Assessment Procedures

1. Governing policy

The Assessment Procedures ("procedures") support the implementation of the Assessment Policy and Grading Policy. These procedures outline key processes relating to the design of assessment, the implementation of assessments tasks for students and the validation, moderation of assessment which are integral components of the quality assurance process.

2. Scope

These procedures apply to all students, staff and others associated with, or contracted by, the Institution who are responsible for conducting assessments.

3. Procedures

3.1 Design

3.1.1   All assessments are designed in accordance with these procedures and the Assessment Policy.

3.1.2   Artificial intelligence (AI) technology may be utilised for the design of assessments in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED) Framework, Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessment Guidelines, and the Artificial Intelligence Policy.

3.2 Modes of assessment

3.2.1   A variety of assessment methods are utilised to support student learning, to recognise the diverse needs of all students and to provide students with an opportunity to complete their assessment work in a manner that is meaningful and/or significant to them.

3.2.2   Assessment is both summative and formative, and is aimed to scaffold assessment so that it contributes to subsequent learning and builds upon existing knowledge to ensure subject learning outcomes are met.

3.2.3   Students must make a genuine attempt, and submit, all assessment tasks that are set for a subject, otherwise they may not have achieved all learning

outcomes satisfactorily to pass a subject.

Formative assessments and tasks

3.2.4   This type of assessment may comprise non-weighted assessment tasks or formative assessments that count towards the student's grade for a subject.

3.2.5   Formative assessment is used to gather information about a student's understanding and progress during the learning process. These assessments provide ongoing feedback to both staff and students to help improve learning and teaching and help identify students who are not engaging or who may need additional support.

3.2.6   Early, formative assessment tasks should be included in all subjects. Feedback on these assessments should be provided to the students before subsequent assessments are due to be submitted.

3.2.7   Formative assessments may include the following types (but not limited to):

- Quizzes
- Class discussions
- Self-assessment or reflection
- Peer-reviews of work
- Polls
- Surveys
- Think/pair/share
- Conceptual questions

Summative assessments

3.2.8   Summative assessment is a type of evaluation that is used to measure a student's overall learning and achievement towards the end of a study period. Assessment is focused on the outcomes of the learning experience.

3.2.9   Summative assessments are designed in accordance with the Assessment Policy. Effective summative assessments should offer opportunities for students to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities in an authentic, reliable and valid manner.

3.2.10   Refer to the Assessment Equivalency Table for the categories and types of assessments.

3.3 Academic integrity

3.3.1   Prevention of academic misconduct is central to the design of assessment tasks as well as the processes by which they are administered and marked.

3.3.2   To prevent academic misconduct in assessment design, the following should be adhered to:

- Follow the Institution's referencing guides.
- All students must sign or electronically acknowledge a declaration that work they are submitting for assessment is their own and is free from collusion, plagiarism, and other forms of academic misconduct.
- Utilise a mix of assessment methods, such as reports, tests, presentations, and projects, to reduce the chances of students sharing answers or plagiarising.
- Incorporate artificial intelligence literacy into the assessment design, defining specific categories of artificial intelligence that are permitted for use.
- When using online platforms to deliver assessments, employ secure browser settings, proctoring software, or IP tracking to deter cheating for assessments carrying a 25% weighting or higher (each or accumulative) towards the subject grade.
- Modify assessments from one study period to the next, or use a question bank to discourage sharing of previous answers. If using online quizzes, randomise questions and answer choices to make it harder for students to share answers during timed tests.
- Apply authentic assessment design principles by using authentic topics, case studies, or scenarios for reports or projects, making it difficult for students to find pre-written material online.
- Craft questions that require critical thinking and application rather than simple retrieval of information.
- Design assessments that involve in class exercises, discussions, debates, or oral presentations, where students must actively engage and demonstrate understanding of the learning outcomes.
- Provide early, formative assessments to gauge student progress and

identify any areas where students may be struggling, allowing for timely intervention.

3.3.3   Refer to the following policies and procedures for creating a fair and ethical assessment environment that promotes academic integrity:

- Academic Integrity Policy
- Academic Integrity Procedures
- Artificial Intelligence in Education Guidelines.

3.4 Student workloads and assessment weighting/timing

3.4.1   Assessments are appropriately spaced throughout the study period and achievable by students in the allocated timeframe.

