TWIST

Journal homepage: www.twistjournal.net

Students' Involvement in Assessment and the Role and Practice of Moderation as a Quality Assurance Measure in Assessment

A Reflective Piece

Mapotso Kena
University of Limpopo, South Africa

Takalani Samuel Mashau*
University of Venda, South Africa
[*Corresponding author*]

Abstract
In all education systems, assessment is an integral part of quality assurance. Different approaches are used in students' assessment, with lecturer-based assessment viewed as traditional and the most commonly used. Lately, there has been a stronger opinion on the involvement of students in their assessment. In this paper, we reflect on self-and peer assessment, including giving feedback, grading, and moderating, which influence overall student learning and contribute to improved cognitive skills. In our view, self-and peer assessment is centred around recognition theory. This theory emphasises and removes guilt and shame associated with traditional lecturer-student assessment. Our reflection argues that students are encouraged to nurture their skills and knowledge through peer assessment when applying recognition theory. This notion is supported by many authors, who state that students become more involved in their learning when they are part of the assessment process. It is, however, worth noting that any student success, whether through self or peer assessment, will only be achieved when students also participate in formulating learning outcomes and assessment criteria instruments.

Keywords
Moderation, Self-assessment, Peer assessment, Grading, Moderating, Recognition

INTRODUCTION

Students' involvement in their assessment is self-assessment. Mulrooney (2019) believes that self-assessment is when students actively assess the quality of their work. In a way, assessment is feedback, grading, and moderation in all aspects of teaching and learning, which are the foundation of assessment in the student learning process. In self-assessment, students actively participate in their learning and enhance their engagement. After the assessment, there is feedback on the outcome based on grading and moderation of question papers and other assessment modes. Quality assurance, which refers to the systematic monitoring and evaluation of the various aspects of a higher education institution to ensure that standards of education are being maintained, is a crucial part of the teaching, learning, and assessment cycle in higher education (Beutel, Adie & Lioyd, 2016).

One of the significant learning experiences is to involve students in their own self- or peer assessment. According to Iglesias Pérez, Vidal-Puga and Pino (2022), self and peer assessment have advantages in training responsibility, criticism, and reflection of the students. Recently, self and peer evaluations have also been shown to be even more effective than lecturer evaluations. Self and peer assessments are to become a core aspect of university student-centred evaluation processes. Self and peer evaluation also reduce the lecturer's workload.

This reflective piece explores the significance of students' involvement in assessment and the role and practice of moderation as a quality assurance measure in assessment. These aspects are fundamental to higher education's teaching and learning process and significantly impact the quality of education provided. In this reflective paper, researchers reflect on how lecturers view the role of students in assessment, including giving feedback, grading, and moderating. This paper aims to provide a reflective analysis of students' role in assessment as part of their learning process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The following paragraphs discuss the theoretical framework that underpins the paper and literature review.

Theoretical Framework

The reflective paper is underpinned by Axel Honneth's critical theory, primarily developed in works like "The Struggle for Recognition" (1995), often referred to as the "theory of recognition, "which centres around the concept of "recognition" as the foundation for a healthy and just society. When recognition is denied, it results in indignations, guilt, and shame, which drive social struggles for recognition and social freedom (Honneth, 2014).

Recognition also centres around the idea that human identity and self-esteem are fundamentally shaped by the social recognition they receive and that social injustices can be understood as failures of recognition within various spheres of life, such as love, work, and law; essentially arguing that the pursuit of social justice is deeply tied to the need for mutual recognition and respect.

According to Fleming (2016), Honneth believes modern society has three recognition orders. The **first form of relating** is self-confidence, which is established and developed in friendship and love relationships. If one, in our case, a student, experiences love, an ability to love oneself and others is developed, and one can forge an identity.

The **second type of relationship** is self-respect, When a person is recognised at this level, one is accepted as an autonomous person with both the right and the ability to participate in the discussions and debates of the institution and organisations of society.

The **third and highest form of recognition** is provided through work and the community, honouring one's contribution through work. Experiences of this nature lead to self-esteem. Relationships of solidarity with others at work and through collaborative social activities enhance one's self-esteem, and one is recognised as having something to contribute to the community.

