



STUDENT ASSESSMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

1. Overview

The purpose of this policy is to outline the process of collecting relevant evidence and making informed judgements to evaluate student learning outcomes.

The Crown Institute of Higher Education (“CIHE”) has designed this policy to ensure that all student assessment tasks are appropriately designed to determine the extent to which students have met the learning and skills outcome requirements within a unit of study and to assist teaching staff to make decisions about the performance of individual students within a unit.

2. Rationale for assessment

The rationale for assessment is:

- to promote, enhance, and improve the quality of student learning through feedback that is clear, informative, timely, constructive and relevant to the needs of the student,
- to measure and confirm the standard of student performance and achievement in relation to a unit of study’s defined learning objectives,
- to reward student effort and achievement with an appropriate grade,
- to provide relevant information in order to continuously evaluate and improve the quality of the curriculum and the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process.

Scaffolding of student familiarity with the genres they are asked to produce and other skills development should be used explicitly in Level 1 assessment structures, typically by the use of smaller developmental tasks and the use of exemplars where appropriate, and learning activities designed to create dialogue and understanding of marking criteria and standards or rubrics.

3. Forms of assessment

Some assessment is formative; it is specifically intended to assist students to identify weaknesses in their understanding, so that they may improve their understanding and enhance their learning. Other assessment is summative; its objective is primarily to pass judgment on the quality of a student’s learning, generally in terms of assigned marks and grades. Furthermore, critical reflection on the outcomes of assessment tasks, both formative and summative, can inform lecturers and students, not only about the quality of student learning but also about the effectiveness of teaching.

Normally, assessment of a unit of study will:

- have a minimum of two but no more than four assessment tasks. An assessment plan with more than three assessment items must be approved by the Academic Board,
- have no single assessment task worth more than 60% of the total mark for the unit of study,
- limit group assessment to 40% of the total mark for the unit of study. With an emphasis on collaboration and teamwork, some units may have a greater than 40% allocation to



group work. Where a weighting of greater than 40% is given to group assessments, written tasks for individual students will be included.

The forms of assessment to be utilised for each unit of study will be clearly set out in the *Unit Learning Guide*.

Genres of assessment (nomenclature)

- *Quizzes* – for in class or online quizzes involving multiple choice or short answer style questions

Written work

- *Written response* – a shorter considered piece of reflection or analysis used as a scaffolding task to assess student development of learning outcomes for further application in later assessments in a unit.
- *Summaries* – written accounts of work or work processes completed individually or as a group.
- *Case study or scenario* – task is based on the use of case study material from a real business or a hypothetical business case and might involve the presentation of the case by a working professional.
- *Analysis* – a longer written account of an analysis and outcomes of the analysis (a financial analysis, a policy or plan analysis etc.) completed using theories, approaches or analytical techniques taught in a unit. Analysis tasks may include a specification of the sub-genre of the task in the title, for example, ‘critical analysis’ or ‘business regulation analysis’ or ‘financial options analysis’.
- *Essay* – an extended piece of writing that aims to persuade readers of an idea based on evidence.
- *Exam* – Invigilated, either in class mid-semester or during exam period. Can be open or closed book. May take the form of short answer questions, multiple-choice questions and essays, where appropriate.
- *Plans, reports or other ‘business’ genres* – will be of the genre required in the professional context (as taught in BUS101) and specified by assessment requirements in the unit learning guide which will be developed using the syllabus of BUS101.
- *Presentation* – involves the oral presentation of work by a student or students typically using visual aids. Please see notes above.

Some assessment types may be combined – a ‘presentation of a plan’ or ‘case study analysis,’ for example, so that the specific nature of the assessment is made explicit in its name and detailed in the assessment guidelines.

Some assessment types will be unique to individual units in the course – an ‘ideas log,’ ‘annotated bibliography’ or ‘written reflection,’ for example. The assessment specifications will be provided in the unit learning guide, including the explication of criteria and standards or a rubric. The generic shape of such tasks will be made explicit in these specifications and in classes.

