Assessment: Courses and Coursework Programs - Procedures

1. Purpose

1.1 These procedures detail the process for designing assessment, feedback and marking, administration of assessment, and assuring standards.

2. Scope and application

2.1 These procedures refer to assessment in undergraduate and postgraduate coursework courses of all unit values.

3. Definitions

Please refer to the University's Glossary of terms for policy and procedures. Terms and definitions identified below are specific to these procedures and are critical to its effectiveness:

Feedback is the information offered to the student on their performance that helps them move towards achieving the learning outcome.

Formative assessment is a learning process that enables both the student and assessor to identify the student's strengths and gaps in knowledge and skills, more specifically;

(a) assessment *for* learning involves staff using evidence about students' knowledge, skills and application of knowledge and skills, to clarify student understanding and learning, and to inform their future teaching.

(b) assessment *as* learning involves students monitoring their own learning to decide what they know and can do, and how to use assessment information for new learning.

Moderation is a rigorous quality review and assurance process that confirms or modifies the assessment task's fitness for purpose, the consistency of the marker's judgments and the validity, reliability and fairness of the outcome and ultimately ensures that academic standards are met.

Standards referenced assessment is the approach taken to assessment at the University where the achievement of students is assessed and reported in relation to a predetermined standard established for the course.

Summative assessment is assessment *of* learning and uses evidence of student learning to assess achievement against outcomes and standards. It contributes to the student's final grade in a course.

4. Contents

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

UniSC

9. Records Management

10 Roles/Responsibilities

5. Designing assessment

5.1 Assessment is part of curriculum design and will be influenced by the:

(a) Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF);

(b) Curriculum Design Principles; and

(c) Universal Design for Learning (UDL) Principles.

These elements are detailed below.

5.2 The quality of assessment is reviewed during curriculum accreditation and approval by the accrediting and approval authorities, using the Curriculum Design and UDL Principles.

5.3 A request for a variation from any element of these procedures can be made to the relevant Dean on the basis of pedagogically sound arguments consistent with the curriculum design principles.

5.4 If the relevant Dean endorses the variation request, it is referred for approval to the next meeting of the Program and Course Committee (PACC).

5.5 Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)

5.5.1 As outlined in the Coursework Curriculum – Procedures, assessment tasks provide scaffolded opportunities to demonstrate achievement of program learning outcomes that align with the learning outcomes for each AQF level and qualification type, in a clear progression of knowledge and skills across the program:

(a) from introductory, through developing to graduate at undergraduate level; and

(b) from advanced to specialised at postgraduate level.

5.5.2 Bloom's Taxonomy is used for developing intended learning outcomes, assessments and activities.

5.6 Curriculum design principles

5.6.1 The curriculum design principles inform the design of the University's curriculum. The principles are:

1. learning-centred;

2. standards-based;

3. constructively aligned; and

4. career and future focussed.

5.6.2 The curriculum design principles accommodate the diversity of disciplines at the University and allow assessment to be designed using a range of approaches. Course Coordinators use the principles to inform their approach to assessment design and to demonstrate its quality.

5.7 Program design

5.7.1 In a coursework program, there will be a clear progression in the expectations of performance required in assessment tasks in courses at the undergraduate level from Introductory, through Developing to Graduate and at postgraduate level – from Advanced to Specialised (refer to the Coursework Curriculum - Procedures for details).

5.7.2 There is evidence of constructive alignment of the assessment tasks, in required courses, with the relevant Program's Learning Outcomes, manifest through the course learning outcomes.

5.7.3 A coursework program contains courses that provide students opportunities to engage with multiple types of assessment tasks.

5.7.4 The spread of assessment tasks across required courses in a program is monitored to prevent students in the program being exposed to an unreasonably high workload.

5.7.5 No program can contain more than 50 percent of required courses that are assessed using Limited Grades to ensure students can measure their individual performance and allow a representative Grade Point Average calculation to be recorded on the student's transcript.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

5.8 Course design

5.8.1 Undergraduate course-based assessment

(1) An undergraduate course is coded at 100, 200, 300 or 400 level and will be designed with a typical course assessment pattern to help students construct meaning and generate new understandings.

