
Faculty of Arts & Education Assessment and Moderation Guidelines

2017

Table of Contents

Background to the assessment and moderation guidelines	4
1 Contextual background to these Guidelines	4
2 Related documents	5
3 Scope of these guidelines	5
Part A. Assessment Guidelines	6
4 Assessment roles and responsibilities	6
5 Design of assessment items	6
5.1 Alignment with subject learning outcomes	6
5.2 Scale and nature of assessment	6
5.3 Criteria and standards	7
5.4 First Year Experience Principles	8
5.5 Pass requirements in subjects	8
5.6 Additional requirements and conditions within graded subjects	9
5.7 Compulsory attendance in on-campus subjects	9
5.8 Recognition of previous assessment in the same subject	10
5.9 Lateness and penalties	10
5.10 Equivalence in assessment across cohorts	10
5.11 Examinations	11
5.12 Subject outline requirements	11
6 Managing the assessment process during the session	11
6.1 Feedback to students	11
6.2 Re-marking of assessment items	12
6.3 Resubmission of assessment items	12
6.4 Managing Late Submission Penalties	13
6.5 Maintaining subject assessment records	13
7 Misadventure, special consideration and extensions	14
7.1 Extensions on assessment items within session	14
7.2 Extensions for tests conducted during session (outside of the formal examinations period)	14
7.3 Extensions for compulsory residential school, fieldwork or practicum requirements	14
7.4 Special Consideration, Misadventure and Extenuating Circumstances	15
7.5 Misadventure at a supplementary exam	15
7.6 Timeframe for applications for Special Consideration	15
8 Grades	16
8.1 Awarding of AA and AE grades	16
8.2 The nature of AA/AE tasks	16
8.3 Communication of availability of Additional Assessment	17
8.4 Changes of grade	17
8.5 Resolution of non-substantive grades	18
8.6 Notification of grades	18
8.7 Timeline for finalising grades at end-of-session	18
8.8 Applying TA grades to an entire cohort	19
8.9 Applying TA grades to individual students	19
8.10 Grade changes – Authority to approve	19
8.11 Reviews of grade	20
8.12 Grades in Workplace Learning Subjects in Teacher Education Courses	20
8.13 Student Academic Misconduct	20
9 Credit	20
9.1 Subject Credit	20
Governance	21

10	Assessment Committees	21
	Part B. Moderation Guidelines	21
11	Background to the moderation guidelines	21
12	Minimum Requirement	22
13	Pre-subject moderation processes	22
14	During-subject moderation processes	23
15	Post-delivery Moderation processes	24
16	School and Faculty Assessment Committee processes associated with moderation	24
	Appendix A. Roles and responsibilities	26
	Appendix B. Glossary of terms	28
	Appendix C. Suggested text for subject outlines	30
	Appendix D Marking Schemes examples	33
	Appendix E Policy references	34

Background to the assessment and moderation guidelines

1 Contextual background to these Guidelines

The new Faculty of Arts and Education was established in July 2016, bringing together three Schools and a Centre from the former Faculty of Arts and the four Schools of the former Faculty of Education. The development of these guidelines is an attempt to provide a shared understanding of process and practice throughout the Faculty and is a direct response to a number of substantial administrative and organisation changes in the University which have taken shape over the past 12 months.

Importantly, these guidelines are grounded in University-wide policy as the 'single point of truth' guiding practices and procedures. Older traditions in the University which used parallel or alternative 'Faculty policy' in the area of assessment (and other areas) have proven to be confusing to staff and students and have led to substantial risks in the application of fair and consistent practice around one of the most important areas of the University's functioning: assessment.

These Guidelines are designed to help staff work in ways that are consistent with University expectations about quality in assessment and moderation practices. The Guidelines are also aimed at ensuring that Faculty practice will be integrated with practices followed elsewhere in the University, especially the Divisional areas strategically related to assessment and student record management and processing. The aim is to ensure that all staff and students in the University can rely on being treated equitably, fairly and consistently across every element of their academic experience at Charles Sturt University.

It is my hope that these guidelines will form the basis for staff reflection on their practices around assessment and moderation and that elements of it will become useful source material for staff induction and professional development. While the University policy bases upon which these guidelines are built are subject to change and re-interpretation from time to time, the articulation of our practice here should be a firm ground from which to incorporate developments in policy and practice elsewhere in the University as they occur.

Professor Lesley White

**Executive Dean
Faculty of Arts and Education**

2 Related documents

These guidelines should be read alongside the CSU Assessment Principles Policy, the CSU Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects, the Moderation Policy, and the Subject Outlines Policy.

These Guidelines *do not* replace any aspect of these or any other University policies. Rather, the intention is that the information contained in this document provides additional detail, or more specific interpretations and clarification of Faculty of Arts and Education expectations around practice consistent with University policy. The Guidelines cross reference to the relevant CSU policy throughout and it is expected that the reader will read the relevant sections of cited policy in order to obtain a full appreciation of the University's requirements.

The University's policy library is located at <https://www.csu.edu.au/about/policy> . Note that University Policies are 'living documents' (as indeed are these Guidelines) and as such are subject to ongoing review and revision. Academic and Administrative staff should periodically review the summary of changes to policy, provided in the CSU Policy Library site (<http://www.csu.edu.au/about/policy>).

3 Scope of these guidelines

Except where specified, these Guidelines apply to all subjects offered by the Faculty of Arts & Education in all modes and on all campuses, whether in Australia or offshore. Where aspects of the Guidelines apply differently, clear instruction about Faculty expectations has been provided.

Part A. Assessment Guidelines

4 Assessment roles and responsibilities

The CSU Assessment Policy sets out the roles and responsibilities of the School and Faculty Assessment Committees, and makes clear that the Executive Dean of the Faculty has ultimate responsibility and authority in the application of the assessment policy and determining student grades. The Assessment and Moderation policies also specify the responsibilities of the various stakeholders in the assessment and moderation processes in general terms. Roles and Responsibilities are defined in [Appendix A](#).

5 Design of assessment items

The design of assessment items occurs at different points within the Subject and Course design process. Staff should ensure that, at a minimum, assessment design conforms to the requirements set out in the:

- [Assessment Principles Policy](#) [http];
- [Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects](#) [http]; and
- [Subject Outlines Policy](#) [http]
- [Moderation Policy](#) [http]

(see <http://www.csu.edu.au/about/policy>)

In particular, staff will take special care to ensure that the principles contained in [Part B](#) and [Part D](#) (clause 16) of the Assessment Principles Policy are adhered to in the design of assessment items. The subsections that follow within these guidelines provide additional information about expectations within the Faculty of Arts & Education in relation to assessment design.

5.1 Alignment with subject learning outcomes

As established in the CSU Assessment Principles Policy, it is an expectation that the description of assessment items, along with the articulated criteria and standards of performance, are *aligned* to the learning outcomes within the subject profile and subject outline. **It is a Faculty expectation that the subject learning outcomes addressed by an assessment item are listed within the assessment item rationale.** Learning outcomes should be a reference point for subject designers in the framing of marking criteria.

5.2 Scale and nature of assessment

The assessment design in a subject will reflect the challenge and performance standards appropriate to the Australian Qualification Standards (AQF) requirements for qualification level of the course the subject serves (see *Assessment Principles Policy*, clause 14b). The design of assessment in subjects will also have due regard to:

- The time available to students to undertake the task demands indicated by the assessment item;
- Students' access to resources necessary to complete the tasks specified in the assessment item description – including any special training required to use specialist equipment or other tools;

-
- The reasonableness of any compulsory performance requirement in an assessment task that might unfairly disadvantage a particular student or group of students, such as those with a disability (in such cases staff should refer to the [Disability and Work or Study Adjustment Policy](#));
 - The total burden on markers in assessing items submitted by students.

In most cases, adequate assessment of student achievement against a session-length subject's learning outcomes should be able to be determined through two well-designed assessment items, though more than two may be necessary in some cases (for instance, where an initial 'low stakes task' is used).

Where subject design teams determine that multiple assessment item regimes (beyond three items) need to be established in subjects, they must consult with the Head of School to clarify the workload implications for staff required to mark such subjects as well as any implications related to the workload of students.

See also *Moderation Policy*, clause 8 and 9 (Pre-Delivery Moderation).

NB: *All assessment items should be due on or before the end of the teaching period*. This meets assessment finalisation goals related to the work of SAC and FAC as well as Divisional goals related to the release of grades and, finally, assists students in managing university workload and preparation for following session enrolment.