These three forms of recognition constitute Honneth's version of the good life as they provide the conditions for successful identity development (Fleming, 2016).

Assessment

According to Wiliam (2011), for many years, the word ''assessment'' was used primarily to describe processes of evaluating the effectiveness of sequences of instructional activities when the sequence was completed. The actions that guided learning processes before the end of the sequence were generally not regarded as kinds of assessments.

Different researchers and authors define assessment more or less the same way as a central process or integral part of teaching and learning. Assessment is a central process in effective instruction. Only through assessment can lecturers determine whether a particular sequence of instructional activities has resulted in the intended learning outcomes (Wiliam, 2011).

McNamee and Jie-Qi (2005) and Burns (2005), as cited by Thawabieh (2017), state that assessment is an integral part of the teaching and learning process, and it is divided into three types:

- assessment of learning: provides data reports about student achievement.
- assessment for learning: integrates teaching and assessment and concentrates upon ongoing (formative) assessment that allows lecturers to monitor the student's progress.
- assessment as learning: concentrates upon metacognitive skills and helps students to become lifelong learners; it depends upon different assessment strategies, one of them being self-assessment.

Self-assessment

Self-assessment is a form of formative assessment in which students reflect on the quality of their work, judge the degree to which it reflects explicitly stated criteria, and revise accordingly. It is a set of abilities that encourages students to play an effective role in monitoring their learning process, provide suitable feedback, and enhance their self-learning, enabling them to be active learners (Andrade & Valtcheva, 2009; Allam, 2004; Rourke, 2013 and Thawabieh, 2017). Kilic and Saglam (2023) believe a classroom formative assessment is critical to student self-assessment. Self-assessment helps students become self-directed and self-regulated learners. Self-assessment involves students judging their learning, particularly their achievements and learning outcomes.

Tillema (2014) and Jónsson (2023) consider student involvement in assessment essential for learning as it develops a shared understanding of what it means to be a competent student. Student involvement in assessment raises interest and motivation for taking an active part in advancing their learning achievements. Translating assessment for students into practice is problematic because lecturers are reluctant to co-share assessment responsibilities with their students. According to Yan (2016) and Andrare (2019), self-assessment in higher education is conceptualised as either a personal ability or skill that can be used to evaluate one's knowledge, skills, and performance or as an instructional and learning process. Atrash et al. (2023) opine that self-assessment must be implemented as an evolving skill. It is bound to change according to content, relationships, and perspective,and the student's learning environment will further influence their confidence. Falchikov (2004) believes that it is possible to involve students in the assessment of work or performance in three distinct areas: traditional academic activity, performance in academic settings, and professional practice.

In self-assessment, students rate their performance against a set standard, while in peer assessment, they rate the performance of their peers. Schemes of assessment involving students may also include some degree of collaboration between staff and students, depending on whether, how, and to what extent the criteria of assessment are discussed and agreed upon by both parties. Assessment of professional practice typically takes place in medical, paramedical, clinical, dental or teaching contexts and the focus of assessment may be practical skills in surgery or anaesthesia, residency performance, physiotherapy or occupational therapy skills or classroom teaching (Falchikov, 2004).

The rationale behind student involvement in assessment is strong. It rests on three main reasons:

- to improve student learning,
- to improve assessment performance, and
- to nurture skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary for life beyond university (McArthur, 2021).

Researchers such as Sosibo (2019) conclude that during this learner-centred teaching and learning era, self-assessments are a viable tool to enable students to become autonomous and self-directed.

Peer Assessment

According to Topping (1998, p.250), peer assessment is "an arrangement in which individuals consider the amount, level, value, worth, quality, or success of the products or outcomes of learning of peers of similar status". It is a pedagogical strategy that requires students to evaluate their peer's efforts within an educational context to support their future learning. Peer assessment is frequently used in a formative manner to generate feedback that can support future efforts, and it has considerable benefits and significant impacts on student learning (Power & Tanner, 2023). El-Senousy (2020) and Dijks, Brummer and Kostons (2018) state that a peer assessment aims to improve students' understanding of the curriculum and to enhance their academic skills, which is why it has considerable benefits and significant impacts on student learning.

