

Assessment Policy - Higher Education

Policy Code: ACA-006

Version: 21.0

Effective Date: 09 January 2024

Purpose

This Policy specifies the College's assessment philosophy and the general principles that guide the College's assessment practices.

Scope

- All higher education students
- All academic staff
- All administrative staff

Policy Statement

Assessment is the process of gathering and analysing information to guide and make judgements about students' learning in relation to curriculum goals. Assessment tasks are designed to indicate progress towards the desired learning outcomes of a particular subject and course; the assessment grade is a measure of the extent to which the learning outcomes of a subject have been achieved. Assessment items are an integral part of the learning process and when well-designed can enhance the overall learning experience and contribute to student achievement.

Assessment Principles

The College subscribes to the following assessment principles:

1. Assessment is an integral part of course design

Course design aims to enable students to successfully fulfil the Course and Subject Learning Outcomes for their chosen course of study, as well as ensure graduates meet expected outcomes of the relevant AQF level and accreditation standards (if applicable). Assessment design will support the achievement of these outcomes and should not undermine the essential educational philosophy.

2. Assessment is linked to Graduate Attributes

Assessment is linked to graduate outcomes via the course and subject learning outcomes. Assessment should be designed to measure the degree to which students have met the learning outcomes, and different learning outcomes will require different types of assessment.

3. Self-Assessment

Assessment tasks, both summative and formative, develop students' skills in critical self-appraisal. Self-assessment is a key professional capability that is necessary to develop a continuous learning plan for professional development.

4. Adult Learning Principles

The teaching of adults at the tertiary level is improved by the application of adult learning principles (andragogy). These principles include the following:

- Adults are internally motivated and self-directed
- Adults bring life experiences and knowledge to learning experiences
- Adults are goal oriented
- Adults are relevancy oriented
- Adults are practical
- Adult learners like to be respected

The application of these principles in assessment design includes providing a range of authentic assessment tasks that engage students in learning.

5. Assessment is rigorous and criterion-referenced, and performance standards are specified

Assessment incorporates a feedback process and is based on explicit, pre-specified, criteria (criterion-referenced assessment). The standard of performance that is required for the award of a particular grade is defined as part of assessment task design and articulated in marking rubrics. Marking guides or rubrics are used in all subjects so that students can clearly see criteria for assessment and how grades are awarded and use this information to improve their learning outcomes.

6. Assessment inspires learning

Well-designed assessment engages students' natural curiosity and motivates them to learn.

7. Assessment is relevant

Authentic assessment duplicates real life situations such as scenarios or case studies and / or promotes the creation of work product that is useful and relevant to self and / or others.

8. Assessment changes through the course

Discipline-based to integrative

While assessment early in the course may be discipline based as students build the foundations of their professional knowledge, later assessment tasks integrate knowledge from a range of disciplines.

Teacher-directed to self-directed

The level of self-direction increases from years 1-2 to years 3-4 of the course of study. In years 1-2 students may have a choice of individual assignments and group projects, and in years 3-4 assignments or projects may be based on personal clinical experiences.

9. Assessment is appropriately weighted

The amount of assessment is designed to provide enough evidence to judge a student's achievement of the learning outcomes for the subject and does not incur an excessive workload on the student or academic staff. The effort involved in an assessment task is commensurate with the value awarded to the task. Assessment is managed across subjects offered in a study period so as not to create an undue load.

10. Assessment is consistent

The College is a national organisation with multiple campuses across five states and includes teaching in on-campus and online delivery modes. Therefore, consistency of assessment is important to ensure that the learning outcomes for the course are achieved regardless of location, instructor or mode of delivery. The performance standards described in the marking rubric, and other assessment requirements, are applied equally to all students.

Assessment Design and Management

Assessment Methods

Assessment methods may take a variety of forms; the key criterion for choice among methods should be appropriateness to the learning outcomes. Assessment is progressive over time to reveal the changes that take place as a student learns. A diverse range of fair, equitable, clear, meaningful and specific assessment instruments and processes may be employed.