Any plan to design assessment items to be due (other than formal examinations managed by Examinations Office) inside the examinations period must be approved by the Head of School.

TO NOTE: "...where an assignment is directly relevant to an examination, assignments that have been submitted by the due date shall normally be returned to students at least one week before the examination is held." (*Assessment Policy Coursework Subjects*, Part BB, clause 111)

5.3 *Criteria and standards*

As stated in Section 1 (clause 9) of the CSU *Assessment Principles Policy*, assessment and grading at CSU are based on a **critterion-referenced standards-based** (CRSB) approach where assessment is aligned to pre-determined and defined criteria and related standards of skills, knowledge, and competencies.

A key aspect of the CRSB approach is the expectation as specified in Section 3 (Part B [clause 14e](#)) of the CSU *Assessment Principles Policy* and in clause 12c of the [Subject Outlines Policy](#) that students will be informed through the Subject Outline about the expectations and requirements of assessment items and the marking criteria and standards for each assessment task, including 'the standard required to achieve each grade level against each criteria' (Clause 14e, *Assessment Principles Policy*).

In the Faculty of Arts & Education it is expected that this requirement will be achieved by including, within the subject outline, a detailed marking scheme which will be used by students and staff alike to understand the criteria upon which an assessment item is to be evaluated. The marking scheme should also – in accordance with clause 14e of the *Assessment Principles Policy* – show how each grade level is demonstrated against each criterion. In addition, the relative weighting of each criterion in determining the overall mark awarded for a submitted piece of work will be made clear.

While the structure of a marking scheme is set by the *Assessment Principles Policy*, the content and layout of a marking scheme is at the discretion of academic staff teaching a subject *in consultation with* appropriate other staff as may be indicated for that subject.

See [Appendix D](#) for examples of different types of Marking Schemes

Online Workshops explaining the intentions of the CRSB assessment policy and providing guidance with the articulation of criteria and standards, along with examples of assessment items in a range of discipline areas with complete marking schemes (e.g., 'rubrics'), can be found within the CSU Assessment and Moderation resources site at:

<http://www.csu.edu.au/division/student-learning/home/assessment-and-moderation/assessment-and-moderation-resources>

5.4 *First Year Experience Principles*

In line with the University Assessment Principles Policy, the Faculty of Arts & Education expectation is that assessment items in the early stages of transition to university should be formative in nature and structured to scaffold students' development as learners. Assessment regimes for UG subjects routinely undertaken by students transitioning into higher education should be designed to help develop academic literacy needs of students, and there should be *timely feedback* in the early stages of these subjects. **Consistent with Part B (clause 14 k) of the CSU Assessment Principles Policy, wherever possible the first assessment task in first year UG subjects should be a 'low stakes' task.** This may be achieved by:

- a) having a non-graded formative task before the first summative task; or
- b) providing a very low weighting (e.g. less than 20%) for the first summative task, or
- c) allowing resubmission for students performing unsatisfactorily on the first task (see Section 6.3 below); and
- d) ensuring that the student support structure in the subject is focussed on clear and frequent communication to students, open dialogue between staff and students, and other such support that will promote success for students (e.g., links to ALLaN, Study Skills, Indigenous Academic Support, and resources like FAQ pages around assessment practices).

5.5 *Pass requirements in subjects*

The requirement for passing a subject should routinely be a final *cumulative* score equal to or greater than 50% of the total marks for the subject.

In addition, to pass the subject, all assessment items - which should be constructively aligned to the Subject's learning outcomes (see Assessment Principles Policy) - must be submitted.

Subjects must also contain a statement specifying how the marks or grades given for assessment items are conflated to determine a final grade in the subject. (*Subject Outline Policy*, clause 15).

(See [Appendix C](#) for examples of a generic statement and other more nuanced examples of different assessment regimes)

Compulsory assessment items

Some subjects may include assessment items which must be passed to pass the subject (e.g. Hybrid subjects and workplace learning subjects), but this should not be a routine requirement.

Where it is a requirement to pass all assessment items or passing a part of the assessment is compulsory, this information *must* be communicated to students in the Subject Outline (See Subject Outlines Policy, clause 12d), including the process for managing the situation where a student achieves a passing grade on cumulative marks but fails a compulsory task.

Such outcomes relate to the provisions of the Additional Assessment policy (see Section 5, Part O of the *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects*) or the Indigenous Australian Hybrid Subjects policy (see Section 2, Part C of the *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects*). However, unless the Subject outline specifically states their use in the subject, other methods will have to be considered to offer a remedy for such outcomes, or the student's result must be set to FL.

Other approaches may be to consider using re-submission for failed items that must be passed to pass the subject (see 6.3 below).

5.6 *Additional requirements and conditions within graded subjects*

The inclusion of additional terms or conditions ('hurdle tasks') beyond actual assessment items **for passing** a graded subject is strongly discouraged. Where expectations relating to academic literacy, participation in online activities and so on are seen as essential, these requirements should be made part of assessment items and integrated into the criteria and standards for the tasks. The only exception is attendance which may be required in certain circumstances as set out in the following section (see 5.7).

The following examples of additional requirements and conditions for passing a subject are *not generally encouraged* as they are either difficult to monitor, not transparent, and/or not easily judged:

- *participate fully in class discussions*
- *complete the set reading for each week*
- *participate as an engaged team member in a particular activity which is part of a particular assessment item*
- *make meaningful postings to the subject forum on a regular basis.*

Staff who wish to specify additional requirements and conditions for passing a subject, beyond the normal requirement of a final cumulative score equal to or greater than 50% of the full value of the subject's assessment, are required to consult with Subject Teaching Team members and the Course Director and then seek approval for their regime of additional requirements from the relevant Head of School prior to the finalisation for publication of the Subject Outline.

Head of School approval should be based on – as a minimum - those considerations in 5.2 above.

5.7 *Compulsory attendance in on-campus subjects*

In on-campus subjects there is an *expectation* that all students will prepare for, attend, participate in, and engage with structured learning activities in all scheduled classes and/or designated online activities. However, consistent with the statements above discouraging the setting of additional requirements to pass a subject beyond performance in summative assessment items, mere attendance at class should not normally be a requirement to pass a subject. Where completion of learning activities that occur during on-campus classes is considered essential in order to satisfactorily complete a subject, performance on these tasks should be assessed as part of the summative assessment items described within the subject outline.

To Note: ‘...summative assessment marks cannot be awarded purely for attendance in an online or face-to-face class.’ (Clause 14p, *Assessment Principles Policy*).

5.8 *Recognition of previous assessment in the same subject*

From time to time students who, at an earlier time, had partially completed a subject may at a subsequent enrolment in the same subject seek to have an earlier attempt at an assessment item satisfy the requirements for an assessment item in that subject.

Subject Coordinators have discretion in accepting a student’s previous attempts at an item provided that:

- The previously submitted assessment item addresses the task specifications of the *current assessment item*;
- The assessment item is *re-marked against the subject’s current criteria for that assessment item*;
- The student accepts that the *mark received previously may not be the mark achieved on the present submission*;
- The student provides the marker with some certification to support the assignment being free of plagiarism (e.g., Turnitin Report).

See also 9.1, **Subject Credit** below.

5.9 *Lateness and penalties*

The Subject Outlines Policy (clause 12f iii) specifies that Subject Outlines must indicate ‘details regarding the late receipt of assignments, in particular any assessment penalties late assignments will incur’.

Staff developing Subject Outlines are required to consider how late submissions will be dealt with and the appropriate level of penalty or other approach that might be adopted to ensure fairness for other students and encourage efficient assessment processing in a subject (see 6.4 below).

Where a penalty is to be used, text found in [Appendix C](#) may be used as a *guide*.

5.10 *Equivalence in assessment across cohorts*

Where a subject is offered concurrently to more than one cohort of students due to multicampus, multi-mode or partner offerings, *assessment items (including exams) will normally be the same for all cohorts of students within a particular session offering*.

With the approval of the relevant Head of School, different assessment items may be used for different cohorts/students in a subject provided that all of the conditions below are met:

- The reason for differences in the assessment items is related to formal partner arrangements or agreed requirements associated with special learner cohorts;
- Subject Convenor and Subject Teaching Team have consulted and are agreed on the different assessment items;
- Different assessment items must address the same learning outcomes and be of the same standard and the same weighting as determined by agreement of the Subject Convenor and the Subject Teaching Team;
- Subject Convenors and Subject Teaching Teams must document in the Online Moderation Record how they have determined consistent application of standards

such that the University can have confidence that students undertaking the different assessment items will be able to demonstrate the same learning outcomes regardless of assessment item experience.