A note on Presentations

Presentations are used at CIHE in order to:

- 1 Generate an interactive and engaging learning environment for students.



- 2 Provide students with ample opportunity to develop their oral communication skills so necessary for their professional lives.
- 3 Assist students in the development of their literacies by providing opportunities to use spoken forms of language on the way to developing more 'written' abstract forms of language.

4. Notification of assessment

A fundamental aspect of developing a unit of study is the specification of the prescribed assessment tasks in a way that relates them directly to the unit objectives (including expected unit learning outcomes), the course structure, the teaching methods to be used, and the learning strategies to be fostered. Lecturers should ensure that students are fully informed, in writing, by the end of the first week of the study period, about unit objectives and expectations, including the assessment requirements.

The details of all assessment tasks should be stated clearly in the *Unit Learning Guide* and include a statement of the objectives of the unit; its assessment plan, including weights allocated to each assessable component and related submission dates; deadlines, sanctions and penalties; and the objectives of the unit in a way that is appropriate to the academic level of the students. As stated above, assessment specifications will be provided in the unit learning guide, including the explication of criteria and standards or a rubric. The generic shape of such tasks will be made explicit in these specifications and in classes.

5. Timing and weight of assessments

Students are expected to reach the objectives of a unit of study progressively throughout the course of the unit. They should be set tasks during the study period that allow their progress to be evaluated against established criteria. Such tasks should contribute to the final assessment in a unit of study.

Assessment tasks should be designed carefully, first, to keep in proportion student time commitment and the weight of the assessment task in the overall assessment, and second, to reflect, as far as possible, the importance of each task in determining the effectiveness of students' having met the unit objectives. This might mean that an important task, such as a final examination, is weighted heavily. Care should be taken to avoid the imposition of a heavy imbalance of assessment load toward the second half of the study period. Assessment should reflect both the level of the unit (1, 2, 3) and the credit points assigned.

Usually, one or more assessment tasks should be set, submitted, marked and returned to students by the mid-point of a unit. Although students need regular feedback on their progress, set assessment tasks should be kept to the minimum that is sufficient to enable students to make judgements about their progress. Due dates for assessment tasks should be well separated in time so as to give students periods of time for reflective learning that are free from the pressure engendered by a looming deadline.

In some disciplines, students are expected to practise skill development continuously. To evaluate students' ability to perform such on-going tasks, consideration should be given to strategies for self-assessment. In this way, students can obtain evidence concerning their level of understanding of the work, while avoiding the stress of frequent formal appraisal by an examiner.



Apart from examination scripts, all assessed work should be returned to the student, preferably in a class context where the student has the right to query the assessment result for clarification either then or at a later time. Lecturers are encouraged to provide feedback to students on all assessment events including final examinations.

Unit Learning Guides should advise students at the beginning of a unit of study how all assessment results are to be combined to produce an overall mark for the unit. In particular, the *Unit Learning Guide* should make expressly clear:

- the weight of each task in contributing to the overall mark,
- the formulas or rules used to determine the overall mark – criteria and standards and/or rubrics,
- minimum standards that are applied to specific assessment tasks, and the consequences if such standards are not met (including failure to submit particular tasks) which will, where appropriate, be presented as a marking rubric,
- rules regarding penalties applied to late submissions, and
- precise details of what is expected in terms of presentation of work for assessment.

Unit level and word limit

The rough guide for level and overall word limit for a unit should be

Level 1: 2,000 - 2,500 max.

Level 2: 2, 500 - 3000 max

Level 3: 3000 - 3,500 max.

Some tasks such as quizzes or plans etc. may be difficult to stipulate word limits for. In such cases, weighting should be determined by an assessment of the study, research and preparation required to complete the task.

Weightings

Weightings for written assessments should take into account **a.** word length and **b.** required preparation work (analysis, research etc.) and the weighting determined by a balance between these two.

Written work

500 – 750 words – 10 - 20%

1000 words – 20 - 30%

1500 words – 30 – 40 %

2000 words – 40 – 45 %

- Where written work is produced collaboratively in groups, the weighting can be reduced to account for the collaboration.

