



## **Staff Recruitment Policy**

**V1.0**

## Purpose

The purpose of the Assessment Moderation Policy at ESSI Academy is to ensure that all assessment practices across the institution are fair, consistent, transparent, and aligned with intended learning outcomes. Moderation is a vital quality assurance process that enhances the reliability, validity, and integrity of assessments and ensures that students are evaluated against clearly defined and agreed-upon standards. This policy reflects ESSI Academy's commitment to student-centred learning, where assessment is not only a tool for grading but also a mechanism to support learning, provide feedback, and measure the achievement of competencies across various disciplines.

## Scope

This policy applies to all homegrown programmes offered by ESSI Academy, including:

- Formative and summative assessments
- Projects and practical evaluations
- Portfolios and presentations
- Written examinations and online tests

While externally awarded or validated programmes may have their own assessment guidelines, ESSI Academy implements this moderation framework wherever possible to ensure internal consistency and comparability.

## Key Principles of Assessment Moderation

Moderation at ESSI Academy is based on the following principles:

- **Alignment:** All assessments must align with the module and programme-level learning outcomes as defined in course documentation and published to students.
- **Fairness and Equity:** Assessment decisions should be based on objective criteria applied consistently across all learners.
- **Transparency:** Assessment and moderation procedures are clearly documented and communicated to staff and students.
- **Feedback and Improvement:** The moderation process provides feedback not only to students but also to assessors, contributing to the continuous enhancement of teaching and assessment practices.
- **Academic Integrity:** Moderation helps to safeguard against grading errors, inconsistencies, and bias, thereby upholding the credibility of qualifications awarded by the Academy.

## **Moderation Structure and Process**

### **1. Establishing the Assessment Team**

For each homegrown programme, an Assessment Team is appointed. This team typically includes:

- The Subject Lead
- Lecturers involved in teaching and assessing the module
- A designated Internal Moderator (where applicable)

The team is responsible for reviewing and agreeing upon:

- The design and structure of assessments
- Marking schemes and rubrics
- Learning outcome alignment
- Assessment instructions and expectations

The Subject Lead chairs the team and ensures alignment with academic standards, internal policy, and the MQF level of the course.

### **2. Pre-Assessment Moderation**

Prior to administering assessments, the Assessment Team will:

- Review assessment tasks to ensure they are valid (i.e., they accurately measure the intended learning outcomes).
- Confirm that the level of difficulty is appropriate for the course's MQF level.
- Agree on the assessment format (written, oral, practical, digital) and whether it supports different learner needs and learning styles.
- Discuss the use of rubrics or marking schemes, including clarification of marking criteria to ensure consistent interpretation.
- Schedule deadlines for marking and moderation meetings.

### **3. Marking and Blind Marking**

Once assessments are submitted:

- Assessors grade student work using the agreed marking scheme.
- Where feasible, blind marking is implemented—particularly in written or online examinations—to prevent bias by ensuring assessors are unaware of the student's identity during evaluation.

## Post-Assessment Moderation

### 4. Internal Moderation

Following the initial marking:

- A sample of marked work is reviewed by the Internal Moderator or Subject Lead. The sample is typically stratified (i.e., it includes work from across the performance range, high, average, and low grades).
- The moderator checks for:
  - Consistency in grading across assessors
  - Fair application of criteria
  - Clarity and justification of marks awarded
- Discrepancies are discussed, and in cases of significant variation, the work is re-marked or jointly reviewed.

In larger cohorts, statistical analysis may also be used to identify anomalies in grade distribution.

### 5. Final Marking Agreement

Once moderation is complete:

- Final marks are confirmed and recorded in the Student Information System (SIS).
- Feedback to students (where this is given) is released, including any relevant commentary on their performance and areas for improvement.

## Student Feedback and Transparency

In alignment with ESSI's student-centred approach, students are provided with:

- Clear information on how they will be assessed
- Assessment criteria and expectations in advance
- Rubrics or marking schemes where applicable
- Constructive feedback that links performance to learning outcomes and offers guidance for improvement (where this is pre-planned)

## **Moderation of Reassessments**

When students resit an assessment or submit revised work:

- The same moderation principles apply
- The reassessment must be based on the same learning outcomes and assessment criteria as the original

## **Student Requests for Revision of Marked Assessment**

ESSI Academy is committed to ensuring that all assessments are marked fairly, consistently, and in accordance with published criteria. However, the Academy recognises that there may be cases where a student believes their assessment has not been graded accurately or that an error has occurred. In such cases, students are entitled to request a revision of their marked assessment, in accordance with this policy.

### **Grounds for Request**

A request for revision may be submitted if the student believes:

- There has been a miscalculation or clerical error in the marking process;
- The assessment criteria were not applied correctly or fairly;
- Relevant answers or evidence were overlooked during marking;
- There is a discrepancy between the feedback and the mark awarded;
- Student believes that they deserve a better grade.

### **Submission Procedure**

- Students must submit their Request for Revision of Assessment Form within five working days of receiving their grade.
- The form must clearly state the grounds for the request and may be accompanied by supporting documents (e.g., a copy of the marked paper or assignment, feedback received).
- The request is submitted to the Academic Office, who will acknowledge receipt and initiate the review process.

### **Review and Reassessment**

- The paper will be reviewed by a second qualified assessor, who was not involved in the original marking.
- The reviewer will assess the work independently, using the original marking criteria and rubric.

## Outcomes of the Review

There are three possible outcomes of the review process:

1. **No change in grade:** The second assessment confirms the original mark.
2. **Upward revision:** The reviewer determines that a higher mark is justified.
3. **Downward revision:** The reviewer determines that the original mark was too high.

Where the grade is changed (either increased or decreased), the revised mark becomes the final recorded mark. Students are informed in writing of the outcome, with a clear explanation of the final decision.

## Confidentiality and Fairness

All revision requests are handled with strict confidentiality and are conducted fairly and without prejudice. No student will be penalised for making a request in good faith.