Number of Assessments

There must be at least two (2) assessment items per subject and the number and weight of assessments should be commensurate with the credit point weight of the subject. One assessment item should be due by Week 7 of the study period to allow for provision of feedback by Week 9 of the same study period.

The following guides are used to determine the number of assessment items, excluding attendance requirements, per subject:

- 2 cp subject – 2 assessment items is ideal, no more than 3 will be permitted
- 4 cp or higher subject - 3 assessment items is ideal, no more than 4 will be permitted

Clinical and Practical Subjects

For courses leading to a practitioner qualification with which the graduate will be entitled to consult / treat clients, the relevant professional associations may strongly support a particular pass level for practical and clinical subjects. In this case it is understood that a student needs to acquire and maintain a high degree of skill to be effective in practice. For this reason, the College stipulates pass requirements in some clinical and practical subjects which are not negotiable (Pass / Fail or must meet a particular grade in an assessment). This requirement is outlined clearly on the Subject Outline if applicable.

It is also essential that a student exhibit high levels of professionalism including strict adherence to client privacy and confidentiality, and escalating urgent duty of care issues for clients at risk. A pass requirement for this is applicable in some clinical and practical subjects which will be clearly outlined on the Subject Outline and within the marking criteria for this subject.

Assessment Completion

In order to ensure that students demonstrate their knowledge and skills across all learning outcomes in a subject, and consequently in a course, students will be required to submit all assessment items with a value of greater than 15% to be eligible to receive a passing grade.

Attendance

Attendance is monitored as per the *Attendance Policy – Higher Education*. Where attendance is a compulsory subject requirement, this will be clearly stated in the Subject Outline along with the consequences of not meeting the requirements.

Pass Requirements

Each Subject Outline will contain a statement clearly articulating the pass requirements for the subject; this will take the form of the following statement:

To achieve a passing grade in this subject students must:

- have a cumulative mark of at least 50%, and
- have submitted all assessment items with a value greater than 15%, and
- [any additional requirements such as meeting attendance requirements or achieving a passing mark in a specific assessment item (hurdle assessment)]

Assessment Procedures

Writing Standards

All assessment must be submitted in alignment with the writing guidelines that specify style (font size, spacing, margins, etc.), mode of expression (grammar, style, syntax, etc.), and method of submission and collection in the assessment information for the subject. All assessment must also correctly reference any external sources using American Psychological Association (APA) referencing. The Library's *APA Referencing Guideline* outlines correct methods of referencing and citation.

Word Limits

Word limits for written assessment items will be adhered to in grading, with a variation of up to +/- 10% from the specified word count accepted.

- Where a range of word count is specified, the word count must fall within the +/- 10% range of the lower or higher specified range without additional variation (e.g. 1000 - 1200 word limit must fall within 900 and 1320 words).
- Where a fixed word count is specified, the word count must fall within the +/- 10% range of the specified word number (e.g. 1000 word limit must fall within 900 and 1100 words).

Where an assessment item is submitted with a word count 10% in excess of the specified limit, the marker will stop marking the assessment at the permitted word limit plus 10%. In cases where the marker excludes content beyond the specified limit, the marking criteria will be applied only to the portion of the assessment falling within the acceptable word limit.

Marking rubrics

All assessment tasks must have a marking rubric which clearly and explicitly states the criteria that will be used to assess a student's work and the standards against those criteria. Assessment criteria and standards must align to the subject Learning Outcomes such that work assessed as meeting the Pass (or higher) standards is evidence of meeting the Learning Outcomes.

The marking rubric will be presented as a table and have the following format:

- Rows will contain criteria against which the student's work will be assessed and the number of marks allocated to each criterion. The total number of criteria should not be excessive
- Table columns will show standards from High Distinction (HD) to Fail (F) (from right to left) with marks associated with each standard aligned to the allocation of marks to subject grades (i.e. HD is 85% or more of available marks).