3.4.2   When setting an assessment task, careful consideration is given to:
a. the time required to complete the task in relation to the learning outcomes and the overall volume of learning for the subject;
b. the relative weighting of the assessment task;
c. the relative timing and due dates of tasks; and
d. the impact on staff and student workload.

3.4.3   No single assessment task can be worth more than 50 % of the total assessment of the subject, except for capstone projects.

3.4.4   Refer to the Assessment Equivalency Table for the allocation of workloads and weightings in assessments.

3.5 Groupwork

3.5.1   Assessment must be aligned to learning outcomes. Consequently, the quality and process of groupwork should only be assessed when it forms part of the learning outcomes.

3.5.2   Groupwork must be structured in such a way that all students are able to demonstrate attainment of all the learning outcomes mapped to the task.

3.5.3   Group assessments over 25% are peer reviewed by other students within the group.

3.5.4   Appropriate guidance and support is provided to students undertaking

groupwork.

3.6 Hurdle assessments

3.6.1   A hurdle assessment is a type of assessment that determines if a student has met specific criteria or "hurdles" necessary to progress to the next level or to achieve a particular goal. It is typically used in situations where there are predetermined criteria that must be met to proceed, such as subject prerequisites or professional registration requirements.

3.6.2   A hurdle assessment mandates a minimum level of performance as a condition of passing the subject.

3.6.3   Hurdle assessments are clearly specified in the Subject Outline including the requirements for performance. Students are notified prior to the assessment of the reasons why the assessment is considered a hurdle assessment and the learning outcome that is being assessed.

3.6.4   The following statement is provided in the assessment briefing: "This assessment is a hurdle assessment. Hurdle requirements are a condition other than the overall mark that must be met for students to pass a subject. Failing a hurdle requirement will result in a fail grade for the subject."

3.6.5   Hurdle assessments may only be used for:
a. assurance of learning to ensure subject and course learning outcomes have been fulfilled;
b. accreditation or fitness to practice purposes; and/or
c. Work Health and Safety purposes.

3.7 Work-integrated learning assessment

3.7.1   Work-integrated learning (WIL) assessment means the assessment of learning that is conducted through "real world" tasks requiring students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in meaningful contexts.

3.7.2   Wherever possible, assessment should embody partnership pedagogy by being co-created with stakeholders to ensure authenticity, relevance and engagement.

3.7.3   Methods of assessment are appropriate for the level and nature of

learning outcomes.

3.7.4   Refer to the Employability Procedures – Work Integrated Learning (WIL) for the requirements regarding WIL.

3.8 Supplementary assessments

3.8.1   Supplementary assessments are permitted under certain circumstances only. Refer to the Supplementary Assessment Procedures for more information.

3.9 Equity and reasonable adjustments

3.9.1   All students are provided with equivalent opportunities for academic success. The design of assessment must have regard to the best approach when dealing with students with needs such as low literacy, lack of confidence or non-English speaking background.

3.9.2   To meet the needs of all students, reasonable adjustments may be made to the way assessments are conducted (but not to the requirements of the assessment). The purpose of these adjustments is to enhance fairness and flexibility so that the specific needs of students can be met.

3.9.3   Reasonable adjustments are made in accordance with the Disability Policy and Student Disability Support Procedures.

3.10 Communication of assessment requirements

3.10.1   Clear assessment information is provided to students in the Subject Outline and Assessment Briefing, and communicated by lecturers throughout the study period.

3.10.2   Assessment information includes timelines relating to when the task is set, when it is due, when, and how feedback is provided.

3.10.3   Assessment criteria and performance standards are made available to students at the beginning of the study period and no later than the point at which the task is given.

3.10.4   Students are responsible for their learning and are expected to actively engage with, and attempt, all assessment tasks, including carefully reading the guidance provided, understanding criteria, spending sufficient time on the task,

taking the initiative where appropriate, and submitting work on time.

3.11 Assessment submission and extensions

3.11.1   Refer to the Assessment, Submission, Extension and Feedback Procedures for information on submitting assessments and how to request an extension.

3.12 Feedback

3.12.1   Feedback is timely and meaningful to support student learning.

3.12.2   Assessment feedback is provided to students in Moodle (this ensures feedback is recorded and available for review past subject sign off).

3.12.3   Refer to the Assessment, Submission, Extension and Feedback Procedures for more information.

3.14 Grading

3.14.1   Assessment tasks are graded consistently across the Institution in accordance with the Grading Policy.

3.15 Validation of assessment

3.15.1   Validation of assessment refers to the process of evaluating and confirming the reliability and accuracy of assessment methods to ensure they effectively measure the intended learning outcomes and provide valid and meaningful results.