Quizzes

Quizzes can be of varying lengths, requiring different types of engagement depending on the learning outcomes they ensure. A scale will be used for the weighting of quizzes. For example, a 10 multiple-choice question quiz would take 20 minutes to complete and be weighted at 5%. A 20 question (MC or short answer) quiz would take 30 minutes to complete and would be



weighted at 10%. This scale is a guide only and will be applied alongside consideration of question types, learning intent and timing in a unit of study.

Exams

1-hour – 25 – 30%

1.5 hour – 35 - 40%

2-hour – 50 - 60%

- Open book exams can be allocated reduced weighting.
- The mix of exam question types and the cognitive, analytical and writing work involved in answering the questions should be taken into account when determining timing and weighting.

Guidelines for presentations

- Duration should be between 6-10 minutes for group presentations and 4-5 minutes for individual presentations.
- In group presentations, durations should include specific allocation for each student's contribution to the presentation – for example, for a group of 3, 9 minutes will be allocated with each student required to contribute 3 minutes.
- All presentations should include a written summary component where the assessment is NOT based on an already completed group or individual task.
- Weightings are to be specified for the presentation and written components of presentation tasks.
 - Group presentations 30%: 10% for presentation component; 20- 25% for written component (adjusted if the word length for the written component is less or greater than 1000 words).
 - Individual presentations 20%: 10% for presentation component; 10- 20% for written component (assuming a 500-750 word written component. To be adjusted accordingly).
 - If a presentation stipulates 'multi-media' additional weighting should be included to account for expertise shown and preparation.

All group-based assessment should use techniques or tools for ensuring that each student's individual contribution is assessed.

The *Unit Learning Guide* should also make clear to students that the aggregated mark for the unit of study may be scaled. Scaling may result, in some cases, in a variation of the final grade awarded to the student for the unit of study that is inconsistent with the individual marks awarded to the student for individual assessment items.

Emphasis should be placed on appropriate referencing conventions and requirements, on the degree of cooperation permitted between students, and on what constitutes academic dishonesty and the consequences of committing it as outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy and Procedure*.

6. Submission of assessment items

Students are required to submit assessment items at the time and date specified in the *Unit Learning Guide*. Assessment items submitted after the due date will be subject to a penalty



unless the student has been given prior approval in writing for an extension of time to submit that item.

Assessments should be submitted in the form specified in the *Unit Learning Guide*. Where assessment items are submitted electronically, the date and time the email was received will be considered the date and time of submission. Written papers or other physical submissions are to be time and date stamped as a record of receipt.

7. Penalties for late submission

An assessment item submitted after the assessment due date, without an approved extension or without approved mitigating circumstance, will be penalised. The standard penalty is the reduction of the mark allocated to the assessment item by 10% of the total mark applicable for the assessment item, for each day or part day that the item is late (a 'day' for this purpose is defined as any day on which campus administration is open). Assessment items submitted more than ten days after the assessment due date are awarded zero marks.

Extensions to assignment deadlines based on mitigating circumstances shall be at the discretion of the Lecturer for a unit, and must be granted in writing. Mitigating circumstances are circumstances outside of the student's control that have had an adverse effect on the student's work or ability to work.

8. Extensions

Extensions are written (email) agreements between students and lecturers or Course Coordinator in which the Lecturer or Course Coordinator grants an extension of time for the submission of an assessment item (not including exams) for up to 3 days.

The special consideration **application** process (9. below) must be used for extension requests in excess of 3 days.

Procedure

For an extension requests, students must email or otherwise write to the Lecturer or Course Coordinator prior to the due date for an assessment item. The student must provide a copy of their work to date on the assessment, demonstrating that they have commenced work. The student can also submit supporting documentation. The Course Coordinator/Lecturer will consider the request and respond directly to the student within 24 hours.

The Lecturer/Course Coordinator will create a record of any and all such extensions in the CIHE intranet and must attach copies of correspondence and any documentation submitted by the student.