According to El-Senoussy (2020), peer assessment encourages students to think for themselves, increase their self-confidence, and take responsibility for their learning. A further advantage of peer assessment is that every student evaluates their work in such a way that enables them to identify the characteristic features and criteria for the tasks they are evaluating and to understand the curriculum better. As such, students no longer become passive receivers of evaluation; instead, they become evaluators capable of assessing not only their work but also the work of their peers.

Moderation

Bloxham (2009) defines moderation as a process for assuring an assessment outcome that is valid, fair, and reliable and that the marking criteria are applied consistently. In their paper Beutel, Adie and Lloyd (2016), moderation is a quality assurance process that plays a central role in higher education's teaching, learning, and assessment cycle.

Moderation is the way to ensure that an assessment outcome is valid and reliable for assessment tasks, fair in assessment judgments, that marking criteria have been applied consistently, appropriateness, and, as well as standards (Bloxham, 2009; Broadbent, 2017 and Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency [TEQSA], 2021). According to Bloxham (2009), if effective moderation has been followed, it improves reliability, reduces marker bias, weakens 'hard' or 'soft' markers, increases student and staff confidence in marking, and enhances staff development.

METHODOLOGY

This paper reflects on students' involvement in assessment and the role and practice of moderation as a quality assurance measure in assessment. It is a qualitative design paper where systemic desktop research was used. The systematic reviews follow structured and predefined methods to identify, appraise, and synthesise the relevant literature. Desktop research is a research method that involves the use of existing data. These are secondary collected and summarised data to increase the overall effectiveness of the investigation. Secondary research is much more cost-effective than primary research, as it uses existing data, unlike primary empirical research. The secondary literature was collected based on the history, challenges, and benefits of transdisciplinary research, teaching, and learning.

DISCUSSION

Although there are means of assessment available, we have however, always been more resistant to implement and have found reasons not to! For example, we have always felt that students will not do justice to "our" disciplines because it is new to them. However, through the literature above and practice, we understood that students can easily be involved in their own assessment, and they do not need policing from their lecturers to do that. In fact, the whole process is beneficial to both the lecturer and the students.

Self- and peer assessment, for example, can help improve students' cognitive skills. Many educators and authors such as Boud, Cohen et al. (1999), Falchikov and Goldfinch (2000) Orsmond, Merry et al. (2000) Liu and Carless (2006) have addressed and highlighted the benefits of including variety in students' teaching and learning, including assessment processes. Indeed, peer and self-assessment are the most common forms of student involvement in the assessment process. Various strategies are employed in higher education, teaching, and learning assessment to encourage students to be more involved in their learning process. In the coming sections, we will delve more into what we have learned about different approaches in assessment and moderation as components of quality assurance in higher learning. We will further reflect more on what we know and have practised and whether there are any contradictions in relation to what we would term "our newly acquired knowledge" and what is considered to be the norm.

Involving students in assessment through self-and peer assessment

Since we were students (in junior and senior years), assessment methods, which we will refer to as "traditional methods" in most institutions of higher learning, have remained almost the same. Universities mainly use these traditional assessment methods to distinguish between exceptionally bright students and those who are exceptionally dull. This misconception is due to the use of uniform assessment criteria for all students or lack of variety in students' assessment. As Andrare (2019) stated, assessment uniformity, like in learning, is inadequate or does not work. Researchers believe the assessment approach has always been based on what the lecturers expect or dictate. Students are just presented with module outlines, which state what they will be taught and how they will be assessed using formative and summative assessments. They are then expected to follow the rules stated in the assessment criteria of such a module. This approach is not entirely wrong or flawed, as it also instils some sense of discipline in students. However, the lack of involvement by students in the whole process, from formulation of the learning outcomes and assessment, results in a lack of ownership where students are just implementers of the set rules. After working on this research paper, one thing has become very clear: the involvement of students in their assessment should be made mandatory and addressed clearly in institutional policies. A question would be, how do we change the status quo? Should assessment approaches change more frequently than the currently used 5-year timeframe dictated by programme review periods?

