



THE UNIVERSITY OF
NOTRE DAME
A U S T R A L I A

Procedure:

Assessment in Higher Education Coursework, ELICOS and Enabling Courses

Effective: 21 July 2020

Audience: Staff and Students

Policy Category: Academic

Policy Sub-category: Learning and Teaching

Key words:	Assessment, Coursework, Enabling
Procedure Owner:	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic
Responsible Officer:	National Director, Learning and Teaching
Review Date:	26 June 2023

Contents

1	PURPOSE.....	3
2	RELATED DOCUMENTS	3
	SECTION A: NEW OR REVISED CURRICULUM	3
3	PLANNING AND DESIGNING ASSESSMENT.....	3
4	COMMUNICATING LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESSES – COURSE OUTLINES 5	5
5	ASSESSMENT AND GRADING	6
6	PLANNING FOR MODERATION OF ASSESSMENT TASKS.....	7
7	ACADEMIC INTEGRITY	8
	SECTION B: DURING TEACHING PERIOD.....	8
8	CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE COURSE OUTLINE	8
9	SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	9
10	PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION.....	9
11	ETHICAL AND HONEST MARKING AND GRADING	9
12	ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK.....	10
13	QUALITY ASSURANCE OF ASSESSMENT JUDGEMENTS – MODERATION OF MARKS AND GRADES	10
14	RE-SUBMISSION OF ASSESSMENT	11
15	RE-MARKING AN ASSESSMENT	11
16	STUDENT ACCESS TO EXAMINATION SCRIPTS.....	12
17	INVIGILATED EXAMINATION.....	12
18	DEFFERRED EXAMINATION (including final examinations)	12
19	SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMINATION	12
20	IRREGULARLY SCHEDULED EXAMINATION.....	12
	SECTION C: CONCLUSION OF EACH TEACHING PERIOD	12
21	RESULTS	13
22	REVIEW BY SCHOOL COMMITTEE.....	13
23	APPROVAL, MONITORING AND REVIEW OF FINAL GRADES	14
24	APPEAL OF A FINAL MARK.....	14
25	MONITORING AND PEER REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT	14
26	ASSESSMENT RECORDS	15
27	DEFINITIONS	15
28	PROCESS SUMMARY.....	18

1 PURPOSE

- 1.1 This Procedure outlines processes to support implementation of the *Policy: Assessment in Higher Education Coursework, ELICOS and Enabling Courses*.
- 1.2 The processes described in this document follow the chronological academic teaching and assessment cycle, including requirements prior to teaching period and/or the delivery of a program or course for the first time (Section A), during teaching periods (Section B) and after teaching periods (Section C), and provides for review, improvement and quality assurance of assessment.

2 RELATED DOCUMENTS

- 2.1 This Procedure should be read in conjunction with the following documents:
 - 2.1.1 University, School and Course Regulations
 - 2.1.2 *Policy: Assessment in Higher Education Coursework, ELICOS and Enabling Courses*
 - 2.1.3 *Policy: Academic Integrity (Students)*
 - 2.1.4 *Policy: Student Appeals*
 - 2.1.5 *Policy: Examinations*
 - 2.1.6 *Policy: Course Outlines*
 - 2.1.7 *Policy: Misconduct*
 - 2.1.8 *Policy: Code of Conduct (Staff)*
 - 2.1.9 *Policy: Students with a Disability*
 - 2.1.10 *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Act 2011*
 - 2.1.11 *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015*
 - 2.1.12 *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*
 - 2.1.13 *Disability Standards for Education 2005*
 - 2.1.14 *Guidelines: Board of Examiners*
 - 2.1.15 *Guideline: Use of Text Matching Software*

SECTION A: NEW OR REVISED CURRICULUM

This section:

- (a) outlines the requirements for assessment in the development of new and / or revised curriculum;
- (b) information students require before commencement of a course of study within a Course Outline; and
- (c) describes the expected decision making processes and practices that Academic Staff should follow in developing appropriate and clearly articulated assessment expectations and for determining the standards and subsequent awarding of marks / and or grades for student work.

3 PLANNING AND DESIGNING ASSESSMENT

- 3.1 Indicative assessment methods should be determined prior to approval of a new Program so that adequate information can be provided for governance committees involved in Program approval to ensure that relevant Standards in the *Higher Education Standards Framework*

(Threshold Standards) 2015 have been met.