5.11 Examinations

Examinations in subjects should be described in the Subject Outline so as to meet the requirements set out in clause 12 h - k of the *Subject Outlines Policy*.

Formal, end-of-session examinations must meet the Examinations Office requirements for presentation and quality assurance prior to submission through the examinations submissions portal.

Please see the CSU Assessment and Moderation resources site at <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/landt/assessment-and-moderation-at-csu/home> for guidance about the design of CRSB exams. Staff developing examination scripts should also consult the Division of Student Learning checklist for examination quality assurance.

NB: End-of-session examinations will be a maximum of two hours duration unless an exception has been approved by the Executive Dean or other officer authorised to do so (for instance, the Deputy Dean).

Students must not have their study for examinations compromised by assignments made due (by design or extension) in the Examinations Period.

5.12 Subject outline requirements

The *Subject Outlines Policy* specifies the assessment information required to be included within the subject outline. In addition to these University requirements, the following sections in these Guidelines ought to be consulted for guidance:

- 5.5 (Pass requirements in subjects);
- 5.7 (Compulsory attendance in on-campus subjects);
- 5.8 (Recognition of previous assessment in the same subject);
- 6.3 (Resubmission of assessment items);
- 7.1 (Extensions on assessment items within session);
- 8.1 (Awarding of AA and AE grades).

6 Managing the assessment process during the session

6.1 Feedback to students

Feedback to students on individual assessment items (excluding exams) should include:

- an indication of how each student has performed against the criteria and standards provided in the subject outline (normally by providing an annotated version of the assessment marking scheme provided within the subject outline);
- a numeric score for a graded item or a satisfactory/unsatisfactory statement for a nongraded item and an indication of how the score has been calculated or the satisfactory/unsatisfactory status determined in terms of the documented criteria and standards; and
- individual written or recorded spoken feedback about performance on the task.

Written or spoken feedback should be clear and respectful of the student and contribute to positive learning outcomes. A student should be able to identify the marker of their assessment task. Feedback needs to be timely and available to students before they submit a subsequent formal piece of assessment. Particularly in large subjects with multiple markers, attention needs to be paid to the *time required to mark an assessment item* at the time of designing the actual task and dates of submission.

All assessment items should be due on or before the end of the teaching period to maximise the student's opportunity to learn from feedback and to assist them access their right to Special Consideration or Review of Grade procedures where they might be felt to apply. (Note however that any feedback relevant to an end of session examination must be returned to the student at least one week before the exam is held. (Assessment Policy Coursework Subjects Part BB, Clause 111)

The interpretation of criteria and standards and the quality of written or verbal feedback needs to be consistent across markers and across cohorts in multi cohort subjects. This will normally be achieved through the adoption of sound moderation practices with respect to marking within subjects.

See Assessment Principles Policy, clause 17a and d.

6.2 Re-marking of assessment items

Formal re-marks of individual assessment items is subject to Part T of the [Assessment Policy](https://policy.csu.edu.au/document/view-current.php?id=301)<https://policy.csu.edu.au/document/view-current.php?id=301> *Coursework Subjects*. Please consult these in the first instance. Full procedures for dealing with requests for a review of mark can be found by consulting Subjects Team.

Note: Where a re-mark of an assessment item is sought at the end of session and *before* grade finalisation, the student's result should be set to TA, pending the outcome of the application for a re-mark.

6.3 Resubmission of assessment items

In the absence of discipline-based or School-level positions on resubmission of assessment items that do not reach a passing grade, subject convenors/coordinators have discretion in determining whether resubmission will be allowed in a subject. *Importantly*, if resubmission is to be allowed, this needs to be made clear in the subject outline (see *Subject Outlines Policy*, clause 12h) and the statement about resubmission should include the information listed at the end of this section (see Appendix C).

Cases where resubmission may be routine

Allowing resubmission following unsatisfactory performance in the first assessment item in first year undergraduate subjects is encouraged especially in situations where the reason for the student's unsatisfactory performance relates to referencing or other aspects of developing academic literacy. Allowing resubmission can be an effective strategy to ensure that students engage with feedback and can also ensure that the first attempt at the first assessment item is a 'low stakes' experience.

Resubmission may also be applied in cases where students fail compulsory assessment items or 'hurdle' tasks in assessment regimes.

Maximum mark on resubmission

If a student's work is satisfactory following resubmission, normally their mark should be recorded as a borderline pass only (that is no more than 50% of the total item's value). This limits the advantage of resubmission in recognition of the efforts of other students who passed the assignment in accordance with the original submission terms.

The following information should be included within the Subject Outline when resubmission is to be allowed:

- the fact that there will be a limit of one re-submission for any one assessment task;
- the effect of the re-submission on the recorded mark for the assessment task (e.g., a maximum of 50% of the marks for the assessment task); and
- whether resubmission for failing assignments is *automatically offered*, or the onus will be on the *student to apply* to resubmit;
- *which* assessment items will be subject to resubmission arrangements.

[See sample wording in Appendix C.](#)

6.4 Managing Late Submission Penalties

As stated in 5.9 above, Subject Outlines Policy (clause 12f iii) specifies that Subject Outlines must indicate 'details regarding the late receipt of assignments, in particular any assessment penalties late assignments will incur'.

Assignments are deemed late when the date they are received at the University – normally through EASTS – is after the submission date specified in the Subject Outline or the date determined following the application for an extension (whichever is later).

Late assignments are marked as any other assignment with the determined mark being then subject to the penalty as described in the Subject Outline.

The exception is assignments received so late as to be beyond the value of the assignment as determined by late penalty. In this case, the assignment is not marked but determined to be worth zero marks and returned to the student unmarked with comment to that effect.

To note: In some cases students may seek to have a late assessment item which has received zero marks, re-marked in accordance with procedures specified in Part T of the *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects* (Review of Marks Awarded for Specific Assessment Tasks). Alternatively, students may commence lodgement of an application for Special Consideration if they believe their circumstances warrant such consideration. Staff should be familiar with these parts of policy and be prepared to provide to, or seek accurate advice for, students seeking reconsideration of their outcomes in assessment during the teaching session.

Staff should avoid offering repeated extension dates to students whose extension has expired. Extensions are meant to offer *short term, one off additional time* to submit work. If the circumstances are such that a much longer period of extension applies, the student should consider making an application for Special Consideration and seeking Grade Pending to a point beyond the end of session.

6.5 Maintaining subject assessment records

As required by clauses 17 and 18 of the *Assessment Principles Policy*, teaching staff are responsible for entering marks into the online grade system (Grade Centre) during the teaching session, normally **at the time that students' marked assessment items are returned**. This may require the Subject Convenor/Coordinator to collate marks determined by markers employed in a subject. Such collation should be carefully checked and must form part of the subject quality assurance (moderation) procedures.

N.B.: The *Assessment Principles Policy*, clause 17d, concerning expectations about uploading and releasing students' results for individual assessment items in a timely manner.

7 Misadventure, special consideration and extensions

7.1 Extensions on assessment items within session

Short Extensions of time to submit

The University's Special Consideration Policy (clause 11), states that Subject convenors/coordinators have discretion in determining the management of short extensions of an assessment task. [Appendix C](#) provides recommended text for subject outlines on extensions.

Notwithstanding the Convenor/Coordinator's discretion in relation to extensions, the following are the minimum Faculty expectations for extensions (see Subject Outlines Policy, clause 12f ii):

- The grounds for granting an extension and the process for seeking an extension of time should be clearly detailed in the Subject Outline and other relevant places in the Subject materials and online support materials;
- The penalty for late submission applies after any extension date expires;
- Student requests for extensions should be received *in writing before* the due date of the assessment item and should include supporting documentation where possible (so that Subject Coordinators/ Convenors can give appropriate advice to students if they feel the circumstances presented by the student may warrant the student making an application for Special Consideration instead); and
- A record of all approvals for extension (including any conditions) granted within the subject should be kept by the Subject Coordinator/ Convenor (normally, this would be as a note in the Grade Centre comment field against the student entry).

NB: Students with more serious circumstances requiring longer or less clear resolution should be supported by advising them to complete an application for Special Consideration (see section 7.4 below). This is especially so for cases of late application for extensions in the final week of teaching. In such cases, staff should consult their Head of School for guidance.