Adding a student element when formulating learning outcomes and assessment criteria can improve students' feelings of ownership, resulting in better performance. We believe that for this success, an intense mindset change is required from both the students and lecturers. As lecturers with many years in higher education and having been involved in management as departmental heads, we believe the search for better approaches and practices in assessment and moderation must be ongoing. From undertaking this assignment and reviewing many articles on different assessment forms, we realise that continued training in assessment and moderation must be an ongoing process. For example, before this exercise, we did not realise the benefits of students' self and peer assessment. Since assessment is meant to show us how efficient our teaching is and what aspects of learning students are deficient at, the students can show us where and how we can improve our teaching and enhance their learning process through their involvement. During self-assessment, students can ask themselves, "What do I know, and how can I show my lecturer what I do not know?" The same questions can be asked during peer assessment, whether this is done through pairs or groups. Feedback from students' self and peer assessment can further assist us as lecturers or moderators in identifying what students know and their challenges through group work, for example.

Students' assessments must be done carefully and thoughtfully. Self-assessment and peer review can influence students' learning ability and improve their cognitive skills.

Generally, the assessment approach used in most universities in South Africa does not encourage critical thinking, nor does it prepare students for the world challenges upon leaving the university. Can students-based assessments address these shortcomings? The answer is "yes" and "no," and this will depend on 1) course outline content and 2) expected learning outcomes.

Our views on assessment have been significantly altered after working on this paper. Assessment of students has always been teacher-centred. To make learning student-centred, they should be part of the learning process, from learning outcome formulations to assessment criteria development.

Peer assessment is a process in which students provide feedback to other students to help each other to help improve their learning. When students give feedback to peers, they also strengthen their understanding of the lesson Learning Goals and Success Criteria, which, in turn, help them to assess their learning process.

Peer assessment also requires a classroom culture characterised by supportive, collaborative relationships between students and their lecturers, and this further leads to feelings of mutual trust among the students. In such a classroom culture, students understand they share responsibility for their own and their peers' learning. Part of this joint responsibility is to provide constructive, respectful, and non-judgmental feedback. Lecturer modelling is the most required approach, and it plays an essential role in establishing a culture for peer assessment. This provides a support structure, opportunities, and expectations for collaboration as designed by the concerned lecturer through constant process monitoring.

Involving students in teaching and learning practices such as programme design and assessment is still considered unconventional in most academic settings. However, this can change, and we firmly believe it must. We believe that to revolutionise teaching and learning, students, as the main stakeholders in our universities, must be fully involved in these crucial practices. They need to clearly understand why particular contents are included in the curriculum, especially the learning outcomes. There are many benefits related to this. For example, Yan, Wang, Boud et al. (2023) confirmed through their meta-analysis study that students' involvement in their own assessment is one of the major contributors to improved performance. It is, however, important to highlight that although this is the case, it does not necessarily mean it can be easy to implement. For this to succeed, students must be involved in programme design, which is not practised in most universities. At least from our experience, we know that students are not involved in program design and self-and peer assessment in our departments.

There will always be resistance from old school members of staff who believe in what they call a "traditional way of teaching and learning," e.g., the notion that students are told what to do, when to do it, and how to do it. Resistance can also be based on workload and time availability, as it was raised during the presentation of this assignment. In our view, these challenges can be overcome, and there are a number of ways that can be used. For example, more tutors and

teaching assistants should be employed to assist lecturers with assessment. In fact, Wald and Harland (2020) suggest that involving students as teaching assistants helps reduce the workload for lecturers and improves students' learning and cognitive skills. So, in another way, this is killing two birds with one stone! This will be more challenging, especially in an environment where young academic staff members are from the same institution, and these traditional modes of teaching and learning are the only approaches they know! This process will, therefore, require some form of dialogue between different parties involved. Assessment should determine whether students have acquired new knowledge or understanding or developed a particular skill or set of skills. Lecturers should avoid being over-prescriptive and restrict students' learning process to specific approaches; doing this can inhibit their cognitive skills.