- 3.2** The process for designing assessment for a proposed Program should be informed by independent review by person/s not involved in the Program design and delivery team prior to formal submission of the proposal to the Program and Course Accreditation Committee (PCAC). A School Learning and Teaching Committee, Program Advisory Committee, or similar may be used.
- 3.3** The assessment tasks designed for a Program should be benchmarked against comparable disciplinary and/or professional standards, within and outside of the University. This may be achieved in the following ways:
 - 3.3.1 External Referencing with an external higher education institution with Programs in the same discipline area.
 - 3.3.2 Benchmarking (or expert peer review) with a professional association.
 - 3.3.3 Peer review with relevant Academic Staff within the University with experience in the same or a similar Program and at a similar stage of the Program.
- 3.4** Assessment design is an integral feature of the curriculum development process for new Programs and is an on-going responsibility of teaching teams in the implementation and improvement of approved Programs. Examples of different types of assessment tasks are outlined in *The University of Notre Dame Australia's Graduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching for Higher Education*. Program design teams, led by the Program Coordinator, and teaching teams led by the Course Coordinator, should ensure that:
 - 3.4.1 Assessment across the program aligns with the achievement of expected program and course learning outcomes that are required for the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) level (where applicable) and in the standards for the discipline and/or profession where relevant.
 - 3.4.2 Processes are followed to establish that assessment practices are valid and reliable, including benchmarking and peer review of assessment design and grading practices against comparable courses in similar programs in other institutions; and
 - 3.4.3 The assessment methods employed provide a balance of formative and summative assessment where:
 - 3.4.3.1 formative tasks are used to assist Students' understanding of the criteria and standards;
 - 3.4.3.2 there is a focus on developing student capacity to make effective use of the feedback they receive; and
 - 3.4.3.3 summative tasks are used to ensure there is evidence of Students' level of achievement of the stated learning outcomes.
 - 3.4.4 There is no single assessment task within a course, including examinations, that is weighted more than 50 per cent of the overall course result unless it is:
 - 3.4.4.1 a requirement of an professional accrediting body;
 - 3.4.4.2 a capstone, project-based or portfolio-based task or thesis. For such tasks, it is expected that Students will be provided with several instances of detailed formative feedback on the work and, for projects, submission of stages/sections of the project may constitute separate assessment items, and laboratory reports that lead to the decision to send Students to clinical settings.
 - 3.4.5 Where the Course assessment entails Students working in groups, a requisite proportion of the grade is allocated to individual performance.
 - 3.4.6 An early low-stakes or formative assessment task is included in all Courses so as to provide Students with individual feedback on progress, such that they receive that

feedback prior to the Census Date.

3.4.7 Minus marking is not used as part of any assessment.

- 3.5 Each School will have a clear process for approval of necessary changes and updates to the Course Outline. A School Learning and Teaching Committee, Program Advisory Committee, or similar may be used.
- 3.6 Changes to assessment task type, task weighting or alignment to learning outcomes must be approved by this School process. Some assessment changes may also require approval from the Program and Courses Approval Committee - as identified in the relevant Procedure: Higher Education Course Approval, Amendment and Discontinuation.
- 3.7 Attendance requirements in and of themselves must not be used as an assessment task for grading purposes but may be included as an additional requirement for successful completion of a Course.
- 3.8 Where class participation contributes to the final grade for a Course it must be based on assessing a Student's contribution to an active learning process using evidence of achievement of pre-determined assessment criteria that align with Course and Program learning outcomes. Class participation should not be weighted at any more than ten (10) per cent of the total assessment for the Course.
- 3.9 Due dates for assessment tasks should normally fall inside of the Teaching (including the examination period).
- 3.10 Unless otherwise approved, all text-based assessment, except for final invigilated examinations tasks will be submitted electronically via <https://learnit.nd.edu.au>. No additional hard copy or email submission is required.
- 3.11 Communication with students on electronic submission ought to include information such as where the submission portals can be found, whether Students can submit more than once, whether they can submit past the due date and any other conditions for online submission. For first year Students offering an opportunity where Students can trial online submission before the due date is also recommended.
- 3.12 The Program Coordinator should ensure that the timing of assessment tasks across the Program and in each Course balances the workload of Students and staff, and that there are opportunities for Students to maximise learning from assessment feedback provided prior to submitting subsequent related tasks.

4 COMMUNICATING LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS AND PROCESSES – COURSE OUTLINES

- 4.1 The Program Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that information about assessment is provided to Students in the Course Outline and in the Learning Management System Course site (Blackboard) no later than the Monday prior to week one of the teaching period in which the Course is delivered. Information in the Course Outline should include, at a minimum:
 - 4.1.1 A summary of assessment tasks that includes for each task the (1) purpose, (2) description, (3) value, and (4) due date.
 - 4.1.2 A task description which provides a clear and detailed description of the nature of the task.
 - 4.1.3 Alignment of each task with the Course learning outcome(s) being assessed as well as alignment between the Course outcomes and the Program outcomes or Graduate Attributes being developed.
 - 4.1.4 Assessment criteria for each task, usually in the form of an assessment criterion-based

marking rubric in which levels of student achievement of each criterion are described.