- Where a task is pass/fail, for example attendance requirements, the table will comprise only Pass and Fail standards

Cells within the table describe the evidence used to show that a student has achieved a particular standard for each criterion. Descriptions must clearly differentiate between performance standards.

Assessment Submission

Written Assessment

Written assignments for all subjects must be first submitted through the plagiarism detection software (*Turnitin*®) and then to the Learning Management System by the specified due date. There is no minimum threshold for *Turnitin* originality scores and all *Turnitin* reports are expected to be reviewed by markers. All instances of suspected plagiarism will be referred for further action under the *Academic Integrity Policy - HE* and / or *Student Misconduct Policy – Higher Education*.

Online Assessment

Online quizzes, online mid-semester exams and online final exams must be completed within the stated window and will be closed at the time and date stated even if students have commenced but not completed the quiz.

The College uses Respondus LockDown Browser to administer all online examinations to ensure academic integrity of closed-book assessments.

Timeliness

It is the student's responsibility to manage their individual study and assessment workload to ensure they can attend all examinations and meet all relevant due dates. Assessment must be submitted within the timeframes specified unless there is an extraordinary circumstance that prevents the student from meeting the deadline.

Where a student is unable to meet an assessment deadline or sit an examination for reasons beyond their control and that could not have been reasonably avoided, the student may seek an extension or other consideration via the Special Consideration process. Grounds for special consideration are described in the *Special Consideration – Higher Education Policy*.

Marking and assessment moderation will be completed in no more than 15 days after the assessment due date to allow release of marks to students in no more than 17 days after submission. Where assessment marking is unavoidably delayed, it is the responsibility of the Subject Administrator, following discussion with the Head of Department, to inform students of the delay. Delays of more than 1 week must be escalated to the Director of Education for action.

Late submissions

Students submitting an assessment after the due date and **without** an approved extension of time will lose 10% of the total available marks for the item per day (or part thereof) it is late.

For example, if the total available marks for an item is 50, then a student will be penalised 5 marks per day

Work that is submitted 7 or more days late will be accepted to meet submission terms however it will not be marked, and the student will be awarded 0 marks.

Note that the final grade will be recorded into the 'GradeBook' of the Learning Management System along with a note that late marks have been applied.

Feedback

Students receive specific, timely, supportive, constructive and developmental feedback on their learning and performance. Students are entitled to feedback on all assessment items, including those such as written

examinations, which are not returned to students.

Feedback may be provided in writing or verbally depending on the assessment item. Written feedback should also be provided in mid-semester for all clinic subjects on student progress towards achieving the learning outcomes. All feedback should reference the learning outcomes for the subject and their relationship to the Graduate Outcomes.

Feedback on items that are not returned to students (e.g. examinations) can be provided by making an appointment with the relevant Subject Administrator. Students are not permitted to take photographs or other records of their completed examination scripts.

Moderation of Assessment

Moderation of a sample of assessment occurs at a variety of points during the year for quality assurance purposes: during department meetings, between the individual lecturers teaching a subject and the Subject Administrator, and at the end of each reporting period by an external moderator and the Examiner's Committee (refer to the *Moderation of Assessment Policy*).

Submission of Assessment when Repeating a Subject

Students repeating a subject must complete new assessment items for the subject and may not resubmit items submitted during an earlier attempt at the subject. Additionally, students may not submit the same, or substantially the same, work for more than one subject.

Assessment Extensions and Examination Deferrals

In certain situations, students may apply for an extension of time of up to two (2) weeks over the original due date of the assessment item or deferral of an examination. Please refer to the *Special Consideration – Higher Education Policy* for grounds for special consideration and additional requirements for special consideration.

Students registered with the Access and Equity Program may have assessment extensions, increase of examination time or other considerations approved as part of their Reasonable Adjustment Plan (RAP). Details are provided in the *Disability Policy* and *Reasonable Adjustment Policy*.

Supplementary Assessment

Students who marginally fail a non-clinical subject will be offered supplementary assessment and awarded an ISE (Incomplete - supplementary examination) or ISA (incomplete – supplementary assessment) grade. Given the nature of clinical assessment, supplementary assessment will not be available for clinical subjects.