3.15.2   Validation is an ongoing, cyclical quality review process which typically occurs during the assessment design process for new courses to ensure alignment across assessment documentation in accordance with the Assessment Policy, and after moderation for existing courses to facilitate future improvement to assessments. It involves the peer review of grading rubrics, marking criteria, alignment of assessment methods with the relevant learning outcomes, that the format, content and criteria for assessment are set at an appropriate AQF level and that risks to academic integrity are mitigated.

3.15.3   The Program Manager (PM) (who work closely with the Subject Leads/lecturers) is responsible for determining when and how often each

assessment is validated in relation to various risks factors which may include, but not limited to:

- The use of new assessment methods
- Subjects deemed "high risk" or "high volume", such as low attendance/attrition/failure rates
- Changes in technology, workplace processes, legislation, and licensing requirements
- Moderation outcomes
- Other documented risks identified by the Institution, industry or regulatory bodies
- Comprehensive course review or course re-accreditation

3.15.4   The PM is responsible for allocating subjects to lecturers (and Subject Leads if applicable) for validation. Typically, at least two members of staff are involved in validating assessments. At least one of those staff members must have had no involvement in the design or delivery of the assessment.

3.15.5   The PM collates the following documentation for the validation process:

- Assessment Policy and Assessment Procedures
- Subject Outline
- Constructive alignment
- Assessment matrix
- Assessment briefing
- Sample answers & invigilation requirements (if any)
- Grading rubrics and marking criteria
- For existing assessments, a sample of assessment artefacts taken from a cross section of grade bands (e.g. Pass, Distinction, etc) (if any)
- For existing assessments, any moderation feedback for assessments that have been delivered previously (if any)

3.15.6   Validators are asked to:

- Review the subject outline, course content, and structure.
- Evaluate the assessment against the materials provided in accordance with the Assessment Policy.
- Review a sample of graded assessments if applicable
- Complete the Validation eForm

- Any moderation feedback on assessments that have (if any) been delivered previously (if any)

3.15.7 The PM (or delegate) analyses the completed validation form and associated outcomes to inform future improvements in assessment design.

3.15.8 The PM (or delegate) must ensure that all new assessments and any updates to the existing assessments are validated before granting final approval.

3.15.9 The PM reports any recommendations on course and subject review as a result of validation to the Course and Subject Committee.

3.15.10 The PMs ensure that assessment standards in all courses are periodically benchmarked against similar courses in other providers and/or with relevant stakeholders (for example, industry partners or employers) in accordance with the External Referencing Procedures.

3.16 Moderation of assessment

3.16.1 Moderation of assessment involves a systematic process of reviewing and adjusting assessment results to ensure consistency and fairness across different assessors, grading rubric, marking criteria, and assessment contexts.

3.16.2 All newly hired academic staff are briefed about grading rubrics, marking criteria and practices as part of their induction for the purpose of calibrating their approach. This ensures that assessment judgments are comparable and staff have the necessary information to impartially evaluate and assess a student's evidence against established sets of outcomes.

3.16.3   The PM is responsible for ensuring the newly hired staff member is capable of:

- Interpreting and understanding the alignment of the assessments with the subject learning outcomes, the grading rubric, marking guide and marking criteria.
- Ensuring that evidence meets the standards;
- Ensuring that evidence is fair, valid, sufficient, authentic, current and independent; and
- Has expertise to make fair and objective judgements.

3.16.4   Ongoing moderation briefings are provided to staff on occasions such as Faculty Day, and/or professional development sessions prior to the assessments.

3.16.5   The PM (or Subject Lead if applicable) is responsible for checking the consistency of marking and grading process against the grading rubric, marking criteria and maintaining regular contact with lecturers throughout the study period, during the moderation of assessment phase and the moderation of grading phase prior to the Board of Examiners.

3.16.6   The PM (or Subject Lead if applicable) collates the following documentation for the moderation process:

- A number of sample assessments, ranging from fail, pass, credit, distinction and high distinction from each lecturer
- Assessment criteria, grading rubric, marking criteria and instructions to lecturers

3.16.7   The lecturers mark the assessments and identify the allocated mark to each criterion in the marking criteria, as well as provide general comments.

