Assessment Quality Panel (AQP) Survey Guide

Table of Contents

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 *Turnitin*.	[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 the unit? Standard 3

  (Note: if you respond no to this question, the assessment level questions about co-assessor activity will not appear and the unit will be marked as not meeting 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

Assessment Classification

The same basic set of questions (below) will be applied for **each** assessment task listed for your unit. However, the first two questions in the Assessment Task Question set determine the questions that will follow; therefore, 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.

Assessment Task Questions

For each assessment task the same basic set of questions are asked. The first two questions are used to determine the classification.

i. What work is being assessed?
ii. What does the student submit; what type of test/exam or performance?

Depending on the response to the second question some additional questions may be asked to further narrow the classification. Correctly classifying each assessment task is important as it determines the display of questions and potentially impacts on the evaluation of Standards 1, 2 and 6.

iii. What do you do to assure academic integrity for this assessment? Standards 1, 2, 6

The remaining questions are standard and will be displayed for each assessment regardless of classification

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?

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	

Study Period

Internal
Partially Online Internal
Fully Online
Area External
Central External

What work is being assessed?

work (an artefact or artefacts) submitted by the student

responses to a test or exam

a presentation, a performance, or the demonstration of a skill

a combination of a presentation/performance/demonstration **with** a related submission

demonstration of integrated knowledge and execution of complex skills and behaviours during a clinical, teaching, or work integrated learning practicum

Popup text

assessed - consider the work or evidence of the student's learning that is being assessed by the marker. If the marker is directly observing the student consider the performance or combination options. Reflections, reports or case studies stemming from a WIL practicum activity are submissions
a presentation - without a related submission
demonstration of a skill -the marker directly observes the skill being performed
clinical, teaching, or work integrated learning practicum- often involving the contribution of the industry partner in the evaluation of the work and/or determination of the mark

What does the student submit?

Text document(s)

Handwritten document(s)

Physical artefact(s)

Digital files(s), formula/symbol based digital document(s), or media file(s) (the electronic file/artefact is stored in Blackboard or at Curtin)

Electronic link to work hosted in a specialised system that cannot readily be exported to a file
→The linked work is predominantly: 1) text 2) media

Physical portfolio

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

Other (specify)[*Check with your Dir L&T before using*]

Popup text

submit - wherever possible a copy of the work should be submitted so that the evidence of the student's work forms part of the student record, however, the term submission can apply to work that is retained by the student after marking without retention of the artefact or other representation of the artefact (ie image file)

text documents(s)- a digital document that is primarily text but may include images, diagrams or embedded media

Handwritten document(s) - A text-based or formula/symbol based document, workbook, lab report or field report that by the nature of the task MUST be handwritten" href="#">Handwritten document(s)

Physical artefact(s) - a physical object such as a model or a piece of artwork

Digital file(s) - .xls, .ppt, cad, software application or program, or other, that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically

Formula/symbol based document(s) - document that primarily contains formulas or symbols, LaTeX script, or computer code that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically

Media file(s) - image, video, audio, or other, that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically

Specialised system - eg Youtube/Vimeo/Echo360 video, website, blog

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 eportfolio or digital file

Indicate the type of test or exam

Centrally scheduled exam or OUA scheduled exam

School based exam

In-class test

Lab test

Remote Invigilated eTest via Blackboard (or other LMS tool or elearning object)

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)[*Check with your Dir L&T before using*]

Popup text

BYOD - Bring Your Own Device

Indicate the type of performance observed by the marker

In-class presentation

Online presentation

Studio presentation

Practical test, demonstration of clinical skill or lab skill

Creative performance

Other (specify)[*Check with your Dir L&T before using*]

Popup text

Online presentation - the student delivers their presentation (student can be heard and/or seen) using an online tool such as Collaborate or WebEx

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

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 monitored and confirmed that the results were correctly entered into Blackboard Grade Centre

Popup text

task - review of assessment design (fit for purpose) and review of assessment task requirements provided to students

reviewed the questions and marking key - for eTests the questions and question pools should be reviewed regularly and new questions added as appropriate.

monitored - through sampling or other approaches appropriate to the task

confirmed - 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.