4.1.5 Clear description for group assessment tasks and how marks will be awarded.

4.1.6 Clear description of any peer assessment processes.

4.1.7 Clear description of requirements to obtain a passing grade in the course.

4.2 In addition, the following general information concerning assessment should also be included in the Course Outline:

4.2.1 How the course has evolved based on feedback, including from Students.

4.2.2 Information about the timing and format of feedback about assessments.

4.2.3 The process and criteria applicable to extensions of assessment submissions.

4.2.4 Student responsibilities for keeping a copy of assessment work submitted and to produce the duplicate upon request, in instances where the original is lost or misplaced.

4.2.5 Penalties for late submission.

4.2.6 Procedures for appeal of assessment and grading decisions.

4.2.7 In addition the following links to policy and procedures must be included:

4.2.7.1 *Policy: Academic Integrity (Students) and Procedure: Managing Breaches of Academic Integrity (Students).*

4.2.7.2 *Policy: Students with a Disability.*

4.2.7.3 *Procedure: Special Consideration.*

4.2.7.4 School and Program Regulations.

4.2.7.5 *Policy: Student Appeals.*

5 ASSESSMENT AND GRADING

5.1 The descriptions below assist in the interpretation of each grade and should be interpreted within the context of the Program, Course, discipline and level of study. For instance, the complexity required of responses to assessment tasks in the final year of a degree for courses at 300 level would be substantially higher than for assessments in the first teaching period of a Program.

Pass (P) [Numerical range: 50-59]

A Pass grade is characterised by work that satisfies the requirements of the assessment task and intended Course learning outcomes. The response demonstrates a competent grasp of the knowledge and skills required. An individual assessment task may exhibit occasional minor errors in style and/or performance. Consistent errors especially in relation to knowledge and understanding are not acceptable at this or any other higher level.

Credit (C) [Numerical range: 60- 69]

A Credit grade is characterised by work that capably satisfies the requirements of the assessment task and intended Course learning outcomes. Assessment tasks demonstrate a well-rounded grasp of the knowledge and skills required but may exhibit occasional minor errors in style and/or performance.

Distinction (D) [Numerical range: [70-79]

A Distinction grade is characterised by high quality in satisfying the requirements of the assessment task and intended Course outcomes but is less sustained than for a High Distinction. Assessment tasks demonstrate a predominantly insightful understanding of the knowledge

required and a high level of skill performance but may exhibit rare minor errors in style and/or performance.

High Distinction (HD) [Numerical range: 80-100]

A High Distinction grade is characterised by sustained, superior quality in satisfying the requirements of the assessment task and intended Course outcomes. Assessment tasks demonstrate insightful understanding of the knowledge required and a high level of skill and/or performance, while avoiding all minor errors in style and/or performance.

Fail (F) [Numerical range: less than 50]

A Fail grade is characterised by work that does not satisfy the requirements of the assessment task and intended course outcomes. Assessment tasks contain frequent errors in the knowledge and skills required and may also exhibit poor communicative competence and major errors in style and/or performance.

Conceded Pass (P) [Numerical range [48-49]

Some courses make provision for this award where work generally demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes have been met but the grasp of the knowledge and skills may be weak. For this reason this grade does not demonstrate that the pre-requisite requirement have been met.

Non-Graded Pass (NGP)

Some courses make use a Non-Graded Pass for Satisfactory Performance (NGP). Any level of achievement from satisfactory to outstanding performance may be used. It is not normally assigned a mark, but where it does, the mark is in line with the level of achievement (i.e. scores from 50 to 100). A non-graded pass reflects that mastery of the task and the course requirements have been achieved.

Fail Due to Non-completion (FN)

A Fail Due to Non-completion is employed under the following conditions:

- Not all assessment tasks have been submitted (and the student had not received an exemption)
- Not all of the requirements for a final grade as stated in the Course Outline have been met
- Not all tasks earned 50 percent or over, despite the overall mark reaching 50% or more as stated in the Course Outline.

Withdrawal with Fail (WF)

A withdrawal with Fail is employed when a student has withdrawn from a Course after the Academic Penalty Date, but no later than the final teaching of the Course.

6 PLANNING FOR MODERATION OF ASSESSMENT TASKS

- 6.1** To ensure consistency of marks and grades awarded, the Program Coordinator (or delegate) should, in consultation with Course Coordinators:

- 6.1.1 Develop a Moderation and Quality Assurance Plan to ensure that all teaching staff are clear about the moderation activities to be undertaken during the teaching period marking occurs.
- 6.1.2 Provide detail of peer moderation processes identifying roles, responsibilities, timing and sample size for moderation.
- 6.1.3 Detail internal benchmarking and external referencing of marked tasks identifying roles, responsibilities, timing and sample size for moderation.
- 6.1.4 Detail where only one academic teaches the course, the peer that will work with the academic.