Peer assessment allows students to understand how others perceive their work. Usually, after self-assessing, the student can think that their work is good or bad, but then other people can have a different opinion. But there is another side to peer assessment where it can result in anxiety in students due to fear of being judged by their peers. It might appear more acceptable to be judged by their lecturers than a peer.

Peer assessment can be daunting for students, especially during the introductory phase of their study. Answering questions like "Where do I start? How do I tell someone their work is not good enough or how do I approach their own when I am not sure what I am doing?" As stated earlier, peer assessment creates anxiety, which can further break down conversations between peers and this has been alluded to by (Petrosino, 2017). In our view, all these challenges can be addressed by various approaches.

Many researchers have discussed the impact of peer assessment and how it can increase or boost motivation among students and their peers. Suskie (2018) explains that students will feel an enhanced sense of ownership by taking assessment responsibility, a serious academic activity. It can further boost student's status in the learning process by encouraging some control over their own learning. It can further encourage the development of a wide range of skills in critical evaluation analysis. Peer assessment might increase a range of social and communication skills, including negotiation skills and diplomacy, verbal communication skills, giving and accepting criticism, justifying one's positions and assessing suggestions objectively."

The role of institutional and national policies in assessment

Students' assessment is not a stand-alone process as it is guided by policies formulated at institutional and national levels. However, these policies are not cast in stone, and certain circumstance can affect their implementation. For example, during COVID-19, teaching and learning policies in most universities had to be amended to accommodate online assessment, which was not the case before. In fact, Sims Lundie, Titus and Govender (2023) attributed the major changes made in assessment methods in various institutions of higher learning as the result of COVID-19. Even post-COVID, universities continue using a blended learning approach, with some assessments still being done online.

Role of students and faculties in the moderation process

Moderation is a form of quality control used at all learning levels, and it is used in higher learning institutions to implement formative and summative assessments. It seeks to ensure that assessors or markers adhere to pre-defined standards. Although this can appear challenging for students, we are sure that students can have a role in the moderation process if they are part of learning outcome and assessment criteria development. There are different ways this can be achieved. They include a) students can be provided with the standards or procedures used to assign their marks in conjunction with the assessment instrument; b) they should have the right to view the lecturer's and the moderator's mark sheet as a post-assessment moderation procedure; and lastly, c) they should have the right to appeal the grades. Although we carry out moderation to assure quality, this can further influence how we set assessments in the future. Moderation can also be influenced by external stakeholders such as employers and professional bodies, especially where students have to undergo experiential training.

We believe that students can contribute immensely to improving their quality of learning and cognitive skills when they are part of the moderation process. Although this is often taken lightly in our universities, other institutions where this is practised have seeded an improvement in students' performance. In most instances, students are already involved in moderation, where they are student assistants and tutors. Students' involvement in moderation requires resources and commitment from university management. Financial resources, for example, are needed to appoint and train students and tutors in moderation and assessment. It is, however, important to caution against using students as casual labourers in the process. They should still be treated as students and be given time to attend to their own studies.

Moderators can be viewed as guardians of fairness in the assessment process. They make sure that every student, irrespective of social status, geographical area, gender, or age, is provided with an equal opportunity or chance to demonstrate their ability. Moderators are expected to provide detailed feedback to lecturers or assessors to maintain the highest quality standard of learning in specific professions. Different stakeholders are expected to participate in the moderation process as part of the assessment. Although lecturers' or assessors' and HoDs' roles are clearly defined in most frameworks, this is not the case for students. Mostly, it appears as if their role is just to write tests and exams without taking any other meaningful roles in the moderation process. We also believe that engaging students as partners in the moderation process can play a significant role in improving their cognitive skills. Another way that students can be moderators is through the evaluation of lecturers, especially at the end of the semester. However, caution should be taken as such evaluations may pressure a lecturer to be more concerned with how much students like him/her rather than being concerned with instructing students on correcting their misconceptions and errors in their thinking processes.