9. Special Consideration

Special consideration involves the formal submission of an **application** for consideration for circumstances beyond the students control that have impacted their ability to complete an assessment. **The request must be made by the assessment due date (or the extended due date if an extension has been granted) unless the student's circumstances mean that they cannot make the application by this date. For applications for special consideration made in excess of 5 days**



after the due date, the student would be required to provide additional documentation supporting the delay in submitting the request.

To apply for special consideration, the student must complete the *Special Consideration form* available under the student portal on the CIHE website, 'forms you may need' tab.

The form MUST be accompanied by supporting documentation and fully completed, including the student's explanation of the kind of special consideration requested.

Please NOTE: Special consideration will not provide for the relaxation of the required academic standards for an assessment item but can involve the following outcomes ('considerations'):

- the student's performance in other assessment tasks in the unit,
- the severity of the event,
- the student's academic standing in other units and in the course, and
- any history of previous applications for special consideration, especially where they indicate a chronic problem.

If an application for special consideration is accepted, any one of the following outcomes may be appropriate:

- no action is taken,
- additional assessment or a supplementary examination is undertaken. Additional assessment may take a different form from the original assessment. If a student is granted additional assessment, the original assessment may be ignored at the discretion of the Course Coordinator. Consequently, a revised mark based on additional assessment may be greater or less than the original mark,
- marks obtained for the completed assessment tasks are pro-rated to achieve a final percentage result,
- the deadline for assessment is extended,
- the student is allowed to discontinue from the unit of study without failure. This is unlikely to occur after an examination or final assessment has taken place.

When reviewing requests for special consideration, special consideration will be given to the progression and completion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

10. Assessment feedback

To minimise the number of requests for reviews of an assessment decision and to provide feedback on formative assessment that assists students to achieve the learning outcomes, CIHE will ensure that students are provided with timely feedback from markers that enables them to understand the reason for their results.

~~In the case of final assessments, students will be offered a "script review" period during which students can obtain individual feedback on these assessment items.~~

11. Reasonable adjustment



Students with a disability may request reasonable adjustment to an assessment task to accommodate their disability. Adjustments to assessment must take into account the special characteristics of the student. Any adjustments made must be 'reasonable' so that they do not impose an unjustifiable hardship upon CIHE.

A request for reasonable adjustment is made by the student in writing to the Lecturer for the unit of study affected.

Making a reasonable adjustment will involve varying the procedures for conducting an assessment, for example:

- allowing additional time for the completion of an assessment,
- extending deadlines for an assessment,
- varying question and response modalities for an assessment,
- providing or allowing additional resources in examinations.

12. Requirements for successful completion of a unit of study

Students must attempt all assessment tasks and achieve at least 50% of the total marks for the unit of study to pass the unit. Students must achieve a mark of at least 40% in their final assessment.

13. Resubmission

Where a student has completed all assessment tasks and marginally fails a unit of study (i.e. has achieved a score of 46-49%) the Course Coordinator may recommend that the student be offered the option of completing additional assessable work which, if completed at the prescribed standard, will result in the student passing the unit. The grade awarded after the additional assessment is finalised is limited to P or F. If the student does not take up the opportunity to complete additional assessment work the grade remains as an F.

14. Grades

During each unit, students will be provided with an evaluation of their individual performance with reference to the criteria for each assessment task. Student performance in individual units of study shall be graded in accordance with the following guidelines:

Grade	Definition
High Distinction (outstanding performance) Code: HD Mark range: 85% and above	Complete and comprehensive understanding of the unit content; development of relevant skills to an outstanding level; demonstration of an extremely high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and excellent achievement of all major and minor objectives of the unit.



