for consistent application of marking criteria and standards

Moderation of a sample of marked work by individuals outside of the teaching/marketing team

Panel of academics discuss and collectively reach a consensus

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Integrity of student results

Results were recorded in Grade Centre as part of, or immediately following, the marking process

Results may be 1) automatically entered if using the Blackboard rubric tool or GradeMark or an eTest, 2) recorded directly into each cell in Grade Centre, or 3) uploaded from an Excel spreadsheet

If changes to marks are required after initial entry to the Grade Centre, a reason is recorded

If no changes to marks were required after initial entry tick the option to indicate you would take the action when required; Reasons for changing a mark include: adding up error, data entry error, late submission penalty applied, adjustments stemming from moderation processes. The reason should be entered in the 'Grading Notes' text box when editing a mark in Grade Centre

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Integrity of student results for Submission: Non-text-digital type assessments

Electronic file to Blackboard assignment link

Electronic file using alternative mechanism (specify) _____

Students do not submit electronically

Section 2 Question Details

Assurance of academic integrity

All markers are briefed about academic integrity requirements, detection strategies and reporting requirements

All suspected cases of plagiarism (Levels I - III) are reviewed by the Unit Coordinator Where an incident of plagiarism involves a 'New to Curtin' student, Level I plagiarism procedures are followed and the incident is reported via the Plagiarism Reporting System (PRS)

Suspected Level II or Level III plagiarism are identified and referred to the Authorised Officer

Cases of collusion, cheating or other academic dishonesty are referred to the Authorised Officer

Pre-marking moderation activities

Were assessment tasks reviewed based on previous student performance and updated?

Were assessment tasks reviewed based on assessor feedback and updated?

Were assessment tasks reviewed based on student feedback and updated?

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Intra-marking moderation activities

Was anonymous marking used?

Was blind double marking of a sample of assessment by a second independent assessor used?

Was exchange marking used?

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Single marker moderation activities

Was rotational marking conducted?

Did a co-assessor second mark samples early in the process and request adjustments be made for the remaining marking?

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Multiple marker moderation activities

Was the teaching/marking team involved in developing the assessment tasks?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in designing the rubric/marking key?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in discussions about the rubric/marking key prior to or during marking?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in discussion about consistency of feedback provided to students?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in pre-marking consensus building?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in exchange marking?

Was the teaching/marking team involved intra-marking communication to maintain consensus?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in rotational marking?

Was the teaching/marking team involved in post-marking review to discuss the marking process/results?

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Development of self-regulated learners

Were students provided with exemplars or marked exemplars?

Did students conduct self or peer reviews using a standard set of guiding questions?

Did students conduct self or peer reviews using the rubric/marking guide?

[Return to survey question summary](#)

Definition of Terms

Academic integrity strategies

strategies that assist the instructor or marker to identify plagiarism, collusion or copying between students in the same unit, self-plagiarism (copying own work from previous attempt at this unit or from another unit) or other forms of academic dishonesty as appropriate.

Analysis of validity for eTest questions

processes for evaluation or review of question content and construct validity, and question performance through item analysis

Anonymous marking

A marking process where the student's identify is hidden from the marker. This can be done by removing the cover page of an assignment or exam and replacing it with a reference number. Some electronic systems can automatically anonymise the submissions until all student work is marked

Blind double marking

A marking process where a clean copy of the student's work, without any feedback or marks is given to a second marker

BYOD

Bring your own device

Confirmation of marks/results

The Co-Assessor is required to confirm the results for each assessment task to ensure that changes have a rationale and to check for potential signs of mark tampering

Consensus building activity

A moderation activity where the rubric/marking key is applied to a sample of student work (present or past) by the academics who will be involved in marking with discussion of results including variances until a shared understanding and consistency is achieved

Digital artefact

An assessment artefact that is primarily non text such as image, video, audio, .xls, .ppt, cad, computer code, software application or program, other, that is a standalone file which can be attached"

Electronic link

A piece of work to be assessed that is hosted in a specialised system that cannot readily be exported, eg Youtube video, website

Electronic portfolio

A compilation of pieces of work in a digital environment

Exchange marking

Exchange marking involves assessors/markers identifying a small number of previously marked artefacts and exchanging them to confirm consistency in marking and feedback provided. This is conducted early in the marking process so that differences between markers can be addressed before the bulk of the assessments are marked. Multiple assessors may be involved in this process to develop and ensure consensus amongst markers

Expected conditions for conduct of assessment task

Instructions should indicate if authorised material are allowed (ie is it open book or open internet)

Expected behaviours during assessment task

Indicate that they are not allowed to consult with other persons

Handwritten document

An assessment artefact that is primarily text present in a workbook, lab report or field report that by the nature of the task must be handwritten

Instructions about academic integrity for each type of assessment

For example for submissions the instructions should 1) warn students about: copying from students (past or present), or from other sources; requesting or employing someone to do the work for them and 2) advise them to appropriately attribute all sources and 3) indicate any use of editorial support

Consider likely breaches of AI for the type of assessment i.e. contract cheating and plagiarism for submissions vs impersonation and cheating for exams

Intra-marking moderation

Moderation activities (to ensure or maintain marker consensus and consistency) that occur in the period from when assessment artefacts are received until the raw or initial marks have been assigned

Media

images, video, interactive web elements

Physical artefact

An assessment artefact such as a model or a piece of artwork

Physical portfolio

A compilation of hard copy work

Post-marking moderation

Moderation activities (to evaluate the effectiveness and fairness of the marking process) that occur in the period from when the raw or initial marks have been assigned until the marks have been released to students

Pre-marking moderation

Moderation activities (to ensure valid, fair and equitable assessments) that occur in the period prior to when assessment artefacts are received

Recording of marks/results

Results may be 1) automatically entered if using the Blackboard rubric tool or GradeMark or an eTest, 2) recorded directly into each cell in Grade Centre, or 3) uploaded from an Excel spreadsheet

Reason for change to marks/results

include: adding up error, data entry error, late submission penalty applied, adjustments stemming from moderation processes. The reason should be entered in the 'Grading Notes'

Rotational marking

A marking process where each question or section is marked across the whole cohort before moving on to the next question or section

Second marking

Second marking involves the remarking of a student's assessment artefact by a second marker. The second marker may be given a clear copy of the student's work (blind second marking) or be able to see the first marker's comments and/or completed marking key/rubric. Check second marking (marking review) is also acceptable

Student identity verification

Sighting of Curtin Student ID where the invigilator is not familiar with each student) prior to test/exam commencement (or within the reading period)

Text document

An assessment artefact that is primarily text (the student's own words) but may also include images, diagrams or embedded media