For the purposes of awarding a supplementary examination a marginal fail will be defined as:

- An overall mark between 47% and 49.9%, or
- An overall mark >50% but having not passed one hurdle assessment.

The failure in the subject must not be the result of a finding of academic misconduct, failing more than one hurdle assessment within a subject, or failure to meet attendance or participation requirements.

The supplementary assessment will take a form suitable to the learning outcomes of the subject. In theoretical subjects this will take the form of an examination, where a final exam was part of the subject assessment, or another type where there is no final exam. In subjects with a practical component, the supplementary assessment may be practical or a combined theory and practical assessment.

Supplementary examinations will be held in the deferred exam period, while supplementary assessment will normally be due 2 weeks after the results release. The supplementary assessment will be marked as pass / fail and the grade recorded as SP (pass following supplementary assessment) or F.

Failure before the end of a clinic block

In clinical subjects a student may be failed before the end of the clinic block where their performance or behaviour is such that they will be unable to pass the subject within the normal teaching period, or that the student's performance or behaviour presents a safety risk to clients or others.

Students must be offered feedback on their performance and behaviour and allowed an opportunity to show improvement before a request for failure before the end of clinic block can be made. An exception to this will occur where the behaviour or performance of the student is of such a serious nature that they must be immediately removed from clinics; this may also precipitate an allegation of misconduct.

Where feedback and counselling of a student has not resulted in an improvement in performance or behaviour, the Academic Clinic Coordinator, in consultation with the Head of Department, may recommend to the Director of Education that the student be awarded a Fail grade prior to the end of clinic block.

The Director of Education will review the recommendation and in consultation with the Director of Student Operations (or their delegate) determine that the:

- Student is allowed to continue and will be advised to seek additional support regarding their performance or behaviour
- Student is to be failed in the subject and their record updated to reflect this decision; the student will be permitted to enrol in a clinic subject in the next clinic block
- Student be failed in the subject and not permitted to re-enrol in any clinical subjects and their record updated to reflect this decision; in this situation the student will be provided advice about possible course variation

Students will be advised of the final decisions and the reasons why a particular decision has been made.

Academic Integrity

Students are accountable to standards of professionalism and ethics throughout their course of study and therefore the College takes a strong position on breaches of academic integrity. Please refer to the *Academic Integrity Policy - HE* for further details.

Assessment Resubmission and Examination Resits

The College does not offer standard assessment resubmission or practical examination resits for any higher education subjects. Where a student's ability to complete an assessment item has been impacted by extenuating circumstances they should apply for special consideration. Further information is provided in the *Special Consideration – Higher Education Policy*.

Grading System

Assessment items for a particular subject are assigned weightings, and marks for each item are aggregated into a grade that reflects the student's achievement in meeting the learning outcomes for the subject. The method of weighting and aggregation is explicit in the Subject Outline.

The College follows a standard seven (7) point grading system that is common in Australia for assigning a subject grade. This system is as follows:

Grade	Description	Grade Point	Percentage range
HD	High Distinction	7	85 - 100%
D	Distinction	6	75 - 84%
C	Credit	5	65 - 74%
P	Pass	4	50 - 64%
SP	Pass following supplementary assessment	4	≥ 50% for supplementary assessment
F	Fail	0	49% or less*
TF	Technical Fail	0	N/A
WF	Withdrawal with Failure	0	N/A
^FNS	Failure no assessments submitted	0	0

*From 2023, subject results are presented without decimals with results rounded to the nearest percentage, hence 49.5 is rounded to 50% whereas 49.4 will be rounded to 49%.

The above table applies to **all students in teaching periods commencing 6 March 2023**.

^FNS grade applied from January 2024.

Historical Grading System

The below two (2) tables apply to cohorts commencing prior to 19 February 2018. This includes cohorts February Online 2018, Summer School 2018, and prior.