7 ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

- 7.1 Students and staff are responsible for upholding Academic Integrity in accordance with the *Policy: Academic Integrity (Students)*.
- 7.2 Strategies to assist Students to develop the knowledge and academic skills needed to meet their responsibilities for upholding Academic Integrity include:
 - 7.2.1 Incorporating mechanisms and assessment practices that deter students from deliberate plagiarism and other forms of Academic Integrity breaches;
 - 7.2.2 Designing assessment in ways that maximise opportunities for Students to produce work that does not breach Academic Integrity; and
 - 7.2.3 Providing assessment feedback to Students that assist them to develop the knowledge and skills to demonstrate Academic Integrity in their work.

SECTION B: DURING TEACHING PERIOD

This section outlines:

- (a) the expected processes and practices involving assessment during the cycle of a teaching period, including responding to Students with a disability and/or medical conditions, that may require reasonable adjustment, special consideration and extensions for submitting tasks, so that Students do not experience discrimination (see *Policy: Students with a Disability*); and
- (b) expectations for the processes that Academic Staff will engage in to ensure that the marker judgment is valid and reliable; and
- (c) roles and responsibilities of Academic Staff relating to end of teaching period examinations. Administration of the end of teaching period exams remain the purview of the Registrar and are captured by the *General Regulations*.

8 CHANGES TO ASSESSMENT AFTER THE PUBLICATION OF THE COURSE OUTLINE

- 8.1 In exceptional circumstances, an Academic Staff Member may seek approval to make a substantive change (defined as a change in either purpose, weighting, constructive alignment of intended learning outcomes with assessment task, assessment type, delivery, or marking criteria) after the publication of a Course Outline. The first step in the process is to make a request to, and have the decision ratified by, the Program Coordinator. The Program Coordinator will then seek final approval by the Dean. Approved substantive changes to Course

Outlines must be reported at the Board of Examiners meeting.

- 8.2** Any changes to an assessment task must be communicated in writing to all Students enrolled in the Course as soon as possible. It is the responsibility of the Course Coordinator to ensure that no Student is disadvantaged by the change.
- 8.3** In some cases, the Course Coordinator may want to negotiate aspects of the assessment tasks with Students during the teaching period as part of the learning experience. When this occurs, all Students in the Course must be given an opportunity to participate and the negotiated assessment must still meet pre-determined intended learning outcomes.
- 8.4** Reasonable adjustments and variations to assessments may be made through a formal Learning Access Plan (LAP) and on the basis of the impact of a disability or a medical condition, and in accordance with relevant legislation and legal obligations of the University as described in the Policy: Students with a Disability.

9 SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

- 9.1** Special consideration may be requested, evaluated and approved in accordance with the *Procedure: Special Consideration*.

10 PENALTIES FOR LATE SUBMISSION

- 10.1** An assessment item submitted after the due date (including any approved extension) is subject to the penalty described in the relevant Course Outline.
- 10.2** Any penalties should be applied consistently to Students in each Program or Course.
- 10.3** A Student should submit items for assessment by the due date, as indicated in the Course Outline.
- 10.4** All assessments should include a declaration that the Student is submitting their own original work.
- 10.5** The Dean or delegate may apply a range of penalties for late submission of an assessment task in accordance with information contained in the Course Outline and/or School Regulations, and subject to the following maximum rates:
 - 10.5.1 Five percent (of the assessment task's identified value) per day for the first seven days from the date identified as the due date for the assessment task.
 - 10.5.2 Ten percent (of the assessment task's identified value) after the eighth day from the date identified as the due date for the assessment task.
 - 10.5.3 A result of zero is awarded for an assessment task submitted eleven days from the date identified as the due date for the assessment task.
- 10.6** Weekends are included in the calculation of days late.

11 ETHICAL AND HONEST MARKING AND GRADING

- 11.1** Markers of assessment tasks have a responsibility to ensure that academic rigor and impartiality is applied and that marking is undertaken fairly, objectively and consistently for all Students enrolled in a Course.
- 11.2** An Academic Staff Member involved in marking an assessment task for a Student who is a relative, family or personal friend must disclose the relationship to the Program Coordinator in the first instance prior to marking, as this may create an actual or perceived Conflict of Interest.

In instances where the Academic Staff Member is the Program Coordinator, the disclosure must be made to the Dean.

- 11.3** Conflict of Interest disclosures should be reported as soon as practicable so that an appropriate process to manage the conflict of interest can be instigated, taking into account provisions of the *Policy: Code of Conduct (Staff)*.
- 11.4** Instances where there has been a failure to declare a Conflict of Interest should be managed in accordance with the *Policy: Managing Misconduct*.
- 11.5** Assessment results should not be discussed or disclosed to anyone who does not have a legitimate right to access the information.