Moderation does not end with assessment and allocation of marks, but it should also be carried out after the assessment has been completed. As a post-assessment activity, moderation can help to determine the causes of high failure and low pass rate. This can be more relevant in cases where professional bodies want to confirm that interpretations of students' progress and achievement align with other professional requirements. Another aspect of moderation that stood out for us was how it could improve continuous learning and its importance during program reviews. Where moderation outcomes are shared between students and lecturers, both parties can identify areas that impact their performance and how they can improve. We have given an example where students are expected to perform certain practical tasks and assessment and moderation processes are used to determine the practicality of such tasks. Moderation comprises a set of procedures designed to ensure quality assurance through monitoring and evaluation of assessments (Sandler, 2013). The characteristics of moderation activity include fairness, validity, reliability, consistency, sufficiency and authenticity (Sandler, 2013). Goss (2021) summarises this perfectly by stating that assessment and moderation can be challenging and tedious, especially when assessing comprehension and knowledge are of primary concern. However, then again, teaching is not an easy career!

Internal pre-moderation, in Williams, Johnston, and Averill's (2022) contextual framework, places students at the centre of moderation, thus highlighting the important role they play in this process. Experience of most of us working as lecturers in higher learning institutions and involved in the moderation of assessment materials, students' involvement is minimal. Their inclusion can, however, be viewed as a crucial process that requires time and attention to ensure the validity and sufficiency of assessment materials. In this regard, the university management, especially the heads of departments and programme coordinators, is responsible for designing how students can be included in the moderation process.

Miller (2018) believes moderation is practised to instil professional and community confidence in the quality of the institution's programmes and the graduates it produces. Hence, the moderation process focuses on ensuring an assessment's quality. This is why moderation of assessments should be undertaken in line with the principles of moderation. Thus, moderation should ensure the assessment is fair, valid, and reliable.

Each discipline approaches self-assessment differently, but the benefits remain the same. For example, students can self-assess their performance in the natural sciences through life experiences such as laboratory-based practical. Self-assessment requires students to judge the quality of their own work against selected criteria, identify the gap between their current and the desired performance standard and take actions to close that gap.

One of the most significant highlights of this paper was the acknowledgement by other scholars on the challenges associated with the currently used assessment methods. Going through literature has given us a new perspective on student assessment. From this experience, we have learned that it is imperative to include students in their learning process, including assessment. We have also realised that there is more to students' assessment than just giving assignments, tests, and quizzes. We further realised that different factors positively or negatively influencing learning could do the same with assessment. An example can be students' everyday use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), especially when writing assignments. This becomes more challenging when lecturers are unfamiliar with the different AI tools students use. In our view, AI should not be a challenge; instead, it should be used to improve teaching and learning, and universities must use monitoring tools to regulate its use-self and peer assessment at different academic levels to improve cognitive students' learning. Many authors have investigated the positive roles of self and peer assessment in higher education environments, and they all concluded that both assessments (continuous and summative assessments) are more beneficial in students learning. The results further show that students respond to both assessment methods positively, and this attitude improves with time. The same, however, could not be said when coming to the new students who found both assessment methods to be more intimidating and daunting. Assessing students is never an easy task. It is a process that must be carefully and thoughtfully done to emphasise improving student learning outcomes. In this piece, we self-reflected and critically analysed our own preconceptions and what we have learned regarding students' assessments, especially self-and peer assessments.

Undertaking the reviewed literature, which addressed students' self-and peer assessment, has broadened and altered our views on assessment and moderation. The following discussion below also provides our reflection on the literature reviewed addressing students' involvement in the assessment process and the role and practice of moderation as a quality assurance measure in assessment. Whilst reviewing the literature, we had an opportunity to critically reflect on our teaching and areas that need major improvements. One such area was our approach to assessment and how this impacts students' performance in general. The most intriguing was to realise the positive impact that can be achieved through self-assessment and peer assessment in many disciplines. Reflecting on our own assessment approach, we realised that there are both strengths and weaknesses. The strengths include applying assessment criteria that improve problem-solving skills, such as the use of case studies. This approach helps students to retain knowledge and master their skills. Weaknesses are mainly putting more emphasis on surface learning and assessing students analytically. Not involving students either through self- or peer assessment is also lacking in our assessment approach and this is what we reflected on in this piece.