(See also 6.4 above)

7.2 Extensions for tests conducted during session (outside of the formal examinations period)

Extensions for mid-session tests will normally only be considered where students have applied to the Subject Coordinator/Convenor in writing on the basis of misadventure or extenuating circumstances, as defined in the Special Consideration Policy, and have provided appropriate supporting documentation, as defined in the [Special Consideration Policy](#) (Section 5, Supporting Documentary Evidence).

Due to the nature of tests and the academic integrity risks around out of schedule examination, extensions granted for class tests may require the student to undertake an alternative equivalent test or assignment designed by the Subject Coordinator.

7.3 Extensions for compulsory residential school, fieldwork or practicum requirements

Extensions for the completion of compulsory residential school, fieldwork or practicum requirements will normally only be permitted where students have applied for Special

Consideration on the basis of misadventure or extenuating circumstances as defined in the *Special Consideration Policy*, and have provided appropriate supporting documentation (see [Special Consideration Policy](#), Section 4 and 5).

7.4 *Special Consideration, Misadventure and Extenuating Circumstances*

The types of circumstances for which special consideration may be granted are specified in the *Special Consideration Policy*, Section 3 (also see [Appendix C.](#))

Only applications for special consideration due to misadventure or extenuating circumstances *that are accompanied by supporting documentary evidence* will be considered. The [Special Consideration Policy](#), Section 5 defines the requirements for supporting documents as evidence of misadventure or extenuating circumstances.

See the application form here: <https://apps.csu.edu.au/specialcons/>

7.5 *Misadventure at a supplementary exam*

Where a student has been granted a supplementary examination (SX) and subsequently experiences misadventure or extenuating circumstances at the supplementary examination, the Subject Coordinator will recommend to the Head of the Teaching School that either:

- a) the student be granted Approved Withdrawal (AW); or
- b) a grade be awarded on the basis of performance in the supplementary exam; or
- c) in exceptional circumstances, a grade be awarded to the student on some basis other than performance on the supplementary examination, e.g., completion of an alternative assessment item.

(See [Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects](#), Section 14, Part TT).

7.6 *Timeframe for applications for Special Consideration*

The Special Consideration process is available to students during session and – if the application concerns an examination they are undertaking in the formal examinations period – up to three days after their last examination. **Applications for Special Consideration are not permitted after the student's grade has been released.** In that circumstance students are to be advised to make an application for Review of Grade if they wish to have illness or misadventure (or other matters) considered in relation to assessment performance during their enrolment in a subject.

The timeframes for applications for special consideration are as follows:

For matters related to the student's experiences during session:

- By the Friday before the commencement of examinations for the session for applications that relate to circumstances experienced *during session* under Special Consideration Policy, Section 3.

For matters related to events/experiences related to an examination (in subjects with end of session examinations only):

- Within three working days of the examination for applications that relate to illness/misadventure experienced *during the examination period and/or the preceding week* (see *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects*, Section 14, Part RR.)

-
- **Staff are strongly encouraged to provide alerts to students (e.g., through forum messaging) about Special Consideration during session, especially around the point of assignment return, when students may need to exercise their rights to apply.**

8 Grades

The key to CSU grades is available in [Section 3 Grades](#) (*Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects*).

The Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects (Section 3, Part G) provides additional information in relation to the awarding of the following grades:

- AW and FW grades (Approved Withdrawal and Fail Withdrawal)
- AA and AE grades (Additional Assessment and Additional (formal) Examination)
- GP and SX grades (Grade Pending and Supplementary Exam)
- TA (To be Assessed)

Staff need to be familiar with the grounds for awarding such grades and clear on the advice to students eligible for or, in some cases, seeking those grade outcomes. Further advice can be obtained from the Head of School, the Faculty Subjects Team or the Sub Dean, Learning and Teaching.

To Note: Staff should ensure that the TA grade is used in those cases where assessment is not yet finalised – and to be especially vigilant at end of session where the autocalculated grades in Grade Centre would result in students having incorrect grades released.

8.1 Awarding of AA and AE grades

From the second session of 2017 (2017-60) the Faculty of Arts and Education has determined that, excepting in special circumstances related to external partnering or service teaching arrangements within the University, AA/AE grading will no longer be offered by a constituent School to students studying in its subjects.

In those exceptional circumstances where AA/AE might be offered, eligible students are defined as in the Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects (Section 5, Part O), with the additional criterion that the student must have completed and submitted all compulsory assessment items for the subject during the session of offering.

In such exceptional subjects, *all* enrolled students regardless of Faculty, School or Course of origin will be eligible to be considered for an AA/AE according to the provisions of Part O of the *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects*, unless alternative equivalent provisions for managing marginal failure/failure of compulsory assessment are in place (for instance in Indigenous Hybrid subjects, Part C of the Assessment Policy- Coursework Subjects will apply).

8.2 The nature of AA/AE tasks

'Schools, through the person to whom authority has been delegated (normally the Course Director or Course Coordinator, in consultation with the Subject Convenor/Coordinator), shall have discretion to determine the nature of the additional assessment offered to the student which need not be the same type of assessment item as the item failed.' – *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects, Part O, Clause 38.*

In designing Additional Assessment items staff are offered the following guidelines:

- In accordance with University policy, additional assessment items may vary in *type* from the item failed (e.g., an examination may be replaced by an essay and vice versa), however, in general, it is expected that:
 - a. The Additional Assessment will be focussed on ensuring the student demonstrates evidence of achieving the outcomes they have failed to demonstrate on the original attempt;
 - b. The Additional Assessment will not be more onerous for either student completion or staff marking than the original assessment item;
 - c. Where reworking of an original assessment task is used as the basis of the Additional Assessment, sufficient measures are taken to ensure that the intent of the AA task is not confounded by the risk of Academic Misconduct (note Clause 14i of the *Assessment Principles Policy*).
 - d. Wherever possible, staff working within Part O of the policy should consider offering AA over AE as AA ensures that the Additional Assessment can be managed promptly by the School and does not delay assessment until the next Examination period nor require staff to develop, manage and mark formal examinations.

8.3 Communication of availability of Additional Assessment

The availability of additional assessment must be clearly communicated to students via the Subject Outline. [See Appendix C](#)

8.4 Changes of grade

In almost all cases, changes of grade occur to convert non-substantive grades (such as GP, TA, AA, AE, SX, IP) to substantive grades (e.g., PS, CR, DI, HD, FL, SY, US). Subject Coordinators/Convenors are responsible for initiating and completing the Change of Grade form including the reason for the change. (See form here:

<https://www.csu.edu.au/division/student-admin/staff-services/resources/forms>)

In some very few cases, a School initiated change of grade may be appropriate where an error is discovered by administrative or academic staff at some point after the release of Grades. In all such instances, the *staff must alert their Head of School and assist with any investigation into the cause of the error.*

When the basis for the Change of Grade is an error in the calculation/entry of marks, the Subject Coordinator/Convenor **must provide a comment verifying the accuracy of all other grades in the subject when submitting the Change of Grade form.**

All grade changes must be ratified by the appropriate School and Faculty Assessment Committees. As such, all grade changes should be returned via the Subject Administration Team to enable inclusion on relevant agendas.

To Note: Where a student makes a request to have a substantive grade reviewed and changed, the Review of Grade process **must** be followed (i.e. *the matter must be dealt with using formal review*).

- **If, during the review of an individual student's grade outcome, other errors come to light affecting other students' results, the School must take action to correct those errors and – where appropriate - advise all affected students of the changes made to their grades.**

8.5 Resolution of non-substantive grades

Adequate records related to non-substantive grading decisions must be kept by Subject Coordinators. For instance, where a Grade Pending decision has been made, a note in a comments column in Grade Centre should show the outstanding assessment to be submitted and the date it is due. Dates and any action for resolution of other non-substantive grades in a subject should also be recorded in Grade Centre.

Subject Coordinators must provide a report on all non-substantive grades awarded in their subject to the end of session School Assessment Committee. These reports will be used by the Subjects Team to assist in providing accurate advice to the Head of School around outstanding grades and the conditions for their resolution.

In the first instance, it is the responsibility of the Subject Coordinator to monitor, process, and report to the Head of School any unresolved grades in their subject from previous offerings they have managed.

Monitoring of unconverted grades from previous sessions is undertaken by the Division of Student Administration. Subject Administration Teams will provide reports of unconverted grades to HoS on a periodic basis for follow-up and resolution. In the absence of any explanatory information for an unresolved grade which has passed a deadline for resolution, the Head of School should convert the nonsubstantive grade to Fail/Fail Withdrawn as soon as possible.