12 ASSESSMENT FEEDBACK

- 12.1** The Course Coordinator should work with Academic Staff over the course of the teaching period to ensure that assessment feedback provided to students is appropriate, timely, consistent and in accordance with the provisions of this Procedure.
- 12.2** Feedback to Students on their performance in each assessment task should provide meaningful information about their current level of performance relative to the intended Course outcomes, standards of performance and be constructive so as to guide future learning.
- 12.3** Feedback to Students on their performance in summative and formative assessment tasks should promote Evaluative Judgement and includes, but is not limited to:
 - 12.3.1 Exemplars / model answers or explanations to questions;
 - 12.3.2 Discussion of tasks in class or online;
 - 12.3.3 Comments on presentations;
 - 12.3.4 Written feedback on drafts;
 - 12.3.5 Activities that require students to self-assess or reflect on their learning;
 - 12.3.6 Practice quizzes; and
 - 12.3.7 Facilitated peer feedback on a draft assessment.
- 12.4** Feedback to Students for assessments other than a final examination should normally be provided within 15 working days, and no later than 20 working days from the submission due date for the assessment task, or the date when the task was submitted, whichever is the later.
- 12.5** Completed assessment tasks and feedback should, as standard practice, be provided electronically. The task should be provided directly to the Student/s concerned and not be passed to a third party, unless written permission has been obtained from the Student. In cases where permission has been granted by the Dean (or delegate) for the task/artefact to be provided to students via printed form, completed tasks should not be left unattended for collection. Students are able to collect completed such tasks from the School's reception.
- 12.6** With the exception of final examinations, feedback to Students on their performance in a summative assessment task should include:
 - 12.6.1 A result for the assessment task against the assessment criteria.
 - 12.6.2 Summary comments, including how students might improve their performance.

13 QUALITY ASSURANCE OF ASSESSMENT JUDGEMENTS – MODERATION OF MARKS AND GRADES

- 13.1** In order to ensure consistency of marks and grades awarded the following peer moderation strategies should be employed:

- 13.1.1 Before marking gets underway markers meet to review and discuss judgments using exemplars of Student work at different standards.
 - 13.1.2 During marking, markers compare earlier and later marks on the same assessment to ensure that they remain consistent in how they apply the assessment criteria and refrain from inadvertently become more lenient (or more stringent) as they mark more of the same assessments.
 - 13.1.3 After marking is complete, undertake second or check marking of:
 - 13.1.3.1 a random sample of assessment tasks to ensure consistent application of marking criteria and standards; and
 - 13.1.3.2 assessment tasks deemed a Fail or High Distinction.
 - 13.1.4 Where there is more than one marker, an analysis of variances between markers is undertaken.
 - 13.1.5 If inconsistencies are detected, Student work will be reassessed and marks adjusted accordingly before assessment work and marks are released to Students.
- 13.2** Scaling of Student marks to a normal distribution is not appropriate within a criterion referenced framework. However, as part of their quality review role, School Learning and Teaching Committees (or relevant) are responsible for comparing distributions of grades and investigating any apparent problems, such as Courses which show skewed distributions (for example, a high proportion of HDs or high failure rates). Courses should be investigated to ensure assessment design and grading practices are appropriate for the academic level and the discipline.

14 RE-SUBMISSION OF ASSESSMENT

- 14.1** A Student cannot re-submit final examinations.
- 14.2** Assessments in a Foundation Course should be re-submitted in instances where the assessment does not meet the standards for Academic Integrity as set out in the Academic Integrity Rubric and associated guidelines approved by the University's Learning and Teaching Committee.
- 14.3** A Student may be permitted by the Course Coordinator to re-submit an assessment in cases where:
 - 14.3.1 the assessment has earned a Fail grade; or
 - 14.3.2 there has been a breach of Academic Integrity in accordance with Policy.
- 14.4** A request to re-submit should be made in writing to the Course Coordinator no later than ten working days after the release of the marked assessment and include clearly stated grounds for the request.
- 14.5** If a request to re-submit is permitted, the Course Coordinator will determine the due date for the re-submission and advise the Student in writing.
- 14.6** The highest grade that a Student can achieve for a re-submission is a Pass (P) Grade.
- 14.7** If the Course Coordinator disallows a request to re-submit, the Student can appeal the decision in accordance with the *Policy: Student Appeals*.