Assessment is one of the most crucial aspects of the educative process in teaching and learning. However, one thing we have learned in the development of this presentation is that different assessment approaches can have a different impact on student learning ability. Although the intention of the educator is always good, not all students benefit from the methods used in the same way. Creating a culture of learning and excellence in students should be a goal of every lecturer and this can be achieved through students' involvement in moderation and assessment.

CONCLUSION

Involving students in the assessment and moderation helps them to take more responsibility for their learning by assuming an active role in the learning process through self-and peer assessment. Engaging students as partners in activities involving self-moderation, self-assessment, and self-evaluation of their test performance and progress in learning can not only enhance their strengths and reduce their weaknesses but also help them learn in greater depth and develop their higher and lower-order cognitive skills (Tsaparlis, Zoller, Fastow, & Lubezky 1999).

Self- and peer assessment form an important component of the student learning process. This should be clearly addressed and should form part of university policies on teaching, learning, moderation, and assessment. Programmes can also be designed in such a way that the role of students in the moderation and assessment processes is more clearly defined. The framework developed by Williams et al. (2023) provides a well-defined approach that universities can use as an analytical tool when designing and evaluating their moderation policies. This made researchers understand the importance and impact of this whole process and how much attention it actually deserves. The same applies to the moderation process and the role of different approaches and their impact in ensuring the quality of learning and assessment. This is for both students and the lecturers. As lecturers involved in various teaching and learning activities, we have always been aware of the importance of students' contributions to their own learning processes. However, we would not involve them in assessment, grading, and moderation. This mainly included class discussions, writing tests, assignments, and quizzes as a form of assessment, and receiving feedback on time.

REFERENCES

1. Andrade, H. L. (2019). "A Critical Review of Research on Student Self-Assessment." *Frontiers in Education* 4: 4. doi:10.3389/feduc.2019.00087.
2. Atrash, H., Katz-Leurer, M. & Shahar, G. 2023. The effect of assessment on student competence in physiotherapy clinical training: a randomized controlled trial. *BMC Medical Education,* 23: 780. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04737-9
3. Beutel, D., Adie, L., & Lloyd, M. (2016). Assessment moderation in an Australian context: processes, practices, and challenges. *Teaching in Higher Education,* 22(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2016.1213232.
4. Bloxham, S, (2009). Marking and moderation in the UK: False assumptions and wasted resources. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education Vol.* 34(2): 209-220
5. Boud, D., R. Cohen & J. Sampson (1999). "Peer Learning and Assessment." Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 24(4): 413–426.
6. Broadbent, J. (2017). Large class teaching: how does one go about the task of moderating large volumes of assessment? Active Learning in Higher Education. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417721360
7. Burns, M. (2005). Looking at how students reason. *Educational Leadership, Vol.* 63(3), 26–31.
8. Dijks MA, Brummer L & Kostons D 2018. The anonymous reviewer: The relationship between perceived expertise and the perceptions of peer feedback in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, Vol.* 43(8):1258–1271. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1447645
9. Falchikov, N. (2004). Involving students in assessment. *Psychology Learning and Teaching,* 3(2). 102–108.
10. El- El-Senousy, H. (2020). How peer assessment could be interactive and effective. *South African Journal of Education. Vol.* 40(2). 1-14. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40n2a1651
11. Falchikov, N. & J. Goldfinch (2000). "Student Peer Assessment in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Peer and Teacher Marks." Review of Educational Research 70(3): 287–322.
12. Fleming, T. (2026). The Critical Theory of Axel Honneth: Implications for
13. Transformative Learning and Higher Education. Victor C.X. Wang (Ed.), *Theory and Practice of Adult and Higher Education.* New York: Information Age Publishing
14. Goss, H. 2022. Student learning outcomes assessment in higher education and in academic libraries: A review of literature. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship,* 48. 102485.
15. Honneth, A. (2014). Freedom's right: The social foundations of democratic life. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
16. Iglesias Pérez, M. C., Vidal-Puga, J., & Pino Juste, M. R. (2020). The role of self and peer assessment in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education,* 47(3), 683–692. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1783526.
17. Jónsson, Í. R. (2023). Student involvement in assessment and power relations: teacher's perspective. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society,* 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2023.2186930.
18. Kilic, D & Saglam, N. (2023). The Use of Self-Assessment in Improving Pre-Service Teachers' Professional Development. *Science Insights Education Frontiers Vol.*19(2). 3057-3071. 10.15354/sief.23.or436.
19. Liu, N.-F. & Carless, D. (2006). "Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment." Teaching in Higher Education 11(3): 279–290.
20. McNamee, G., & Jie-Qi, C. (2005). Dissolving the line between assessment and teaching. *Educational Leadership. Vol.* 63(3), 72–77.
21. Mulrooney, H.M. (2019). Exploring self-assessments in university undergraduate students: how accurate are they? *New Directions in the Teaching of Physical Sciences, Vol.* (14). https://doi.org/10.29311/ndtps.v0i14.3208
22. Orsmond, P., S. Merry & K. Reiling (2000). "The Use of Student Derived Marking Criteria in Peer and Self-assessment." Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 25(1): 23-38.