3.16.8   The PMs reviews and identifies any major discrepancies between grades/marks. If a major discrepancy of the weighting of the assessment is detected, a meeting of the lecturers is convened and the reasons for the discrepancies are discussed to reach a consensus. If a consensus cannot be reached, the matter is referred to the Dean who makes a final decision.

3.16.9   The PM (or Subject Lead if applicable) provides the moderation feedback to the lecturer, and decide if further training or performance management is needed.

3.16.10 The PMs document the sign-off process. The Board of Examiners (BOE) meet to agree the grades.

3.16.11   If any subjects are identified as "high risk" or when assessment tasks are borderline for moderation, the PM (or Subject Lead if applicable) convene a moderation meeting with lecturers from the subject to discuss any variance that arises from the samples. The PM facilitates the meeting to reach consensus through discussion. The BOE to consider if moderation of a whole group/class is required to assess whether an adjustment of assessment results is allowed or

necessary for consistency and fairness.

3.16.12 If consensus cannot be reached, the PM refers the process to the Dean who implements expert moderation using either their expertise or those of another suitable academic with appropriate expertise.

3.16.13 Once grades have been agreed, sample papers from each band in the grading scale are distributed to all lecturers undertaking the subject and are stored in a repository for future training.

3.16.14 Using the Moderation eForm, lecturers are encouraged to provide recommendations and feedback on consistency and improvements for the future.

3.16.15 The PM reports to the Dean if there are any changes recommended to the assessment design, marking guide, grading rubric and marking criteria.

3.16.16 If there are any changes recommended to the subject and/or the course, the PM actions the recommendations in accordance with the Subject Development, Review and Approval Procedures and/or the Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures, and report to the next subsequent Course and Subject Committee.

3.16.17 The PMs ensure that assessment standards in all courses are periodically benchmarked against similar courses in other providers and/or with relevant stakeholders (for example, industry partners or employers). Refer to the External Referencing Procedure for details.

3.16.18 All assessments are monitored regularly and are comprehensively reviewed at least once during the course accreditation cycle, or as required by professional accreditation bodies.

3.17 Ratification of results

3.17.1 All results and grades are ratified at the Board of Examiners as per the terms of reference outlined in the Governance Charter.

3.18 Review of assessment results

3.18.1 Students may formally request a review of their assessment result in a subject, provided that there are academic or procedural grounds for the request.

Refer to the Student Review of Assessment Results Procedures for more information.

4. Roles and responsibilities

4.1   The Deputy Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) has executive oversight of the implementation of these procedures.

4.2   The Academic Board is responsible for monitoring academic quality and achievement standards across all the Institution's courses.

4.3   The Course and Subject Committee (CSC) is responsible for reviewing, monitoring and reporting of all assessment across the Institution.

4.4   The Board of Examiners is responsible for approving subject grades and make recommendations on progression and completion matters.

4.4   Program Managers are responsible for validating, moderating, monitoring an identifying risks to assessments at the course level in collaboration with their course teams.

4.5   Subject Leads (or lecturers if there is no Subject Lead for a subject) are responsible for the design and development of effective assessment at the subject level in collaboration with their subject teams. Subject Leads ensure all students receive timely and constructive feedback on their assessment. Subject Leads collate a full listing of marks for each student and assessment item when marking and moderation has been completed.

4.6   The Learning, Design and Innovation team advises on assessment design.

4.7   External reviewers assess the quality of assessment within a subject or course. Reviewers may be asked to comment specifically on assessment efficacy in measuring level of achievement of student learning outcomes, including both assessment methods and grading of student assessments; assessment alignment to relevant AQF criteria in terms of measuring achievement of AQF/qualification levels and that grading meets sector norms.

5. Related documents

Assessment Policy

Assessment, Submission, Extension and Feedback Procedures
Disability Policy
Student Disability Support Procedures
Student Examination Rules
Supplementary Assessment Procedures
Assessment Equivalency Table
External Referencing Procedures
Academic Integrity Policy
Academic Integrity Procedures
Artificial Intelligence in Education Framework.
Employability Procedures—Work Integrated Learning
Course and Subject Policy
Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures
Learning and Teaching Policy
Course Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures
Subject Outline Policy
Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy
Guidelines for Implementing the Learning and Teaching Principles
Grading Policy
Student Review of Assessment Results

Approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee on 7 November 2023 (updated by Academic Board on 17 June 2024)