15 RE-MARKING AN ASSESSMENT

- 15.1** A request for a re-mark should be made in writing to the Course Coordinator no later than ten working days after the release of the marked assessment and include clearly stated grounds for the request on the basis of:

- 15.1.1 A breach of the *Policy: Assessment in Higher Education Coursework, ELICOS and Enabling Courses*, and/or a breach of this Procedure, and / or a breach of School Regulations sufficient to cause disadvantage to the Student; or
- 15.1.2 Failure to adhere to the approved assessment process, and / or marking criteria as contained in the Course Outline.
- 15.2** The request must be made no later than ten Working Days after the release of the marked assessment.
- 15.3** The Course Coordinator should review the assessment and advise the Student in writing of their decision to allow or disallow the re-marking.
- 15.4** Students should be made aware that a re-mark could result in a lower final mark.
- 15.5** If the Course Coordinator allows the re-marking, they also determine the final mark to be awarded.
- 15.6** If the Course Coordinator disallows the re-marking, the Student may appeal the decision in accordance with the *Policy: Student Appeals*.

16 STUDENT ACCESS TO EXAMINATION SCRIPTS

- 16.1** All examination scripts remain the property of the University.
- 16.2** Students have a right to access feedback relating to their assessment tasks.
- 16.3** Each School may determine the conditions under which access to examination scripts may be granted, including whether access may not be granted due to the nature of the assessment.
- 16.4** To access to an examination script, a Student must make a request in writing to the Dean within ten Working Days of the official publication of final grades.

17 INVIGILATED EXAMINATION

- 17.1** Final Invigilated examinations are scheduled and administered by the Campus Registrar.

18 DEFERRED EXAMINATION (including final examinations)

- 18.1** A deferred examination may be granted in accordance with the provisions of the *General Regulations*.

19 SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMINATION

- 19.1** A supplementary examination may be granted accordance with the provisions of the *General Regulations*.

20 IRREGULARLY SCHEDULED EXAMINATION

- 20.1** An irregularly scheduled examination may be granted accordance with the provisions of the *General Regulations*.

SECTION C: CONCLUSION OF EACH TEACHING PERIOD

This section acknowledges that the monitoring of student progression and results play a critical role in safeguarding academic standards and ensuring comparable academic outcomes. The school Committee (either formally or informally constituted) should provide the opportunity for Program and/or Course coordinators to engage in critical discussion and examination of grades and student progress. In doing so it also provides support for building consensus and Academic Staff capacity around assessment practices. At the next level, the role of the Board of Examiners is to ensure that the School has addressed quality assurance through the appropriate mechanisms according to policies and procedures.

21 RESULTS

21.1 The Course Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the results of all items of assessment are recorded.

22 REVIEW BY SCHOOL COMMITTEE

22.1 Student grading is subject to systematic approval, monitoring, and review at the end of every teaching period in accordance with the processes outlined in this Clause.

22.2 At the conclusion of each teaching period, a school Committee should be convened with responsibility for:

22.2.1 Reviewing student marks and grades and confirming the final mark and grade to be awarded using the grading hierarchy described in Section 5.1 of this Procedure.

22.2.2 Verifying students' academic standing.

22.2.3 Making appropriate recommendations for prizes, awards or other forms of recognition for exemplary academic performance to the Board of Examiners.

22.3 The school Committee should also, as part of their role in safeguarding academic standards:

22.3.1 Review academic progress of each Student in the Course in each teaching period and identify appropriate management and support.

22.3.2 Monitor and approve the distribution of final grades and compare the performance of current Students against past cohorts where appropriate.

22.3.3 Ensure quality processes such as moderation and calibration have been actioned for assessment tasks across the teaching period.

22.3.4 Ensure a quality process such as moderation has been actioned for all narrowly failed final grades.

22.3.5 Require the Course Coordinator to provide further evidence of quality assurance mechanisms.

22.3.6 Finalise any missing results and record reasons for missing results.

22.3.7 Ensure that a permanent and auditable record of the minutes of the meeting is created and maintained.

22.3.8 Formally approve the minutes of the previous meeting.

22.4 In cases where the proposed results reflect skewed grade distributions (for example, a high proportion of HDs or high failure rates), the Course Coordinator should provide an explanation of the results using evidence to demonstrate one or more of the following:

22.4.1 Assessment tasks for the Course are appropriately aligned to the Course learning outcomes, including the results of internal reviews of the assessment tasks.

22.4.2 Appropriate mechanisms for moderation, including evidence of alignment between

- assessor or examiner judgments on the marks or grades awarded to students.
- 22.4.3 Evidence of comparability of the Student cohort's performance with other Students in the same Course in previous years or teaching periods.

23 APPROVAL, MONITORING AND REVIEW OF FINAL GRADES

- 23.1** The Board of Examiners has overall responsibility for:
- 23.1.1 Confirming that the school Committee has followed appropriate quality assurance processes, including those outlined in Section 22;
 - 23.1.2 Endorsing the distribution of final grades where appropriate.
 - 23.1.3 Making appropriate recommendations for prizes, awards or other forms of recognition for exemplary academic performance.
 - 23.1.4 Endorsing the Dean's recommendation for supplementary exams.

24 APPEAL OF A FINAL MARK

- 24.1** A Student may appeal their final mark in accordance with the *Policy: Student Appeals*.