(2) For a 12 unit value course:

(a) Two (2) or three (3) summative assessment items;

For example:

In a semester

- one formative non-graded and three summative tasks; or
- one formative graded and two summative tasks; or
- three summative tasks

OR

In a session;

- one formative non-graded and two summative tasks

(b) up to six (6) assessment exercises can be spread throughout a course with the formative assessment starting in the first third of the teaching period;

(c) where there are three (3) summative assessment tasks, these will be distributed to enable students to receive and action feedback on submitted work before the next assessment task;

(d) a variety of assessment task products;

(e) the maximum word length of 5,000 or equivalent, taking all assessment tasks into consideration will be applied (see Bachelor Honours Degree - Procedures for undergraduate dissertation courses);

(f) the maximum weighting of an assessment item is 50 percent of the total summative assessment for the course;

(g) the minimum weighting of an assessment item is 10 percent of the total summative assessment for the course;

(h) the allocated weighting of each summative assessment task reflects its relative value in measuring the learning outcomes and the student workload to successfully complete the task;

(i) the maximum weighting for the collective component of group work is 50 percent of the total summative assessment for the course or 70 percent for a course with group work as the majority of the learning outcomes; and

(j) the maximum weighting which can be allocated to multiple choice questions in assessment products is 40 percent of the total assessment value for the course.

(3) For courses with a unit value other than 12 units:

(a) the maximum word length of a three (3) unit course will not exceed 1500 words or equivalent;

(b) the maximum weighting of an assessment task for a six (6) unit course is 70 percent;

(c) the maximum word length of a six (6) unit course will not exceed 3,000 words or equivalent, taking all tasks into consideration;

(d) the maximum weighting of an assessment task for a twenty four (24) or thirty six (36) unit course is 50 percent;

(e) the maximum word length of a twenty four (24) unit course will not exceed 10,000 words or equivalent;

(f) the maximum word length of a thirty six (36) unit course will not exceed 15,000 words or equivalent; and

(g) the maximum weighting of an assessment task in an identified dissertation course of 24 or more units is 100 percent as identified in the Bachelor Honours Degree – Academic Policy and related procedures.

5.8.2 Postgraduate course-based assessment

(1) A postgraduate coursework course is coded at 500, 600 or 700 level and will be designed with a typical course assessment pattern to help students construct meaning and generate new understandings.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

(2) For a 12 unit value course:

(a) the maximum weighting of an assessment task in a postgraduate course is 70 percent;

(b) the maximum weighting of an assessment task in an identified postgraduate dissertation or project course of twelve (12) or more units is 100 percent;

(c) the maximum word length is 7,000 or equivalent, taking all assessment tasks into consideration; and

(d) in a research course of forty eight (48) units or greater, the assessment of that course will be consistent with the arrangements for supervision and examination of the dissertation, with a maximum word length of 28,000 words.

5.8.3 Limited grade courses

(1) The use of Limited Grade – Pass (PU) and Limited Grade - Fail (UF) is restricted to courses where there is:

(a) a work integrated learning (WIL) activity categorised as a workplace and industry 'placement' (refer to the Work Integrated Learning - Academic Policy); or

(b) extensive project work/coursework assessed in diverse settings external to the University; or

(c) a professional competency task is included in the course.

(2) In a course eligible to use Limited Grades, all assessment items in that course are marked on a Pass/Fail basis and all assessment tasks are required to be passed for a student to successfully complete the course.

(3) In accordance with the Supplementary Assessment – Procedures, supplementary assessment is not available in Limited Grade courses.

(4) In a Limited Grade course, there is no requirement that each summative assessment task be allocated a weighting reflecting its relative value in measuring the learning outcomes.