8.6 Notification of grades

Official notification of final grades is the responsibility of the Division of Student Administration.

Faculty teaching staff members are not permitted under any circumstances to search the University's secure systems or disclose their own confidential assessment records to supply enquirers with information about a student's final grades.

Students seeking information about their grades from School staff should be referred to Student Administration or recommended to check their own online student records.

The University reserves the right to withhold or otherwise restrict access to information about a range of information that it holds, including student results. Staff should not unwittingly expose themselves to violations of the University's right to protect its data and the privacy of information held about individuals.

8.7 Timeline for finalising grades at end-of-session

The deadline for subject convenors/coordinators finalising grades for a subject is specified by the University and notified to the faculties by the Division of Student Administration.

The finalisation of grades is the main priority during the end-of-session processing periods. Subject Convenors/Coordinators, Subject Administration Teams and Heads of School should bear in mind the Faculty requirement to have finalised grades for submission **in advance** of the School Assessment Committee meetings and the Faculty Assessment Committee meetings after end of session. All staff engaged in activity related to subject marking and grade finalisation processes **should be available** for comment up to and including the School Assessment Committee meeting prior to the Faculty Assessment Committee meeting.

HoS and other staff managers should take this into account when considering any leave or other applications that may remove staff from campus or ready contact during the assessment finalisation period. Where the subject convenor or coordinator is a sessional staff member, they should provide phone details where they can be contacted if necessary during the grade finalisation period.

NB: Submission of Grades (Assessment Policy - Coursework Subjects (Part N):

“Submission of final grades by University Faculties to the Division of Student Administration should not be delayed by a minority of scripts or assessments for a subject being outstanding.”

8.8 Applying TA grades to an entire cohort

TA grades will not normally be applied to entire student cohorts, except when the final assessment has been delayed, such as may occur for students undertaking practicum requirements post the end of session or in exceptional circumstances such as marker illness or unexpected absence from duties.

Where it is deemed necessary to apply a TA grade to an entire cohort this should first be discussed with the Head of School.

The application of entire cohort TAs should be accompanied by adequate record keep as indicated in 8.9 below.

8.9 Applying TA grades to individual students

TA grades are normally awarded where further action to resolve the grade is required on the part of the University and that action is not able to be taken in time to finalise the grade prior to the meeting of the School Assessment Committee.

TA grades will not normally be allocated to individual students except in the case of lecturer illness/misadventure, where marking has been legitimately delayed, or within practicum subjects when extensions of time are given for individual students to complete practicum requirements with third parties. In these cases, the following procedures will be followed:

- The Subject Coordinator will record the TA grade in Grade Centre along **with a comment as to the timeframe for resolving the grade**. (Note directions to Subject Coordinators concerning non-substantive grades management in section 8.5 of these Guidelines)

NB: Time limit for conversion of TA to a Substantive Grade

The Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects specifies (Part K, clause 29) that *“Heads of Schools will arrange to have TA grades from the previous session reviewed and converted to substantive grades at the first appropriate Faculty Assessment Committee thereafter.”* Under normal circumstances this would be the **next** Faculty Assessment Committee meeting. (See also 8.4 above.)

Note also the use of TA in cases relevant to section 16, notes i and ii below.

8.10 Grade changes – Authority to approve

Heads of Schools have the delegated authority to approve grades, changes to grades and conversions to substantive grades which require approval before the next meeting of the School and Faculty Assessment Committees, noting that **all** such approvals are to be reported to, and ratified by, the next meeting of the School and Faculty Assessment Committees. Such grade changes are processed via the Subject Administration Team where details are recorded for presentation to the next available meeting of the School/Faculty Assessment committee.

8.11 Reviews of grade

The Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects (Section 10, Part S) provides direction on the Review of Grade criteria and requirements.

The Review of Grade is a formal appeal process concerning disputes about the validity or appropriateness or fairness of an approved final grade outcome in a subject or subjects.

All reviews of grade should be considered by the School Assessment Committee, and recommendation made to the Faculty Assessment Committee for ratification. When there is no pending Faculty Assessment Committee meeting, the School Assessment Committee recommendation may be approved/varied by the Executive Dean. The final outcome is ratified by the Faculty Assessment Committee. The process of Review of Grade is managed by the Subject Administration team.

To Note: The procedure for requesting a Review of Grade is quite different to the procedure for requesting re-marking of an assessment item. See above (6.2) for guidelines on and procedures associated with requests for the re-mark of an assessment item. However, note that where a student wishes to request a re-mark at the end of session after grades have been finalised and released to students, a Review of Grade is the appropriate process to follow (see Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects, clause 73).

8.12 Grades in Workplace Learning Subjects in Teacher Education Courses

The decision processes regarding failing grades for the workplace learning experience in Teacher Education (EPT) subjects are currently under review.

8.13 Student Academic Misconduct

The [Misconduct - Student Academic Misconduct Policy](#) is the guide to definition and determination of Student Academic Misconduct at CSU.

9 Credit

9.1 Subject Credit

Credit for subjects is managed by the University's Credit Policy (See: <https://policy.csu.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00120>).

In general, credit for a subject or set of subjects will be determined on entry to a course on authority of a Course Director or other authorised officer (see Credit Policy, clauses 4 and 5). But Subject Coordinators may be asked for their recommendation on credit applications from students prior to a student's enrolment in their subject.

Notwithstanding the University's commitment to 'maximising the credit available to students' (Credit Policy, clause 3), staff approving credit must be satisfied that any credit granted does not disadvantage a student in achieving the Graduate Outcomes specified for the course from which the student seeks to graduate.

In addition to *maximum credit* limits (see Credit Policy, Section 3), the following limits apply:

- *Credit will not be granted for part of a subject* (Credit Policy, clause 12).
- *Credit for studies undertaken 10 or more years previously needs to be scrutinised for relevance and consistency with present subject area expectations* (see Credit Policy, clause 13)

Governance

10 Assessment Committees

The work of School Assessment Committees is fundamental to the valid progression of students through their subjects and courses. It is the place where final grades are endorsed for recommendation to the Faculty Assessment Committee. School Assessment Committee is where reports on each subject's grade set is tabled, moderation reports considered, decisions on extenuating circumstances in assessment are made and where Reviews of Grade are considered. The School Assessment Committee is the School's chief quality agency as well as review and approval body for the fundamental work of a School.

The membership and terms of reference of School Assessment Committees are available in <https://policy.csu.edu.au/document/view-current.php?id=134>.

The Faculty of Arts & Education expects that:

- Schools Assessment Committees may be of varying sizes to suit the needs and size of the particular School. **However, the Committee normally includes the relevant Head of School (or nominee) and should draw sufficient membership from the School Board, taking into consideration the need for expertise in assessment, practice, procedures and policy.**
- Heads of Schools will receive necessary documentation and advice from staff proceeding on leave, for *bona fide* illness, compassionate or extenuating circumstances at the time of scheduled School Assessment Committee meetings. **All other academic staff must endeavour to be available for consultation for the period of the Committee meeting and one hour thereafter to ensure that the Committee can finalise its deliberations prior to the compilation of minutes and associated papers for the Faculty Assessment Committee.**
- **At end of session, School Assessment Committee meetings will be held in such a way as to allow for follow-up, finalisation, reporting and timely dissemination of minutes prior to the Faculty Assessment Committee.** Dissemination of School Committee minutes to Faculty Assessment Committee members should occur no later than noon on the day prior to the Faculty Assessment Committee meeting to allow for adequate review and preparation time.
- The minutes and other papers of School and Faculty Assessment Committees are confidential. Nevertheless, Presiding Officers are reminded of the need to apply protocols around privacy (e.g. the use of names and disclosure of detailed medical conditions, legal circumstances, etc. should be avoided) and careful use of appropriate language is required, for example, in the "comments" sections of various appendices such as Special Consideration summaries.

Part B. Moderation Guidelines

11 Background to the moderation guidelines

The Moderation policy sets out requirements for the moderation of subject materials, assessment designs and assessment processes, with requirements specified at the presubject, during-subject and post-subject stages of the teaching cycle. The policy sets out

the broad expectations at these stages but leaves the specific details open to interpretation by faculties. This document provides the additional detail required to make clear what is expected under this policy within the Faculty of Arts and Education.

