RATIFICATION OF RESULTS: QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK

The Ratification of Results Quality Assurance Framework underpins the processes and articulates the framework supporting the ratification of results and comprises:

1. Five Overarching Principles
2. A set of Quality Standards
3. The Quality Assurance Cycle with Expected Actions
4. A set of Supporting Documents to encourage consistency in the processes (‘plan’) and reporting (‘check’) stages of the Cycle.

The Framework is visually represented in Appendix A.

OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES

The Framework has been developed based on five overarching principles:

- **Fairness**: just and reasonable action in accordance with accepted rules or principles. Procedural fairness requires that all cases be treated in essentially the same way, subject to the same or equivalent scrutiny, and evaluated using the same or equivalent rules and procedures.
- **Transparency**: the open provision of information. Transparency is operating in such a way that it is easy for others to access and examine process, information, discussion and decision making.
- **Objectivity**: the state or quality of being objective, just and unbiased. Objectivity involves informed and unguarded discussion and review.
- **Reliability**: an indication of consistency. Reliability determines the degree to which processes produce consistent outcomes, and perform their intended function, across varying settings. Information and data must be valid to ensure reliability.
- **Continuous Quality Improvement**: an ongoing effort to improve quality. Continuous Quality Improvement involves incremental and/or breakthrough improvement of processes that lead to the achievement of higher levels of quality.

It is expected that these five principles will be recognised and embedded in all aspects of the quality assurance processes in each Faculty.

QUALITY STANDARDS

The six Quality Standards are key elements of the Quality Assurance Framework:

- **Moderated standards-based assessment**: Assessment is standards-based and is subject to moderation, as outlined in the *Moderation Framework*.
- **Moderated grading**: Grading reflects achievement against the approved standards, and these standards observe the broader University policies on grading and assessment. Grading is subject to moderation, as outlined in the *Moderation Framework*.
- **Identification and reporting of quality issues**: Unexpected results and significant issues are identified and reported.
- **Robust discussion of quality issues**: Unexpected results and significant issues are robustly and objectively discussed.
- **Commitment to resolution of quality issues**: Strategies to address unexpected results and significant issues are proposed, and implemented, to promote continuous quality improvement and conclude a cycle of quality enhancement.
- **Transparent and improvement-focused processes**: Reporting, review, strategy proposals, progress and outcomes are documented.

In developing the Standards for the Framework, ensuring *fairness, transparency, objectivity* and *reliability* in the processes and reporting, and promoting *continuous quality improvement* in the review and monitoring components are recognised as important.
**QUALITY ASSURANCE CYCLE**

The Quality Assurance Cycle is divided into five stages: Plan, Act, Check, Monitor and Improve. These stages do not stand in isolation from one another and, in fact, must feed into each other to promote continuous quality improvement.

Each stage of the Cycle has a set of Expected Actions which support the evaluation and measurement of performance against the Standards, and contribute to continuous improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Expected actions</th>
<th>Supporting documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Plan | 1.1. Each Faculty establishes processes to monitor the ratification of results process against the Quality Standards. These should include subprocesses at the unit and department level.  
1.2. Each Faculty evaluates its processes periodically. | Example process/es to illustrate application of framework within a Faculty, including a statement of function for the various tiers in the ratification of results process. |
| 2. Act | 2.1. Each Faculty monitors its performance against the Quality Standards, as per the established Faculty processes.  
2.2. Each Faculty identifies unexpected results or significant issues in relation to the Quality Standards. | Example reporting models/standardised templates to illustrate the type of information, and level of detail, expected at the various tiers in the ratification of results process. |
| 3. Check | 3.1. Each Faculty reports on its performance against the Quality Standards.  
3.2. Each Faculty reports unexpected results or significant issues in relation to the Quality Standards.  
3.3. Each Faculty initiates a review of its processes and/or units periodically, or in response to identified issues. Where a review of a unit is required, this should feed into the broader Program and Unit Review Cycle. | Example reporting model/standardised templates to illustrate the type of information, and level of detail, expected at the various tiers in the ratification of results process. |
| 4. Monitor | 4.1. The Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) will monitor and review processes in accordance with the annual review cycle. | |
| 5. Improve | 5.1. Where an issue is identified, the Unit Convenor and/or Department will propose strategies to respond to this issue. These proposed strategies are documented and an evaluation of their effectiveness is provided after the next offering. This should feed into the broader Program and Unit Review Cycle.  
5.2. Each Faculty proposes and implements changes to its processes to address identified issues, where relevant.  
5.3. Where broad and systemic issues are identified by the Faculty, they will recommend amendments to University rules, policies or frameworks to Academic Senate for consideration and/or approval. | |
APPENDIX A

CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderated standards-based assessment</th>
<th>Moderated grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and reporting of issues</td>
<td>Robust and objective discussion of quality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to resolution of quality issues</td>
<td>Transparent and improvement-focused processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Example Process: Ratification of Results

**Unit Convenor** oversees assignment of marking against approved standards.

**Unit Convenor** considers performance against Quality Standards.

**Unit Convenor** documents unit-level performance against Quality Standards via the "Unit Summary Report".

Unit Summary Report provided to Head of Department for Department consideration.

**Department** reviews, robustly and objectively discusses, and minutes the discussion of 'Unit Summary Reports' (with reference to the Moderation Framework).

**Head of Department** documents department-level performance against the Quality Standards via the 'Departmental Summary Report'.

Departmental Summary Report provided for Faculty consideration.

**Faculty** reviews, robustly and objectively discusses, and minutes the discussion of 'Departmental Summary Reports' (with reference to the Moderation Framework) [Unit Summary Reports attached].

- Do significant issues/propose strategies trigger changes to a unit/s?
  - YES: **TRIGGER**: Feed into broader Unit & Program Review Cycle
  - NO

**Associate Dean (S&Q)**, or nominee, documents faculty-level performance against Quality Standards via the 'Faculty Summary Report'.

Faculty Summary Report provided to Faculty Board.

**Faculty Board** considers the 'Faculty Summary Report' (Final Grade recommendations and Department Summary Reports attached).

- Do significant issues trigger recommendations for changes to the process, or to University rules or policy?
  - YES: **TRIGGER**: Proposed amendments to process, rule or policy recommended to Academic Senate.
  - NO

Executive Dean, or nominee, evidences that faculty-established processes have been followed via the 'Faculty Board Summary Report' [Report Pro-Forma D: High-level detail].

**Faculty Board** ratifies results.

Faculty Board Summary Report provided to Academic Senate.

**Academic Senate** notes ratification of results, and considers recommended amendments to process, rules or policy.
UNIT SUMMARY REPORT

REPORT PRO FORMA A
Detailed summary of individual unit information. This may include:
- Comment on Unit Convenor Summary Report from previous offering
- Comment on any issues that were previously raised and how these were addressed in the unit's current offering
- Comment on any changes to the unit and how these changes impacted cohort performance (compared with previous offerings)
- Evidence of moderation practices: in setting standards, designing assessment and grading
- Identifying noteworthy or unexpected results or experiences
- Any proposed amendments to unit following experiences/results/evaluation for the given session (and in light of cohort performance)

REPORT PRO FORMA B
Medium-level summary of overall departmental information. This may include:
- Report on any ongoing issues
- Update on any outstanding action items from the last Faculty Assessment meeting
- Report on changes to units which significantly impacted cohort performance (compared with previous offerings)
- Evidence of moderation practices: in setting standards, designing assessment and grading
- Report on any issues with units being offered for the first time
- In light of cohort performance, suggest amendments to teaching strategies, units and/or relevant policies or rules of the University
- Report on any issues, points of concern or positive outcomes that the department wishes to highlight

REPORT PRO FORMA C
High-level summary of overall departmental information. This may include:
- Noteworthy issues, such as matters relating to moderation practices, units offered for the first time or significant changes to units which had an impact on cohort performance
- Outlining Departmental quality assurance process
- In light of cohort performance, suggest amendments to teaching strategies, units and/or relevant policies or rules of the University
- Department Summary Reports and/or Minutes attached for information

REPORT PRO FORMA D
High-level summary of overall faculty information. This may include:
- Confirmation that a quality assurance process has been established, and followed
- Identification of common/overall themes
- Highlight/extracts from Department Assessment meeting minutes:
  - ongoing issues/outstanding action items
  - Issues/points of concern/positive outcomes
- Suggest amendments to teaching strategies, units and/or relevant policies or rules of the University
- Faculty (Quality) Summary Reports and/or Minutes attached for information

AUDIENCE
- Department Faculty
- Faculty
- Faculty Board
- Academic Senate

AUTHOR
- Unit Convenor/s
- Head/s of Department
- Associate Dean (S&Q), or nominee
- Executive Dean, or nominee