General Grading

The following table applied to all theory subjects and any practical and clinical subjects that had a pass level of 50% prior to 19 February 2018:

Grade	Description	Grade Point	Percentage range
HD	High Distinction	7	91-100%
D	Distinction	6	80-90%
C	Credit	5	65-79%
P	Pass	4	50-64%
F	Fail	0	49% or less

Practical and Clinical Subjects

In practical and clinical subjects that had a pass level of 70% (as specified on the Subject Outline) prior to 19 February 2018, the grade spread was as follows:

Grade	Description	Grade Point	Percentage range
HD	High Distinction	7	91-100%
D	Distinction	6	80-90%
C	Credit	5	70-79%
F	Fail	0	69% or less

Grade Point Average

A grade point average (GPA) on a scale of 0-7 is calculated once the student has completed all subjects for a course, and it is recorded on the course transcript.

$$\text{GPA} = \frac{\text{Sum of (subject grade point X subject credit points)}}{\text{Total credit points attempted}}$$

Advanced Standing credit obtained via Recognition of Prior Learning, Credit Transfer, or Informal or Formal Articulation, does not contribute to the GPA. Please refer to the *Recognition of Prior Learning Policy – HE and VET*.

Definition of Grades

High Distinction (HD)

Exceptional performance indicating complete and comprehensive understanding of the subject matter, genuine mastery of the relevant skills, demonstration of an extremely high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative, and mastery of all the learning outcomes of the subject.

Distinction (D)

Excellent performance indicating a very high level of understanding of the subject matter, development of relevant skills to a very high level; demonstration of a very high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and achievement of all learning outcomes of the subject.

Credit (C)

Good performance indicating a high level of understanding of subject matter, development of relevant skills to a high level; demonstration of a high level of interpretive and analytical ability and achievement of all learning outcomes of the subject, although some minor elements of outcomes may not be fully achieved.

Pass (P)

Satisfactory performance indicating an adequate understanding of the subject matter, development of relevant skills to an adequate level; demonstration of adequate interpretive and analytical ability, and achievement of the learning outcomes for the subject although some elements of the outcomes may not be fully achieved. Where a Pass grade is awarded following supplementary assessment, it is denoted as SP.

Supplementary Pass (P)

Where a Pass grade is awarded following supplementary assessment, it is denoted as SP.

Fail (F)

Unsatisfactory performance indicating an inadequate understanding of the basic subject matter, failure to develop relevant skills, insufficient evidence of interpretive and analytical ability; and failure to achieve the learning outcomes for the subject. Students have failed to obtain a pass mark using the aggregation of all individual pieces of assessment or have failed to complete a summative assessment item. Students may have also withdrawn after Friday of Week 13 to receive this grade.

Technical Fail (TF)

A Technical Fail is awarded when a student has an overall mark of $\geq 50\%$ however has not meet the subject pass criteria due to failure to meet attendance requirements or failure to meet a required performance level in an assessment item.

Withdrawal with Failure (WF)

Student cancelled enrolment in the subject with penalty after the census date and before Friday of Week 13 and is awarded a Fail grade for the subject.

Failure no assessments submitted (FNS)

Student remained enrolled in subject for the duration of the teaching period but did not submit any assessment items. Implemented from January 2024 onwards.

The following grades **do not contribute** to the Grade Point Average:

Exemption (EX)

Exemption from a required subject is recorded when a student has applied for and been granted advanced standing in a course as a result of:

- Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) for life and work experience
- Credit transfer internally or from another Higher Education institution
- Formal articulation from a VET qualification through an articulation agreement between providers
- Informal articulation from a VET qualification, or partial qualification, based on assessment of competencies achieved.

Credit is not given for subjects awarded a grade of Pass Conceded (or equivalent) at another institution.

Once an exemption is granted through one of the above processes, EX is applied to the subject on the student's transcript. There is no distinction on the transcript based on the method of achieving advanced standing. Please refer to the *Recognition of Prior Learning Policy – HE and VET*.