Note that moderation is required in all subjects. However, workplace learning subjects which are graded as Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory only on the basis of student performance on placement are exempt from the during-subject stage of moderation. Staff may seek guidance from the Head of School about the applicability of all phases of moderation in other subjects on a case-by-case basis.

12 Minimum Requirement

In the Faculty of Arts and Education the minimum requirement as specified in clause 6 of the CSU Moderation policy shall be “that moderation of all learning materials and assessments for each subject will be undertaken at least once per year” with the proviso that, at the discretion of the HoS, wherever it is deemed necessary to undertake moderation with a subject more frequently it may be done.

Heads of School should consider more frequent use of moderation where there have been, for instance, significant changes in Subject Teaching teams, revision of subjects, problems with assessment outcomes, or concerns raised in SES results, direct student complaint and so on.

13 Pre-subject moderation processes

An Online Moderation Form is created prior to the beginning of the session for each subject and this form is used to record the actions undertaken at each step of the moderation process for a subject for the session. A single form is created for all offerings and all cohorts undertaking a subject in a single session. The following sections provide some guidance about the steps undertaken and the timing of each step.

Prior to the commencement of the moderation process the Head(s) of School (HoS) or delegate(s) will allocate a subject convenor (SCV) or subject coordinator (SC) to prepare the subject outline, a Moderator to complete the quality assurance in the subject, and in cross campus subjects Cohort Facilitators (CF) who will also have input to and provide feedback on the assessment design. According to the University’s Moderation Policy, moderators will be “experienced staff, with appropriate skills”.

For cross campus subjects only one Online Moderation form needs to be completed. However, once the first version of the Subject Outline is cloned for other campuses the cloned version/s of the outline will need to be Quality Assured within the Subject Outline development system. The subject convenor (SCV) should ensure that versions of the outline created for the other campuses contain no unauthorised changes to assessment that have been introduced during cloning.

The following table provides a summary of the steps involved and the responsibilities of the various roles prior to commencement of the session.

Timing	Person responsible	Task
Before session start minus 6 weeks	HOS or delegate	Allocate SCV/SC/ and Moderator

Before session start minus 4 weeks	SCV/SC	Complete subject outline including rubrics using Subject Outlines development tool addressing issues identified in previous session's Moderation Record and complete appropriate sections of the Online Moderation form.
Before session start minus 2 weeks	SCV/SC	Finalise subject outline based on moderator QA and previous Moderation Record feedback
Continuous against reports and then final check in week before session start	HoS	Check that all subject outlines have been published. (Monitor Subject Outline Publishing reports from DLT)
Before session start	HoS or delegate	Follow up with subject convenors/ coordinators as necessary.

14 During-subject moderation processes

The during-subject process differs depending on whether the subject has more than one concurrent offering and depending on whether the SCV/SC undertakes all of the marking or additional markers are employed.

For single offering subjects where the SC undertakes all of the marking the assigned Moderator should check the marking of a subset of the marked assessment items (e.g., moderating one from each grade achievement level) as well as checking the marking of a sample of assessment items graded FL and HD.

Note that workplace learning subjects graded Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory only on the basis of student performance on placement are exempt from during subject moderation.

The following table summarises the roles, responsibilities and expected timelines for the during subject phase.

Timing	Person responsible	Task
Before due date of each assessment item	SCV and SC	Discuss criteria with markers.
Immediately after due date of each assessment item	SCV/SC	Prepare sample marked assessment items
As assessment items are marked	SCV/SC/Moderator	Check marking of a subset of assessment items from each marker; provide corrective advice as necessary.

After return of each assessment item	SCV/SC/Moderator	Post overall feedback to Interact, discuss issues with marking team, check that correct marks have been entered into Grade Centre for each assignment and results released to students.
At the conclusion of the subject	SCV/SC/Moderator	Teaching/marketing team and Moderator discuss emergent issues and grade allocations.

15 Post-delivery Moderation processes

The post-delivery moderation phase is focussed on an evaluation of the moderation process used in subjects and also an examination of the validity of the grades assigned to students attempting the subject which have been moderated. Much of what happens in this part of post-delivery moderation is actually done close to the time of during-moderation.

The post-delivery moderation process includes the formal scrutiny of the moderation reports associated with offerings undertaking moderation in the session. This is undertaken as part of the School and Faculty Assessment Committee meetings at the end of each session.

16 School and Faculty Assessment Committee processes associated with moderation

The role of the School and Faculty Assessment Committees is to scrutinise subjects in terms of their assessment design, assessment and moderation processes, and the outcomes of those processes. The focus is on ensuring that subjects evidence sound assessment design, validated through peer review, and implemented in a fair and consistent way for all cohorts, and that reported grade outcomes are justifiable, fair, and valid.

The Moderation Record is used in the SAC and FAC to report:

- the review of the subject assessment regime including the alignment of assessment items with learning outcomes and the appropriateness of criteria and performance standards;
- the quality assurance of subject outlines prior to publication in MSI;
- the assessment moderation processes implemented to assure quality and validity of marking;
- Assessment Committee comments and recommendations and sign off including feedback for future offerings.

For cross campus subjects the School Assessment Committee in the school in which the subject is *convened* will scrutinise the subject including the offerings on other campuses.

The School Summary Moderation Report on all subjects moderated in a session will be used during the end of session Faculty Assessment Committee meeting to record the sign off by the committee along with any issues identified or follow up required.

The following table summarises the roles, responsibilities and expected timelines for this phase.

Timing	Person responsible	Task
Prior to the end of session School Assessment Committee meeting	SAC Members	Scrutinise subjects to identify subjects needing to be discussed at the meeting.

At SAC meeting (prior to grade approval in Grade Centre)	SAC Members	Scrutinise moderation process in identified subjects. Recommend grades. Record issues in Moderation Record. Complete report to FAC Notify relevant CDs of any emergent issues through minutes.
Following SAC meeting	HoS or delegate	Sign off on recommended grades in Grade Centre.
At Faculty Assessment Committee meeting	FAC Members	Scrutinise records from SAC related to moderation process for identified subjects. Note any issues in the Moderation Records provided by Schools. Approve grades.

To Note:

- i) If serious problems are identified which impact the validity of the grade determinations in a subject it is expected that students will be awarded a TA grade in the interim to allow time for issues to be addressed, grades to be recalculated and confirmed.
- ii) In subjects where all students in the subject or an entire cohort have been allocated a TA grade, the HoS should ensure that when the change of grade form is received for the remaining cohorts a member of the assessment committee scrutinises the processes in the subject with a particular focus on the cohorts initially allocated a TA. The change of grade for an entire cohort should not be approved until this scrutiny has occurred and any issues emerging have been addressed.
- iii) Following approval by the committee, the HoS as SAC Presiding Officer completes the Grade Centre sign off process.
- iv) In cross campus subjects the Secretary of the SAC in the convening school notifies the HOS responsible for other offerings of the subject when the grades have been approved so that Grade Centre signoff can be completed.
- v) School Assessment Committee Secretary completes minutes and forwards these to the Faculty Assessment Committee .SAC Secretary also notifies Course Directors of any major issues relating to subjects within their course.

Faculty Assessment Committee – End of Session Meeting

Faculty Assessment Committee members are provided with the minutes of School Assessment Committees. During the meeting, members will identify subjects or individual student grade outcomes for additional scrutiny or discussion based on the information in these minutes.

Grade recommendations from the SAC are approved (or amended as necessary).

Appendix A. Roles and responsibilities

Head of School – allocates people to Subject Coordinator, Subject Convenor or Moderator role, establishes timelines and expectations such that all grades are finalised in advance of the School Assessment Committees, follows up with academic staff where subject moderation processes have not been undertaken correctly, chairs School Assessment Committee (or delegates this role to an Associate Head of School), signs off on grades recommended by the School Assessment Committee. Heads of School also have the authority to approve variation in in Subject Outlines after publication, including assessment items, or other exceptions to these guidelines for individual subjects, and discipline specific requirements, as well as signing off on cohort-based TA grades. When a Head of School is the Subject Convenor, the Executive Dean will act in the role of Head of School for the purposes of the assessment regulations and delegations.

Teacher Education Leadership Team (TELT) – oversees the procedures associated with the application of these guidelines and approves exceptions to these guidelines for teacher education subjects.