5.8.4 Work Integrated Learning student placement code of conduct assessment

(1) In courses identified as a workplace and industry placement course, under the Work Integrated Learning - Academic Policy, an assessment task will be included to assess a student's performance against a discipline specific code of conduct, or set guidelines for professional conduct, or another suitable instrument which is informed by the professional standards or code of conduct for the relevant profession.

(2) The student placement code of conduct assessment task is assessed on a Pass/Fail basis.

(3) The student placement code of conduct assessment task is not included in the count of maximum number of summative assessment tasks in a course, as identified in these procedures.

5.9 Assessment design

5.9.1 Assessment tasks

(1) Assessment tasks assess the retention and application of the valued knowledge and skills that students are provided with the opportunity to learn in the course.

(2) In designing the assessment tasks for a course, consideration is given to:

(a) professional standards;

(b) the AQF level of the course (introductory, developing, graduate, advanced or specialised);

(c) the scaffolding of knowledge, skills and application through any pre-requisites or assumed knowledge for the course;

(d) alignment of marking criteria with course learning outcomes, which in turn align with the program learning outcomes;

(e) Bloom's Taxonomy of measurable verbs to describe and observe knowledge, skills and application of knowledge and skills;

(f) support for students' transition to higher education and provision of early formative feedback on progress to students and staff in first year assessment;

(g) the link between formative and summative assessment and constructive feedback;

(h) the number and types of assessment tasks required to generate evidence that enables reliable and valid judgments of student performance;

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

(i) the amount of assessment required to generate evidence that enables reliable and valid judgments of student performance to be made about the degree to which the student has met the learning outcomes; and

(j) the workload that the assessment requires of both students and markers and the sustainability of those approaches to assessment.

(3) Assessment task definitions can be found in the Assessment product list (task types).

5.9.2 Academic integrity through assessment design

(1) In designing assessment tasks, strategies should be considered to assist students to maintain their academic integrity, these include:

(a) design assessment tasks that assess the student's knowledge, skills and the process undertaken to complete the task i.e., design assessment tasks/topics around authentic activities relating to a work context or recent or current events; personalise the assessment topics by inviting students to draw on their own experiences;

(b) changes to assessment topics and/or products every iteration of a course;

(c) help students work in cooperative learning groups and set expectations in group assessment tasks; and

(d) clarify the boundaries between collaboration and collusion.

5.9.3 Class participation and mandated attendance

(1) Class participation can be used as assessment *as* and *for* learning for courses, and assesses student contribution in an active and cooperative learning process either on campus or online. Class participation:

(a) will not be weighted at more than 10 percent of the total assessment for the course; and

(b) will be assessed on an evidence basis through the application of criteria.

(2) A minimum level of participation may be required to pass a course when:

(a) the course is a WIL placement or where students are required to demonstrate competency in a range of practical tasks;

(b) the course contains professional competencies required as a pre-requisite for a WIL placement course;

(c) there are statutory requirements such as occupational health and safety training; and

(d) professional accreditation specifies particular activities for students to achieve particular competencies.

(3) No result can be allocated for attendance (either on campus or online).

(4) If attendance is mandated by a professional accreditation authority, then this will be specified in the program requirements and the specific Course Outlines and reasonable alternatives will be provided for students who cannot attend because of circumstances beyond their control.

5.9.4 Self and peer-assessment

(1) Self-assessment is a formative assessment activity and no summative results can be awarded, as the focus of self-assessment is to monitor progress and reflect on and improve the learning as demonstrated through summative tasks.

(2) Where peer-assessment is a summative assessment task, it can be weighted at a maximum of 10 percent of the total assessment for the course. Peer-assessment can also be utilised formatively to enable students to actively improve their learning.

(3) Processes for peer-assessment will be designed to ensure that students are treated with fairness, consistency, and respect. The Course Coordinator will provide written instructions and criteria for students undertaking peer assessment.

(4) The Course Coordinator will moderate the results of peer-assessment to ensure that student feedback is explicit, informative and accessible as a requirement for summative tasks and as appropriate for formative tasks.