25 MONITORING AND PEER REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT

- 25.1** At the end of each teaching period, the assessment methods, tasks and processes for each Course should be reviewed by the Program Coordinator and teaching team, taking into account feedback from all stakeholders.
- 25.2** Where the Course Coordinator is the only Academic Staff Member delivering the Course, the Course Coordinator should meet with another Academic Staff Member.
- 25.3** The review should cover all aspects of the assessment design process, including:
- 25.3.1 Assessment methods and tasks;
 - 25.3.2 Marking rubrics;
 - 25.3.3 Assessment marking and grading;
 - 25.3.4 Assessment feedback to students; and
 - 25.3.5 Adequacy of resources for effectiveness and sustainability.
- 25.4** The results of the review should inform changes to the next iteration and/or delivery period of the Course. Where changes to assessment tasks or methods have been made as a direct result of Student feedback and/or academic peer feedback this should be recorded in the Course Outline.
- 25.5** The results of assessment reviews at a Course level should contribute to regular review of assessment across the Program to ensure that:
- 25.5.1 All intended learning outcomes are assessed;
 - 25.5.2 There is appropriate sequencing of learning outcome development;
 - 25.5.3 Assessment is progressive across levels;
 - 25.5.4 Assessment tasks are fair with respect to weighting and timing of assessment across the program;
 - 25.5.5 There is no unnecessary duplication of assessment of learning outcomes; and
 - 25.5.6 There is diversity of assessment strategies across the Program.
- 25.6** Evidence of the review should be kept for reporting in the biennial Course monitoring report and for the substantive program review.

26 ASSESSMENT RECORDS

- 26.1** After twelve months following the release of the final results in a Course, the University may destroy examination scripts and other assessment materials which have not been returned to the student.
- 26.2** The final grades awarded for Course standards, especially threshold or pass standards, should be benchmarked and/or externally referenced as outlined in Section 3.3 of this Procedure.

27 DEFINITIONS

- 27.1** For the purpose of this Procedure, the definitions outlined in the *Policy: Assessment in Higher Education Coursework, ELICOS and Enabling Courses* apply.
- 27.2** In addition, the following definitions apply to this Procedure:

Assessment benchmarking and external referencing means a process used to compare Student performances in assessment, as well as assessment and grading practices for similar programs and courses offered on different campuses of the University and by other universities.

Calibration means an internalisation of standards belonging to the team or learning community and an ability to apply those standards consistently when assessing student work (Sadler, 2009).¹

Census Date has the same meaning as provided in HESA. The University will publish the Census Date for all Courses on the University's website.

Continuous Assessment means a relatively even distribution of an array of tasks across a teaching period to sustain consistent student engagement and effort.

Foundation Course means a Course that develops student's academic literacy and/or numeracy skills at a foundation level, and normally offered at the beginning of a Program.

Invigilated Examination means an examination conducted by the University under set conditions.

Irregularly Scheduled Examination means an examination that examines the same learning outcomes as the final Invigilated Examination and is conducted under the same invigilated conditions as an Invigilated Examination but is held at a different time, date and/or place that is ordinarily:

- (a) on a date during the official examination period; and/or
- (b) at a time commencing before the regularly scheduled examination, unless otherwise approved by the Campus Registrar.

Learning Action Plan means a document that outlines the necessary reasonable adjustments

¹ Sadler, D.R. 2009. Grade integrity and the representation of academic achievement. *Studies in Higher Education* 34, no. 7: 807–26

for individual students with a disability or medical condition so that they can participate in education on the same basis as students without a disability or medical condition.

Marking Rubric means an evaluative criteria that indicates how students can demonstrate their achievement of the Course outcomes and describes levels of achievement that are meaningful for the markers and students (i.e. can be understood without interpretation) (Dawson, 2017).²

Moderation of assessment means quality assurance, control processes and activities such as peer review that aim to assure: consistency or comparability, appropriateness, and fairness of assessment judgments; and the validity and reliability of assessment tasks, criteria and standards. Moderation of assessment processes establish comparability of standards of student performance across, for example, different markers, locations, subjects, providers and/or courses of study (TEQSA, 2017).³

Minus marking is where a mark(s) is/are deducted for unanswered questions or incorrect answers

Peer Review refers to a summative process generally conducted against specified standards that have the capacity to illuminate high quality examples of best practice. Increasingly such reviewers are experts 'with qualifications and standing in the higher education sector who are capable of assessing the worth and value of teaching resources and similar artefacts' (Philip, Lefoe, O'Reilly & Parrish, 2008, p. 766).⁴

Re-marking means marking an assessment for a second time where that assessment has not been altered or added to by the student in circumstances where the student considers that the assessment has been inappropriately assessed.

Re-submit means where a student submits for marking a piece of work that has been altered, added to, rewritten or re-worked by the student subsequent to the original assessment being submitted.