Grade	Definition
Distinction (very high level of performance) Code: D Mark range: 75-84%	Very high level of understanding of the unit content; development of relevant skills to a very high level; demonstration of a very high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and comprehensive achievement of all major and minor objectives of the unit.
Credit (high level of performance) Code: C Mark range: 65-74%	High level of understanding of the unit content; development of relevant skills to a high level; demonstration of a high level of interpretive and analytical ability and achievement of all major objectives of the unit; some minor objectives not fully achieved.
Pass (competent level of performance) Code: P Mark range: 50-64%	Adequate understanding of most of the basic unit content; development of relevant skills to a satisfactory level; adequate interpretive and analytical ability and achievement of all major objectives of the unit; some minor objectives not achieved.
Fail (outright) (attempted all assessments but did not achieve 50%) Code: F Mark range: below 50%	Inadequate understanding of the basic unit content; failure to develop relevant skills; insufficient evidence of interpretive and analytical ability; and failure to achieve some or all major and minor objectives of the unit.
Fail Non-Submission Code: FNS Mark range: below 50%	Did not attempt all assessments therefore fails to show attainment of ULOs.
Withdraw with Failure Code: WF	Withdrew from the unit after the census date.
Withdraw Without Failure Code: WO	Withdrew from the unit before census date or after the census date with special circumstances.
Credit Granted Code: CPL	Credit has been granted for the unit of study following an application and its approval.

15. Publication of results

All results must be reviewed and properly approved before publication. The Teaching and Learning Committee will nominate three of its members (but not any student representative) to sit at the end of each study period as the Results Review Committee to approve results prior to publication. At least one of the members will be an independent member of the Teaching and Learning Committee.



Once results have been approved the Dean will ensure that the approved mark and grade is recorded in the student database against the relevant unit of study and students notified of their results by the student management system.

16. Review of grade for a unit or assessment item Review of Grade

Assessment item

In the first instance, students should approach the Lecturer, where appropriate, to discuss their concerns about an assessment decision. Where the issue regarding the assessment decision is unable to be resolved at this level, a formal request for a review may be made. See below.

The grounds upon which the student may request a review of an assessment decision are:

- that the student believes that an error has occurred in the calculation of the grade, and /or
- a demonstration that the assessment decision is inconsistent with the published assessment requirements or assessment criteria.

Final grade for a unit

All requests for the review of a final grade for a unit must be done through the formal review or grade process as set out below.

Formal Review of Grade

A student may wish to request that their grade for a unit or individual assessment item be reviewed. An application for Review of Grade must be lodged, using the appropriate form (a fee of \$50 will be charged) within ten working days of the official notification of results on the web.

The grounds for the application for Review of Grade(s) must be clearly described in supporting documentation to the application. A separate application must be lodged for each unit or individual assessment item. A separate fee must be paid for each unit or individual assessment item. The charge will be refunded to any student whose application is successful.

An application for a Review of Grade will be rejected when one or more of the following apply:

- no reasonable grounds are stated in the application for Review of Grade(s),
- in the normal course of events, the piece or pieces of work have already been assessed by at least two people knowledgeable in the field,
- reasonable grounds exist to Review of Grade, but such a review, if conducted, would not result in any alteration of the grade, or
- the student has not completed all essential requirements of the unit (except in some cases of special consideration).

The Course Coordinator will provide a written response to the grounds for the Review of Grade outlined by the student.

The Dean will consider the student's application and the response from the Course Coordinator and determine whether the grade should be changed.



Where a student's Review of Grade results in a change of grade, CIHE will refund the prescribed charge and the student will be notified of the outcome via their student email account.

Where an application for a Review of Grade is rejected, or does not result in a change of grade, the student will be advised, via their student email account normally within one week after the decision, of the reason for the outcome and will not be entitled to a refund of any prescribed charge paid.

17. Related documents

- Unit Learning Guide

18. Version history

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Sections modified
1.0	Academic Board	27.1.2017	Document creation
1.1	Academic Board	21.4.2017	Weightings and word limit stipulations; Special notes on assessment types, specific guidelines for presentations.
2.0	Academic Board	15.9.2017	Special consideration, extension of assessments criteria benchmarked with other Universities. Refinement of processes for review of grade and clarity re nomenclature.

Document owner: Dean