5.9.5 Group work assessment

(1) Where group work is an assessment task, the Course Coordinator will design the curriculum to include processes and learning activities to facilitate effective management of, and learning through, group work.

(2) Group work can be assessed individually for each group member, collectively for the group, or preferably by a weighted result allocation comprising both a whole group and individual component (including peer assessment). Students will be made aware of the criteria and any weighting associated with each criterion in the Course Outline.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

(3) The assessment criteria will make it possible for students to be marked separately should exceptional circumstances necessitate separate results.

5.9.6 Negotiated assessment

(1) In some instances, the Course Coordinator may want to negotiate aspects of the assessment task(s) with students during the teaching period as part of the learning experience. When this occurs, all students in the course must be given an opportunity to participate.

(2) Negotiated assessment opportunities are represented in the Course Outline through a broad description of the purpose and process. If required, the learning outcomes that will be addressed in the task are identified as a proxy for criteria, until specific criteria are designed. All other assessment procedures still apply in a negotiated task.

(3) The weighting of an assessment task or the number of assessment tasks cannot be altered through the process of negotiated assessment.

5.9.7 Multi-location and online course assessment

(1) Assessment tasks for courses offered in multiple locations will be designed so that all students have an equal opportunity to engage with them. All offerings of the course will have assessment requirements designed to enable equivalent opportunities for student academic success through achievement of the expected learning outcomes for the course.

(2) The use of different assessment items for courses offered in the same mode at different locations in the same teaching period will be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

5.9.8 Variation to assessment

(1) Adjustments and variations of assessment for a student are made in accordance with the Students with a Disability - Operational Policy.

(2) A student who has a temporary disability or experienced a traumatic event that will affect their ability to complete an assessment task(s) should contact AccessAbility Services.

(3) A Learning Access Plan outlining the determined reasonable adjustment is provided to the student, based on recommendations from the student's treating health professional. The student should ensure the Learning Access Plan is given to the relevant Course Coordinator in a timely manner and discuss any alternative arrangements/adjustments. If the Course Coordinator has any concerns that the recommendations will compromise any Inherent Academic Requirements, they should contact AccessAbility Services to discuss.

(4) The Central Examinations - Procedures are followed for students requiring alternative arrangements for central examinations.

5.9.9 Alternative assessment tasks

(1) An alternative assessment task may be set when circumstances prevent a student from completing an assessment task and it is not feasible to recreate the required circumstances for that assessment task. A Course Coordinator will then vary the details of that assessment task provided that the alternative enables an equitable assessment to be made and does not compromise an essential requirement of the course.

6. Feedback and marking

6.1 Formative and summative feedback

6.1.1 Each course teaching team will have an equitable approach to providing feedback across all delivery locations.

6.1.2 Feedback on formative assessment tasks will include information that helps a student progress from their current practice to more effectively achieve the learning goals of the course.

6.1.3 Each course will include early feedback on formative tasks (non-graded or graded) in the first third of the teaching period. Providing "formative" feedback allows students to monitor their own progress effectively and to use that information to guide their own effort, practice and decision making.

6.1.4 Feedback on all summative assessment tasks will include:

(a) a result for the task in response to stated assessment criteria;

(b) an explanation of student performance in relation to the assessment criteria and the standards to which each is met; and

(c) summary comments, including what aspects of the task have been done well and how students could improve their performance.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

6.1.5 All students receive feedback on all summative assessment. Feedback on final examinations is only required to be provided on the request of the student.

6.2 Timing of feedback

6.2.1 The design of assessment task must consider the requirement for feedback to be given to students. Students must receive feedback on submitted work before the next assessment task when the tasks are related.

6.2.2 Feedback on assessment tasks will normally be provided within ten business days and must be provided within fifteen business days from the due date for the assessment task or the date when the task was submitted, whichever is the later. In the case of a final assessment task, where feedback will not inform the submission of another task in the course, feedback on the assessment must be provided no later than with the submission of final grades.