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/marking guide and sufficient information to ensure fair and consistent evaluation of student work (not displayed for eTests)

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 item 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/marking team

Intra-marking moderation activities, as appropriate to the task, are employed to maintain marking consistency (e.g. a panel of academics discuss and collectively reach a consensus)

Popup text

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.

Near grade boundaries - just above and below pass/fail and boundaries between other grade bands such as distinction/high distinction

Borderline - just above/below pass mark

Outlier - high or low scoring assessments

Item validity - i.e. content and construct validity, and item analysis

eTest - where automatic marking is employed

consensus - All members of the panel must agree on the mark to be assigned; moderation is part of the marking process.

Integrity of student results

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

Integrity of marks was appropriately monitored and managed. This includes ensuring that any changes to marks, after initial entry, have a rationale recorded in Blackboard Grade Centre

Popup text

recorded - 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.

Any changes to marks - If no changes to marks were required after initial entry tick the option to indicate you would take the action when required

Rationale recorded - 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.

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

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 CoordinatorWhere 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?

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?

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?

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?

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?

Assessment Classification

Top Level Classification	Q1 What work is being assessed	Q2 what is submitted or what type of test/exam or performance		Second Level Classification
Submission Type	work (an artefact) submitted by the student	text document		Submission: Text-based-digital
		Handwritten document		Submission: Text-based-handwritten
		digital artefact		Submission: Non-text-digital
		physical artefact		Submission: Physical
		electronic link	text	Submission: Text-based-link
		electronic link	media	Submission: Non-text-link
		physical portfolio		Submission: Physical-P
		electronic portfolio	text	Submission: Text-based-link-EP
		electronic portfolio	media	Submission: Non-text-link-EP
Examination Type	responses to a test or exam	Centrally scheduled exam		Examination: Central-Exam
		School based exam		Examination: School-Exam
		In-class test		Examination: School-Test-IC
		Laboratory test		Examination: School-Test-LT
		Invigilated eTest in Assessment Centre		Examination: Central-eTest
		Invigilated eTest		Examination: School-eTest
		Non-Invigilated eTest		Examination: School-eTest-NI
		Take-home test/exam	electronic file	Submission: Text-based-digital-THE
		Take-home test/exam	handwritten	Submission: Text-based-handwritten-THE
		Take-home test/exam	hardcopy	
Performance Type	performance of a skill or a presentation	Practical test, demonstration of clinical skill		Performance: Skill
		Creative performance		Performance: Creative
		In-class presentation		Performance: Presentation-IC
		On-line presentation		Performance: Presentation-OL
		Other		Performance: Presentation-O
Combination Type	a presentation with a related submission	In-class presentation	text	Combination: Presentation-text-based-submission-IC
		In-class presentation	media	Combination: Presentation-non-text-submission-IC
		On-line presentation	text	Combination: Presentation-text-based-submission-OL
		On-line presentation	media	Combination: Presentation-non-text-submission-OL
		Studio presentation		Combination: Presentation-non-text-submission-ST
		Other		Combination:Presentation-text-based-submission-O
		Other		Combination:Presentation-non-text-submission-O
WIL Type	clinical or work integrated learning practicum			WIL: Practicum

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

Assessed work

consider the work or evidence of the student's learning that is being assessed by the marker. If the marker is directly observing the student consider the performance or combination options. Reflections, reports or case studies stemming from a WIL practicum activity are submissions

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

Formula/symbol based document(s)

document that primarily contains formulas or symbols, LaTeX script, or computer code that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically

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

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 file

image, video, audio, or other, that is a standalone file that can be submitted electronically

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)

Submission

Wherever possible a copy of the work should be submitted so that the evidence of the student's work forms part of the student record, however, the term submission can apply to work that is retained by the

student after marking without retention of the artefact or other representation of the artefact (ie image file)

Text document

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