Subject Convenor - takes full responsibility for all aspects of the design, leadership and management of multiple cohort teacher education subjects, including: preparing the subject outline for discussion with Cohort Facilitators for their own campus, course or mode and ensuring the teaching team meets regularly over the duration of the subject, coordinating the academic staff assigned to teach the subject; monitoring the quality and effectiveness of teaching within the subjects; ensuring that assessment and moderation procedures used in the subjects are consistent and uniform ; overseeing the grade allocation processes, and managing the finalisation of all non-substantive grades arising from the offering, recommending revisions for future sessions completing the Moderation Record; and attending the end of session School Assessment Committee meeting if required.

Subject Coordinator (single cohort subjects) –takes responsibility for overseeing the design/refinement and management of subjects, including coordinating the academic staff assigned to teach the subjects; monitoring the quality and effectiveness of teaching within the subjects; ensuring that assessment and moderation procedures used in the subjects are consistent and uniform; allocating recommended grades, managing the finalisation of all nonsubstantive grades arising from the offering, recommending revisions for future sessions; completing the Online Moderation Record; and attending the end of session School Assessment Committee meeting as required.

Subject Coordinator or Cohort Facilitator (multi cohort subjects) – participates in subject development discussions prior to subject outline completion, participates in discussions about the application of marking criteria, and provides information to the subject convenor for reporting. In some cases will also fill the role of Moderator.

Moderator – needed for every subject. The Moderator consults with the convenor or coordinator throughout the session and completes each step of the Online Moderation Form prior to the Subject Moderation Report being sent to the School Assessment Committee.

School Assessment Committee Secretary – Together with the Presiding Officer of the SAC, manages the development of the agenda, and records and prepares minutes for the School Assessment Committee. Acts in a liaison capacity between the SAC and FAC with respect to distribution of minutes.

School Assessment Committee Presiding Officer – oversees the scrutiny of Moderation Reports during meeting, oversees the scrutiny of all grades presented for approval and follows up any areas of concern with the relevant staff; 'signs off' the recommended grades.

School Assessment Committee Member – scrutinises Moderation Reports and other grade data for subjects in advance of the meeting and notes any concerns or areas for follow up. Contributes to scrutiny of subjects and feedback to Subject Coordinators during meeting.

Faculty Assessment Committee Presiding Officer - oversees the scrutiny of SAC Minutes during meeting and follows up any areas of concern; approves grades.

Faculty Assessment Committee Member – Reads minutes of School Assessment Committees in advance of meetings and highlights any issues. Contributes to scrutiny of subjects and grade decisions during meetings.

Faculty Assessment Committee Secretary – Assists with the compilation of School Minutes and matters arising which will form the main agenda items for the Faculty committee. Prepares and distributes the minutes of the Faculty meeting.

Course Director - Monitors feedback from assessment committees at the conclusion of each session and follows up with appropriate staff about changes to any aspect of assessment or moderation as required.

Appendix B. Glossary of terms

Assessment item - An assessment item is any piece of work listed in the Assessment Information section of a subject outline which a student is required to complete to satisfy the requirements of the subject. Assessment items include, but are not limited to: essays, tests, examinations, laboratory, clinical or field practicum, projects, compilations, productions, presentations, performances, web-based discussion (See CSU Assessment Principles Policy). (NB: the term *Assessment 'Task'* is often used interchangeably with this term by staff and even in Policy. In this document 'assessment *task*' normally refers to the work students submit in response to an item.)

Additional Assessment - A student who marginally fails will be offered the option of completing additional assessable work which, if completed at the prescribed standard, will result in the student passing the subject. See Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects, Part O.

Cohort - all students correctly enrolled in a subject.

Criterion referencing - the assessment of the extent to which a student achieved the stated learning outcomes of a subject. This assessment is carried out against previously specified benchmarks ('criteria'). Where a grade is assigned, it is assigned on the basis of the standard the student has achieved on each of the criteria. It provides a focus for teaching and learning and specifies for the lecturer and student what is required from the assessment task. In criterion referenced assessment, judgments about the quality of students' performance are made by reference to predetermined criteria and standards and not by reference to the achievement of other students. Criterion referenced assessment differs from norm-referenced assessment in which grades are determined by reference to other students' performance with only a certain percentage of students expected to attain each grade. At CSU, assessment is not norm-referenced. (CSU *Assessment Principles Policy*).

Formative Assessment Task – A single assessment task is formative when it provides feedback to students on how their work can be improved. In this way, the intent is to help students to monitor and reflect on their learning progress and determine where improvements can be made. (CSU *Assessment Principles Policy*).

Moderation - the process of reviewing subject assessment items and learning materials to achieve appropriateness and constructive alignment with learning outcomes. It is also the process of reviewing and checking the marking and grading of individual markers to achieve consistency in the application of subject learning outcomes, performance standards and marking criteria. At CSU, moderation has three phases: pre-delivery moderation; moderation during delivery; and post-delivery moderation. (CSU *Moderation Policy*).

Multi-cohort subject – a subject in which there are concurrent offerings on more than one campus or in both on-campus and distance education mode.

Standards - statements describing the level of the quality of student performance in relation to the stated criteria in an assessment task. In standards-based assessment, specific criteria are established and standards (which are specified levels of the qualities of performance) are developed for those criteria for each assessment task. A student's achievement (and marks awarded) can then be assessed by reference to their standards of performance in various aspects of the assessment task. In this way, comparisons can be made between students based on their achievement of the standards. To achieve this, staff will need to identify and articulate clearly the different levels of performance that are connected to the grade and communicate those standards to students and other staff. (CSU *Assessment Principles Policy*).

Subject Administration Team – the Administrative unit which manages Subject

Administration matters and supports the School and the Faculty in the various processes related to assessment, approvals, grade quality assurance, grade conversion, and student applications related to assessment and grades.

Subject Teaching Team – the academic staff teaching a subject and who, collectively, work towards designing, delivering, teaching and assessing student work in a subject. The Subject Coordinator/ Convenor is principally responsible for the management of the subject and for guiding the personnel working with them over the teaching session.

Summative Assessment Task – Summative assessment: Assessment is summative when it forms part of the final grade in a subject. The student's work is assessed in terms of predetermined standards so that it can be classified in terms of levels of achievement (grades). (*CSU Assessment Principles Policy*).

Supplementary Examination - Supplementary examinations are examinations granted on the basis of misadventure or extenuating circumstances which prevented a student sitting an official examination or which adversely affected the student's performance in an official examination. See *Assessment Policy – Coursework Subjects*, Parts I, M, RR, SS, & TT.

Appendix C. *Suggested* text for subject outlines Extensions

'If a student encounters a misadventure or extenuating circumstances (see definitions below) of a minor nature and needs a short extension of up to 7 calendar days they should copy and paste the following into an email, completing the information required, to their Subject Coordinator, including an indication of the work completed to date:

Student No:
Student Name:
Student Contact phone:

I request an extension in the subject:
For Assessment no:

Reason:

Any student experiencing misadventure or extenuating circumstances requiring an extension of *longer than 7 calendar days* or if the application is *after the last day of lectures*, should contact their Subject Coordinator immediately. Depending on the circumstances the student may need to apply for Special Consideration using the form available at [here](#) .

Please note: while waiting for a reply from their Subject Coordinator students should continue to complete their assignment and submit it without delay *regardless* of whether they have or have not received an approval for an extension.'

Misadventure

'Circumstances contributing to misadventure can include:

- Medical reasons;
- Family/personal reasons – including death or severe medical or personal problems
- Employment related reasons – such as a substantial change to routine employment arrangements or status

The following circumstances would **not** be considered misadventure:

- Routine demands of employment;
- Difficulties adjusting to University life, to the self-discipline needed to study effectively, and to the demands of academic work;
- Stress or anxiety normally associated with examinations, required assessment items or any aspect of course work;
- Routine need for financial support;
- Lack of knowledge of requirements of academic work

(See Special Consideration Policy).

Extenuating circumstances

Circumstances that can be deemed to be extenuating include:

- Administrative problems – such as the late receipt of teaching materials, enrolment errors or delays;
- Sporting or cultural commitments – where a student has been selected to participate in a state, national or international sporting or cultural event;

-
- Military commitments – where a student is a member of the armed forces involved in a compulsory exercise;
 - Legal commitments – where a student is called for jury duty or is subpoenaed to attend a court, tribunal, etc.
 - Other events that pose a major obstacle to the student proceeding satisfactorily with their studies.

The following would **not** be regarded as extenuating circumstances:

- Demands of sport, clubs, and social or extra-curricular activity (other than selection for state, national or international sporting or cultural events);
- Difficulties with the English language during examinations.'