6.3 Marking

6.3.1 Assessment criteria and standards

(1) Assessment criteria are the elements the assessor will focus on when making a judgement about the task. All assessment tasks will have criteria which will be specified in the Course Outline.

(2) Criteria will be based on the learning outcomes of the course and will assess those learning outcomes.

(3) An assessment task will have no more than six (6) criteria.

(4) Any grading tools, such as criterion-referenced assessment rubrics or marking guides, will be made available to students at the beginning of the teaching period when the course site on the Learning Management System (LMS) is made available, or simultaneously with the release of the assessment task to students. Rubrics and marking guides will have the same criteria as those specified in the Course Outline.

(5) Rubrics and marking guides typically include three elements: the criteria, the standards (for example High Distinction (HD) to Fail (FL)) and the standards descriptors, which succinctly describe the levels of achievement required for each criterion at each standard. (Refer to the Grades and Grade Point Average (GPA) - Academic Policy for generic descriptions of each standard).

(6) The result a student receives for an assessment task is provided to the student in a numeric form, except for courses using limited grades. Markers may additionally use a letter grade that is consistent with the Grades and Grade Point Average (GPA) - Academic Policy.

6.3.2 Making judgements on student performance

(1) Results for all assessment tasks and the overall grade for a course are decided only by predetermined criteria and standards. Results are neither determined by the comparative performance of other students in the course nor allocated to fit a predetermined distribution.

6.3.3 Marking non-replicable assessment tasks

(1) When students are required to complete an assessment task greater than 30 percent that cannot be preserved or replicated (e.g. oral presentation or organising an event), the assessment task will be either video recorded or assessed in real time by more than one marker.

(2) Work integrated learning placements are exempt from this clause. Refer to the Work Integrated Learning - Academic Policy.

6.3.4 Negative marking

(1) Negative marking, in which a result less than zero is allocated to any part of any component of an assessment task, is not permitted.

6.3.5 Markers

(1) Where academic judgement is required to assess, the marker will have an appropriate level of discipline knowledge and assessment capacity, understanding of the course and the task's role within it, and an understanding of the University's policy documents relating to assessment. It is the responsibility of the Course Coordinator to ensure that staff appointed as markers satisfy these requirements.

6.3.6 Conflict of interest

(1) Staff who mark assessment tasks have a responsibility to assess student work fairly, objectively and consistently for all students enrolled in a course.

(2) Staff who assess a student who is a relative, family or personal friend must disclose the relationship as this may create an actual or perceived conflict of interest. Refer to the Conflict of Interest – Governing Policy.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

UniSC

7. Administering assessment

7.1 Submission of assessment tasks

7.1.1 A single submission method is required per assessment task.

7.1.2 The required method of submission of assessment tasks is electronically through the LMS, Eportfolio or Work Integrated Learning System. If an alternative submission method is required, this is identified in the Course Outline.

7.1.3 Students must keep a copy or record of all submitted assessment tasks to minimise the impact of lost, stolen, or damaged assessment tasks when submitted. On request, students will be able to present a copy of the task if required.

7.1.4 Date of submission will be decided by the Course Coordinator in consultation with the Program Coordinator. No assessment tasks are to be due during the University's identified examination preparation period or on a weekend or public holiday unless attendance on a weekend or public holiday is a requirement for the course.

7.1.5 Time of submission is between 9.00am and 4.30pm to ensure a range of student support services are available.

7.1.6 A submission date may be extended by the Course Coordinator for all students. Any extension to the submission date for an assessment task will be communicated to all students through the LMS.

7.1.7 Penalties for late submission of assessment tasks

(1) The Course Coordinator can apply a range of penalties for late submission of an assessment task for students without an approved extension. The penalties for late submission of an assessment task must be applied consistently across all students who submit after the task due date without an approved extension.

