MODULE 6 · NOTES

Alignment, Moderation and Audit

R A D C

Collaboration Competency for ESD: Designing, Teaching and Assessing Collaboration
Micro Certificate 2 · Assessing and Auditing the Collaboration Competency

LEARNING OUTCOME

By the end of this module, you will be able to: audit one's own Collaboration design against the five ways an alignment claim fails, and plan its moderation.

1 The alignment chain

An auditor reads the alignment table, then asks to see the marked scripts. Only the course learning outcome is directly assessed; every other layer is a claim traceable through it.

SDG One primary goal → **PLO** Programme outcome → **CLO** Given in the syllabus → **Criteria 1–4** The four criteria → **Script** The marked submission

Criterion numbering is what makes the chain auditable: a reviewer follows a competency to a named criterion on a named rubric, and from there to one student's script.

CLO (example)	SDG	Competency	Assessed by
Reconcile client, regulator and downstream-user requirements for a discharge standard, and defend the selection in an individual justification memo naming the interest conceded to and why.	SDG 6	Collaboration	Individual memo, week 11, criteria 1–4

2 Course outline wording

Copy this into your course outline, replacing the bracketed text.

This course implements Education for Sustainable Development. Two ESD competencies are developed and assessed: Collaboration and [Competency B]. The primary Sustainable Development Goal is [SDG n]. [CLO n] is mapped to [the programme's ESD outcome]. Collaboration is assessed through [the individual submission, week n], criteria 1–4. [Competency B] is assessed through [task], criteria 5–8. Attainment of the outcome is computed from these criteria only. The rubric is published in this outline and released with the brief in week [n]. All four levels are marked. Group work occurs in [the week 9 activity]. The group event is not marked for the competency; the individual submission carries the judgement.

3 The semester schedule

When	What you do
Before semester	Publish the rubric inside the course outline, with descriptors already adapted.
Week 1	Tell students the competency in plain language, and that a group event will produce an individual mark.
Week 4	Release the brief with the rubric. Record the date in the course file.
Week 5	Practice activity. Students self-assess; return one sentence naming one criterion. No mark.

When	What you do
Week 9	Assessed activity. Same rubric, different scenario.
Week 11	Individual submission, plus the structured self-assessment.
Weeks 12–13	Mark, then second-mark a 10 per cent sample and every borderline case.
After results	Revise weak evidence indicators, never the fixed descriptors. Report attainment to the programme.

4 Moderation and second marking

- Rubric published before submission, and the date recorded.
- Two markers score the same three scripts before marking begins.
- Discrepancies discussed; criteria clarified in writing; descriptors left unchanged.
- A 10 per cent sample and all borderline cases second-marked.
- One anonymised exemplar kept per level, per criterion where possible.
- Any criterion on which two markers disagreed by more than one level flagged to the programme.

5 Five ways an alignment claim fails

Failure	What the auditor sees	Caught by
Competency named, not required	Collaboration is in the syllabus but no assignment requires it. The commonest failure, and invisible until the scripts are read.	The one rule (Module 1)
Assignment misses the competency	The group report is there; the individual account is not.	The attribution test (Module 3)
Rubric not published	Criteria written at marking time. Students were never asked for the evidence.	Rubric faults (Module 5)
Levels not defended	Two markers cannot agree on level 3 versus level 4, and no written clarification exists.	Moderation (above)
No individual attribution	All group members recorded at the same level, with no document explaining why.	The individual evidence rule (Module 4)

TWO FURTHER FAILURES

SDG as decoration: a goal logo on the outline with nothing in the content connecting to it. **One CLO, five SDGs:** broad mapping that dilutes everything and evidences nothing. Claim one primary goal that the content genuinely touches.

6 The audit checklist

Run this before you publish the course outline.

☐ The topic contains genuinely competing interests, written as one sentence
☐ A practice activity and a later assessed activity, with feedback between them
☐ An individual submission attached to every group activity
☐ Four clauses in the brief, one per criterion
☐ Four criteria and four levels, published with the brief
☐ All four levels marked, and the rubric not capped

☐ A named second marker

THE LINE THAT DECIDES WHETHER THIS IS A PLAN

A plan with no named second marker is an intention, not a plan.

Key points

- Only the CLO is directly assessed; SDG and programme outcome are traced through it to a script.
- Claim one primary SDG; publish the rubric with the brief; record the date.
- Calibrate two markers on three scripts, then second-mark 10% and all borderline cases.
- Check your design against the five failures, and name your second marker.

Activity: Workbench sections 08–10 and Check 3; copy your plan and course-outline paragraph. **This completes the course.**