(See *Special Consideration Policy*).

Penalty for late submissions

An example statement:

“In the absence of an approved extension, or University defined misadventure or extenuating circumstances, the penalty for assessment items submitted after the due date is 10% of the assessment item value per calendar day.

For example, for an assessment item worth 40% of the subject assessment, the penalty for late submission will be 4 marks out of 40 per calendar day. If a student's work was assessed against the marking criteria to be worthy of a mark of 30 out of 40 but was submitted two days late, the student would receive a mark of 22 out of 40 (30 marks less 2 days @ 4 marks per day).”

NB: Staff should consult with their Head of School to check if the School has a preferred approach to dealing with lateness.

Additional Assessments (AA)

This subject offers Additional Assessment as specified in the University's Assessment Policy - Coursework Subjects (Part O). Students receiving a raw score of 45-49 will be offered the opportunity to submit an Additional Assessment, which will be designed by the Subject Convenor or Coordinator to ensure the student achieves all the subject learning outcomes in order to achieve a PS grade in the subject.

NB: The Faculty of Arts and Education does not routinely offer AA in any of its subjects, except in those courses and subjects where its use is endorsed.

Resubmission

Resubmission of failing assessment items is permitted in this subject. Unless otherwise offered, a student who has failed an assessment task may make a request to resubmit that task re-worked for reconsideration to pass the task. If the student's request for resubmission is accepted by the Subject Convenor/Coordinator, the following procedures and conditions apply:

- Resubmission requires that the student submits a fresh attempt at the item, including supplying the marker with a copy of the original failed assessment task.

-
- Normally, resubmission must be *within* a 14 calendar day period after the receipt of the returned assessment task.
 - Resubmitted assignments may achieve no more than a minimum pass (50%) of the full value of that assessment item.
 - Students may only resubmit **once** for each assessment item in the subject which allows resubmission.

Pass Requirements

A generic statement which may be used (in lieu of the more nuanced statements below):

'Assessment in this subject will be cumulative. Students must submit **all** assessment items in order to be considered for a passing grade. The achievement of a cumulative total of all assessment items in the subject resulting in total marks of 50% or greater shall constitute a passing level of performance in the subject.'

Some particular examples which spell out all the conditions:

- 'Students must submit all assessment items in this subject to be considered for a pass in the subject. The cumulative mark achieved across assignment one and two ('total mark') will be used to determine the SY/US grade for this subject. A total mark above 50% will be deemed SY, a total mark below that will be deemed US'; or
- 'The cumulative marks achieved for the three assessment items in this subject will determine the final grade of HD through FL in this subject. To be eligible to be considered for a passing grade, students must submit all assignments.'

NB: *While for most circumstances the generic statement will be acceptable, staff may wish to consider using something more detailed and personalised to the subject where it is deemed helpful to students and staff working in the subject.*

Bespoke statements developed for a particular subject should always be quality assured by the moderator or other academic colleagues prior to inclusion in the Subject Outline.

Appendix D Marking Schemes examples

Marking 'Rubric'

Criteria	High Distinction	Distinction	Credit	Pass	Fail	Weighting
Criterion 1	Description of the standard of performance against criterion 1 needed to achieve a high distinction grade	Description of the standard of performance against criterion 1 needed to achieve a distinction grade	Description of the standard of performance against criterion 1 needed to achieve a credit grade	Description of the standard of performance against criterion 1 needed to achieve a pass grade	Description of the standard of performance against criterion 1 that will result in a fail grade	50% ¹
Criterion 2	etc	etc	etc	etc	etc	20%
Criterion 3	etc	etc	etc	etc	etc	20%
Criterion 4	etc	etc	etc	etc	etc	10%

In articulating the standards needed to achieve each criterion at the various grade levels it is important that staff use unambiguous language which qualitatively and/or quantitatively differentiates between student work at each level. The use of adjectives such as “excellent”, “very good”, and so on, can result in standards that are open to interpretation by students and markers and are thus discouraged. In some cases examples of work that illustrate different standards may be used to help scaffold students’ understanding and interpretation of statements about performance standards.

Numeric values for each grade level are not required on a rubric, however they may be indicated in a note to the marking rubric². Weighting of each criteria is required in such schemes as it provides transparent information to the student about the relative emphasis in marking aspects of the task.

OTHER EXAMPLES TO BE LISTED

¹ Or 5/10 marks, 2/10 marks, 2/10 marks etc.

² For example, “...a HD grade applies to an overall score equal to or greater than 51; DI applies to overall scores less than 51 and greater than or equal to 45 ...” (for an assessment item worth 60 marks).

Appendix E Policy references

Assessment Principles Policy

Part B - Principles of Assessment

(14) This Policy is founded on the following principles:

- a. assessment at the University is criterion-referenced and standards-based, where a student's work is assessed against stated criteria that reflect the expected learning outcomes of the course and subject;
- b. the level of difficulty /complexity of the assessment tasks will align with, and be consistent with, the AQF requirements for the qualification level of that course;
- c. all assessment tasks and practices will be developed from a whole-of-course perspective using assessment mapping so that all assessments are aligned with the approved course standards;
- d. assessment will be sequenced and scaffolded to enable students to build progressively their capabilities and skills;
- e. assessment requirements in subjects, including the weighting of assessment tasks and the criteria against which tasks are assessed and marked, and the standard required to achieve each grade level against each criteria will be made clear to students and communicated to them in the [Subject Outline](#), before the subject commences. Assessment criteria and standards may be communicated to students in the form of an assessment rubric;
- f. in the same subject offered across different cohorts, courses, modes and sessions, assessment tasks will be equivalent, and assessment processes will be fair, and consistently applied, for all students;
- g. students will be encouraged to engage actively in their own education, so that they progressively manage their learning and develop as active partners in the learning process;
- h. in relation to students with disabilities, reasonable adjustments will be made to ensure fair and equitable practice in accordance with policy and legislation, for example the University's [Disability and Work or Study Adjustment Policy](#) and the Federal [Disability Standards for Education \(2005\)](#);
- i. assessment will be conducted within the supportive framework and context of academic integrity at the University that aims to minimise the occurrence of academic dishonesty and misconduct;
- j. the responsibilities of both staff and students in regard to assessment tasks, processes and reporting should be stated clearly and unambiguously in course documentation;
- k. wherever possible, especially in first year undergraduate subjects, students will be required, early in the teaching period, to complete an item of assessment with low weighting, the purpose of which is to scaffold learning and provide feedback to students;

-
- l. each course will include an identified early assessment task suitable to identify students in need of additional English language and numeracy proficiency support, as specified in the [English Language Literacy and Numeracy Policy](#);
 - m. students will receive constructive, adequate and timely feedback on their performances in assessment tasks;
 - n. assessment will be complemented by appropriate and approved moderation processes, as outlined in the [Moderation Policy](#);
 - o. assessment tasks and marking will allow students to clearly demonstrate their level of capability and achievement where differentiation between the performances of students may be required; and
 - p. summative assessment marks cannot be awarded purely for attendance in an online or face-to-face class.

Part D - Staff Responsibilities

(16) Staff have the following pre-assessment responsibilities for every subject offered by the University:

- a. developing assessment items in subject and course teams, to ensure that assessment tasks are moderated in accordance with the [Moderation Policy](#) before they are adopted for use;
- b. establishing valid criteria and standards of performance that are consistent with the assessment task, aligned with the stated learning outcomes and experiences as specified in the subject outline and compliant with pre-delivery moderation processes;
- c. situating assessment regimes for a subject within the assessment map for the course;
- d. ensuring that, once set and communicated to students, assessment tasks are not altered, unless approved by the Head of School;
- e. communicating to students the assessment criteria and performance standards in the subject outline no less than two weeks before the subject offering commences. Students must be informed about: the expectations and requirements of assessment tasks; the marking criteria and standards for each assessment task, including the levels of performance required to achieve each passing grade in each task; and, the submission dates and presentation requirements of each task;
- f. ensuring that assessment tasks enable all students to demonstrate their knowledge, skills or competencies. This includes assessment situated in field trips, clinical or workplace learning, research reports and theses and other course or subject requirements;
- g. when developing assessment tasks and subject requirements, ensuring that consideration is given to the diverse backgrounds of students, including those who identify as Indigenous, low socioeconomic status, first-in-family to attend university, mature age, or who have accessed the course through alternative entry programs such as TAFE; and
- h. ensuring that consideration is given to the provision of reasonable adjustments for students with disabilities.