(2) Late submissions may be penalised up to and including the following maximum percentage of the assessment task's identified value, with weekdays and weekends included in the calculation of days late:

(i) One day: deduct 5%;

(ii) Two days: deduct 10%;

(iii) Three days: deduct 20%;

(iv) Four days: deduct 40%;

(v) Five days: deduct 60%;

(vi) Six days: deduct 80%;

(vii) Seven days: A result of zero is awarded for the assessment task.

Days Late	% Penalty	Example Penalties				
		50 Marks	40 Marks	30 Marks	20 Marks	10 Marks
1	5	-2.50	-2.00	-1.50	-1.00	-0.50
2	10	-5.00	-4.00	-3.00	-2.00	-1.00
3	20	-10.00	-8.00	-6.00	-4.00	-2.00
4	40	-20.00	-16.00	-12.00	-8.00	-4.00
5	60	-30.00	-24.00	-18.00	-12.00	-6.00
6	80	-40.00	-32.00	-24.00	-16.00	-8.00
7	100	-50.00	-40.00	-30.00	-20.00	-10.00

Table: Maximum penalties for late submission

7.1.8 Penalties for late submission of online examinations

(1) In addition to the examination duration time, a submission time of 15 minutes will apply to all online examinations of duration of one hour or more that require a student to submit their work (if not submitted automatically when the examination duration has elapsed).

(2) The following penalties will apply for a late submission for an online examination:

LESS THAN 15 MINUTES	NO PENALTY
From 15 minutes to 30 minutes	20% penalty

UniSC

More than 30 minutes	100% penalty

(3) Penalties will not apply if a student can demonstrate system and/or process issues beyond their control resulting in the late submission of the assessment or for students with a Learning Access Plan.

(4) If a student experiences€57€57technical issue/s which impact€57their ability to submit an online examination, they must contact the Course Coordinator as soon as possible via email to resolve the issue. If the issue continues, at the conclusion of the exam€57the student must provide evidence by taking screenshots of€57as many€57of the following:€57€57

- error messages
- screen not loading€57
- timestamped speed tests€57€57
- power outage maps€57
- messages or information from their internet provider regarding the issues experienced.

All screenshots€57must€57include the date and time the issue occurred. The evidence will be€57reviewed,€57and an outcome provided by the Course Coordinator.

(5) Refer Central Examinations – Procedures for the conduct and design of central examinations and the Guide for supporting students for online centrally scheduled examinations.

7.1.9 Grounds and evidence for exemption from penalties

(1) The student must follow the application process identified by the relevant School for applying for an exemption from penalties for late submission of assessment tasks.

(2) Students can request to have late penalties removed after the due date if they provide the relevant supporting documentation.

(3) The Course Coordinator can require independent evidence for extension requests of less than five (5) calendar days. For extension requests of more than five (5) calendar days, students must provide independent evidence. The independent evidence will include an indication of the number of days the student is unable to undertake assessment tasks.

(4) The grounds and required supporting evidence for applying for an exemption from penalties are:

GROUNDS	SUGGESTED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
(a) illness or serious health problem	A completed UniSC Medical Certificate form, from a registered Medical Practitioner.
(b) significant personal trauma	At least one of the following documents:
	(i) a completed UniSC Medical Certificate form, from a registered Medical Practitioner accompanied by relevant supporting documentation, or
	(ii) written verification from Student Wellbeing.
(c) cultural or sporting commitment at state, national or international representative level	A signed and dated letter (on the organisation's letterhead) that includes the student's name, details about the event, and details of the student's participation in the event.
	Legal Commitment
	A copy of the summons, subpoena, court order or notice of selection for jury duty stating:
	- student's name; and
	- the reason for the commitment; and
	- date/s of attendance required.
	Emergency Management body
	A signed and dated letter (on the organisation's letterhead) that includes:
	- student's name; and
	- the reason for the commitment; and