Incomplete grades

The following grades are used to indicate where a student has outstanding assessment in a subject, once completed a substantive grade (F-HD) will be awarded.

- **IR** – Incomplete due to extensions - the student has been granted an extension of time to complete a assessment due to extenuating circumstances
- **DX** – Deferred examination – the student has been awarded a deferred examination
- **CMU** – Clinic make-up – the student has one or more clinic session which needs to be completed before a final grade can be awarded
- **ISA** - Incomplete due to supplementary assessment. Student has marginally failed a subject and has been offered supplementary assessment after which a final grade of SP or F will be awarded.
- **ISE** - Incomplete due to supplementary examination. Student has marginally failed a subject and has been offered supplementary examination after which a final grade of SP or F will be awarded.

To facilitate student enrolment and progression, incomplete grades must be finalised as soon as possible after results release.

Outstanding attendance requirements in clinic subjects (i.e. clinic make-ups) must be finalised by the end of Week 3 in the following clinic block, for grade finalisation by the College by census date of the following clinic block.

Incomplete grades revert to a Fail (F) if the outstanding assessment is not submitted and / or made up (i.e. clinic) within the timeframes outlined above.

Reviews and Appeals

Assessment remarks

The College does not offer automatic assessment remarks for any higher education subjects, however, under certain circumstances a remark may be offered as a resolution to an academic issue (e.g. grade appeal). When seeking a remark, the onus is on students to provide a case, with supporting evidence, for why the marking was not consistent with the published marking rubric or another error has occurred.

The following are not acceptable grounds for a remark:

- Desire for higher marks or believing that the effort and time to complete a task is worthy of more marks
- Performance in other subjects or assessment tasks
- Wishing to graduate or progress in the course
- Disagreeing with the subject learning outcomes or assessment task requirements
- General grievances unrelated to the assessment task

Where a remark is granted, the work will be assessed against the published marking rubric for that item and in all cases the remark will replace the original mark and may result in a higher, lower or unchanged overall subject mark.

These procedures apply only to those assessment item able to be physically reviewed and remarked (e.g. they do not apply to clinic performance or oral presentations that have not been recorded).

Any student who wishes to be considered for a remark of an individual assignment or exam, or review of overall final grade, including any errors in marking perceived by the student, must follow the following steps:

Preliminary Step - prior to proceeding to the informal and formal reviews, the student must self-assess the assessment feedback provided in relation to the marking rubric or unit learning materials and learning outcomes aligned with the assessment and consult the original marker. This self-assessment must be provided as part of the informal and formal review processes.

Informal Review - Stage 1: students first need to meet with the Subject Administrator to review the assessment in question or final grade.

Where a mathematical or other calculation error is identified (e.g. part of the task was not marked) this is considered an administrative error and does not require the student to seek formal remark. Staff should correct the error and transmit the corrected information to the student and update the LMS or inform OSR of the new mark as appropriate.

Formal Review - Stage 2: if student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of the informal review meeting, the student can formally request a remark using the *Application for Remark Request*, clearly outlining the grounds for the appeal. The request needs to be submitted within ten (10) working days of the mark release date and will be considered by the Head of Department. Where the Head of Department grants the remark, they will arrange for a suitably qualified staff member (other than the original marker) to reassess the work against the published marking rubric. The assigned staff member must not be provided with information about the original mark. The student will receive the outcome of the review within ten (10) working days of the review form submission.

Appeal of Remark Decision – Stage 3 : Where a student remains unsatisfied with the outcome of the remark process they may appeal via the Appeal of Academic Decision process as outlined in the *Complaints and Appeals Policy – Domestic – HE*. Appeals must be made within 10 working days of the outcome of their remark application.

Please note – review of grades may lead to no change or change that leads to an increase or decrease of the overall assessment mark or subject grade. Where a remark is granted, **the remark grade will be the final grade applied** to the assessment and / or subject.

Review of subject grade

Students may seek a review of a subject grade where they believe that the grade has been awarded erroneously due to incorrect recording of assessment marks, failure to follow College Policy and Procedure in awarding of a grade, or failure to consider evidence of illness or extenuating circumstances where evidence was provided at the time of assessment item.