23. Petrosina, K. 2017. Reflective peer review: A metacognitive Approach. In: Student Success in Writing Conference. Georgia Southern University, USA.

24. Power, J. R., & Tanner, D. (2023). Peer assessment, self-assessment, and resultant feedback: an examination of feasibility and reliability. *European Journal of Engineering Education, Vol.* 48(4). 615–628. https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2023.2185769.

25. Sadler, D. R. (2013). Assuring academic achievement standards: From moderation to calibration. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 20: 5-19.

26. Sims, D., Lundie, S., Titus, S. & Govender, R. 2023. Shifting assessment paradigms in South African higher education: Evolving towards transformative approaches to policy development. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South*, 7(3): 138-170.

27. Sosibo, Z.C. (2019). Self-Assessment: A Learner-Centred Approach towards Transforming Traditional Practices and Building Self-Directed Learners. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *Vol.* 33 (5), 76–97. https://doi.org/10.20853/33-5-3586.

28. *Suskie L. (2018). Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide, 3rd Edition. Copyright © 2018, Wiley.*

29. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). (2021). Higher Education Standards Framework - Threshold Standards 2021. Commonwealth of Australia. https://www.legislation.gov.au/F2021L00488/latest/text.

30. Thawabieh, A.M. (2017). A Comparison between Students' Self-Assessment and Teachers' Assessment. *Journal of Curriculum and Teaching*, *Vol.* 6(1). 14–20. http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/jct.v6n1p14.

31. Tillema, H. (2014). Student Involvement in Assessment of their Learning. In: Wyatt-Smith, C., Klenowski, V., Colbert, P. (eds) Designing Assessment for Quality Learning. The Enabling Power of Assessment, Vol 1. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5902-2_3.

32. Topping, K. (1998). Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities.

33. *Review of Educational. Research, Vol.* 68. 249–276. doi: 10.3102/00346543068003249.

34. Tsaparlis, G., Zoller, U., Fastow, M., & Lubezky, A. (1999). Students' self-assessment in chemistry examinations requiring higher- and lower-order cognitive skills. *Journal of Chemical Education,* 76(1), 112.

35. Wald, N & Harland, T. 2020. Re-thinking the teaching roles and assessment responsibilities of student teaching assistants. *Journal of Further and Higher Education,* 44(1): 43-53.

36. Wiliam, D. (2011). What is assessment for learning? *Studies in Educational Evaluation, Vol.* 37. 3–14.

37. Williams, A.H., Johnston, M.B. & Averill, R. (2023). Theorising a contextual framework for moderation of internal assessment: development and opportunities. *Education Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability,* 35: 449-469.

38. Yan, Z. (2016). "The Self-Assessment Practices of Hong Kong Secondary Students: Findings with a New Instrument." *Journal of Applied Measurement,* 17 (3): 1–19.

39. Yan, Z., Wang, X., Boud, D. & Lao, H. (2023). The effect of self-assessment on academic performance and the role explicitness: a meta-analysis. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education,* 48(1): 1-15.