Supplementary Examination means an examination that is different in content from an invigilated examination and is required to be sat by a student at a time, place and date set by the Campus Registrar, and is sat in addition to the Invigilated Examination.

Working Days means a day in which the University is open for business but does not include public holidays or weekends.

² Dawson, P. 2017. Assessment rubrics: towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(3), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1111294>

³ Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency, 2017. Glossary of terms, [online] Available at: <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/glossary-terms>. Accessed 16 April 2020.

⁴ Philip, R., Lefoe, G., O'Reilly, M., & Parrish, D. 2008. A peer review model for the ALTC Exchange: Contributing to the landscape of shared learning and teaching resources. In Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology? Proceedings of ascilite Melbourne 2008, Deakin University, December, p. 766.

Version	Date of approval	Approved by	Amendment
1	26 June 2020	Vice Chancellor	Effective date - new procedure.
2	21 July 2020	DVC, Academic	Minor amendment- reference to <i>grade</i> in clause 24 replaced with <i>mark</i> .

28 PROCESS SUMMARY

Process Step	Responsibility
<p data-bbox="156 443 491 477">New/Revised Curriculum</p> <ul data-bbox="156 488 967 1151" style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and design Assessment as per Clause 3.2. • Ensure assessment design meets requirements of Clause 3.4 • Benchmark assessment against comparable disciplinary and/or professional standards (within and external to Notre Dame) • Arrange approval of Program/Course via PCAC • Ensure that information about assessment is provided to Students in the Course Outline and in the Learning Management System Course site (Blackboard) no later than the Monday prior to week one of the Semester in which the Course is delivered, and that information is in accordance with Clauses 4.1 and 4.2 of this Procedure • Prepare Moderation and Quality Assurance Plan to clarify moderation processes • Nominate a person to work with any Staff member who is solely responsible for teaching a Course 	<p data-bbox="991 483 1262 591">Course Coordinators and Program Coordinators</p>
<p data-bbox="156 1276 480 1310">During teaching periods</p> <ul data-bbox="156 1321 967 1984" style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve any substantive changes after publication of a Course Outline in exceptional circumstances and report changes to Board of Examiners • Make any reasonable adjustments and variations to assessments through a formal Learning Access Plan, in accordance with <i>Policy: Students with a Disability</i> • Apply any penalties for assessments submitted after the due date in line with Course Outline and consistently across each Program/Course • Disclose any conflict of interest related to assessing students' work • Act on disclosure according to Policy • Ensure that provision of feedback to students meets standards set out in this Procedure. • Ensure that feedback is provided to students within time frame set out in Clause 12.4. • Approve divergence from electronic submission 	<p data-bbox="991 1317 1257 1464">Dean, on recommendation of Program Coordinator</p> <p data-bbox="991 1554 1251 1588">Course Coordinator</p> <p data-bbox="991 1677 1251 1711">Course Coordinator</p> <p data-bbox="991 1756 1062 1789">Dean</p> <p data-bbox="991 1946 1251 1980">Course Coordinator</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employ peer moderation strategies, ensure moderation meets stipulations in this Procedure, and provide evidence of moderation to the school Committee • Ensure scaling of marks and/or normal distribution of marks and grades is not applied • Review Course results to ensure the course is at the requisite academic level and design is appropriate • Ensure students’ rights to feedback have been met as set out in Section 12 • Action eligible resubmission or re-marking requests and ensure decisions are communicated to Students in writing • Determine conditions of access to examination scripts as per Section 16 of this Procedure. • Schedule and administer final invigilated examinations • Grant requests for deferred and/or supplementary examinations or for irregularly scheduled examination • Process student appeals 	<p>School Committee</p> <p>Course Coordinator</p> <p>Campus registrar</p> <p>Appeals Officer</p>
--	--



<p>Conclusion of teaching period</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convene a School Learning and Teaching Committee at the end of every teaching period, to undertake approval, monitoring, and review of assessments • Ensure academic standard are met through the application of quality review processes as per Clause 22.3 of this Procedure • Where the proposed results show a skewing of grades, prepare evidence to explain the soundness of the results of the assessment process using evidence as set out in this Procedure • Verify that the Course Coordinator has taken all necessary steps to ensure that students’ results accurately reflect the students’ performance against the assessment criteria • Review and confirm mark and grades, verify academic standing, and forward recommendations for student awards, prizes and recognition to the Board of Examiners • Keep an auditable and permanent record of school committee meetings and approve meeting minutes • Confirm the school Committee has followed the quality assurance processes as set out in this Procedure, endorse grades and make recommendations for student prizes, awards and recognition • Endorse Deans’ recommendations for supplementary exams 	<p>Dean</p> <p>school Committee</p> <p>Board of Examiners</p>
---	---