The following are not acceptable grounds for a review of a subject grade:

- Disagreement with the assessment method or the standards required for assessment tasks
- A belief that the grade is not a reflection of normal academic performance
- Belief that the grade does not reflect the time or work effort put into the subject
- The need to have a higher grade for scholarship, GPA or other reasons
- Financial or other implications of failing a subject
- Personal and/or medical problems that were not raised during the teaching period
- Loss of marks due to academic misconduct

Students wishing to seek review of subject grade are required to apply for *Review of Subject Grade* via the appropriate form. Applications are to be made no later than 10 days after the subject grade release date. The application will be considered by the Head of Department who, based on the evidence provided, may reject or approve the review.

Where the review is granted, the outcome may include correction of arithmetic errors in calculation of the grade, remark of assessment items, approval to resubmit assessment items or other outcomes as appropriate to the case.

Where a student remains unsatisfied with the outcome of the subject grade review process they may appeal via the Appeal of Academic Decision process as outlined in the *Complaints and Appeals Policy – Domestic – HE*. Appeals must be made within 10 working days of the outcome of their subject grade review application.

Definitions

College – The Australian College of Natural Medicine Pty Ltd trades as Endeavour College of Natural Health (Endeavour) and Endeavour Wellness Clinic. For the purpose of this Policy, any reference to ‘College’ or ‘the College’ should be considered a reference to each or any of these respective entities or trading names.

Student - an individual person who is formally enrolled to study at the College. The individual person is that who appears on the College’s documents such as enrolment, admission and payment documents, and who is assigned an individual student ID.

Related Procedures

Grievance Procedure

Further Information

Related Policies

Academic Integrity Policy – HE
Attendance Policy – Higher Education
Complaints and Appeals Policy – Domestic - Higher Education
Complaints and Appeals Policy – International
Disability Policy
Examination Policy – Higher Education
Moderation of Assessment Policy
Reasonable Adjustment Policy
Recognition of Prior Learning Policy – HE and VET
Special Consideration Policy – Higher Education
Student Misconduct Policy – Higher Education

Related Documents

APA Referencing Guideline
Application for Remark Request
Review of Subject Grade

Guidelines

AQF Qualifications Pathways Policy, 2013, AQF Council
Australian Qualifications Framework, 2011, AQF Council

Benchmarking

Christian Heritage College
Deakin University
Flinders University
Griffith University
James Cook University
Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology
University of Newcastle
University of Queensland
University of Wollongong

Grade ranges -

Australian Catholic University
Australian College of Applied Psychology
Macquarie University
Queensland University of Technology
University of New England

University of New South Wales
University of Newcastle
University of the Sunshine Coast
University of Southern Queensland
University of Sydney
University of Technology Sydney

Supporting Research and Analysis

Boud, D. (2010). *Assessment 2020: Seven propositions for assessment reform in higher education*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

McNeil, H. P., Hughes, C. S., Toohey, S. M., & Downton, S. B. (2006). An innovative outcomes-based medical education program built on adult learning principles. *Medical Teacher*, 28(6), 527-534. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600834229>

Russell, S. C. (2008). *Assessment in Australian Universities: What they say they do to engage students*. Retrieved from www.ojs.unisa.edu.au/index.php/atna/article/viewFile/369/286

Related Legislation

Not applicable

Review and Approval

Policy Author

Director of Education

Policy Owner

Director of Education

Contact

Director of Education

jenny.wilkinson@endeavour.edu.au

Recommending Body

Education Board

Meeting date: 16 November 2023

Approval Body

Academic Council

Meeting date: 8 December 2023

Policy Status

Revised – full revision to match current process, added FNS

Responsibilities for Implementation

- Director of Education
- Director of Student Operations
- Heads of Department
- Academic staff
- Student Advisers

Key Stakeholders

- Academic Council
- Director of Sales, Admissions & Retention
- Education Board
- Students