	- date/s of attendance required.
(e) Defence Forces Reserve commitment	A signed and dated letter (on the organisation's letterhead) that includes:
	- student's name; and
	- the reason for the commitment; and
	- date/s of attendance required.
(f) commitments as a member of the UniSC High Performance Sport program	At least one of the following documents,
	(i) a signed and dated letter (on the organisation's letterhead) that includes:
	- student's name; and
	- the reason for the commitment; and
	- date/s of attendance required.
	or
	(ii) written verification from the Coordinator, High Performance Sport Program.
(g) religious or cultural grounds	A signed and dated statement (on the organisation's letterhead) that includes the student's name, indicating that the student is a regular attendee or participant from an imam, pastor, rabbi or equivalent spiritual or community leader.
(h) unexpected circumstances including family, employment, personal or external events.	Attendance at a funeral of a family member or close friend
	At least one of the following documentation:
	(i) a Statutory Declaration and an obituary, funeral notice or funeral program; or
	(ii) written verification from Student Wellbeing.
	Death of family member or close friend
	(i) at least one of the following documentation: written evidence of the situation such as an obituary, funeral notice, or hospital/medical certificate;
	(ii) Death Certificate;
	(iii) Statutory Declaration; or
	(iv) written verification from Student Wellbeing.
	Unexpected primary carer responsibilities
	(i) at least one of the following documents: a completed UniSC Medical Certificate form indicating the student's primary carer responsibilities;
	(ii) a Statutory Declaration indicating how primary carer responsibilities have impacted the student's ability to study accompanied by relevant supporting documents; or
	(iii) written verification from Student Wellbeing.
	External events (e.g. natural disaster, pandemic, civil unrest)
	(i) at least one of the following documents: a Statutory Declaration and a copy of a public record such as a weather report or media coverage; or
	(ii) written verification from Student Wellbeing.
	Unexpected technical difficulties, screenshots/photographs of as many of the following as possible:
	• error messages
	• screen not loading
	• timestamped speed tests
	• power outage maps
	• messages or information from your internet provider regarding the issues experienced

UniSC

All screenshots€57must€57include the date and time the issue occurred.

Your special consideration application will be€57reviewed,€57and an outcome updated within 3-5 business days.

7.1.10 Renegotiation of assessment due dates

(1) Students must submit assessment extension requests to the relevant School with the identified supporting documentation.

(2) If a student requests an extension at least 48 hours prior to the due date and time, and the student is not replied to by the due date, an exemption from late penalties is granted.

(3) The renegotiated due date for all extensions cannot extend past the final date of the examination period for the study period in which the extension is being sought.

(4) A renegotiation to the due dates may result in a change, either earlier or later, or the student being required to undertake an alternative assessment task.

7.1.11 Resubmission of an assessment task

(1) At the discretion of the Course Coordinator, students who have failed an assessment task may be invited or permitted to revise and resubmit a specific assessment task for marking. This is not available if:

(a) the assessment item is a final examination; or

(b) the assessment task is related to core professional competencies in a Limited Graded course.

(2) In courses that use the standard grading scale, the maximum result that can be attained under such circumstances is 50 percent of the value of the assessment task.

(3) If a resubmission is approved by the Course Coordinator, the option must be available to all students with the equivalent circumstances.

7.1.12 Supplementary assessment

(1) Eligibility for supplementary assessment is outlined in the Supplementary Assessment – Procedures.

7.2 Grades

7.2.1 Aggregation of results – final grade

(1) In a course using the standard grading scale, a students' final mark in a course will be the aggregate of the results from all assessment tasks according to the percentage weighting of the assessment tasks.

7.2.2 Release of results to students

(1) Students' results for each task will be released via the LMS once the task has been moderated and within the time parameters set out in these procedures.

7.2.3 Transfer of results across enrolments

(1) The 'carrying over' of a result from an assessment task undertaken during a previous enrolment in a course, to a subsequent enrolment in the same course, is not permitted.

8. Assuring standards

8.1 Grade Standards

8.1.1 Assuring grade standards has three processes:

(a) moderation

(b) verification; and

(c) ratification.

8.1.2 A course goes through all three processes each time it is offered.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

8.1.3 An individual staff member can only perform one of the following roles when undertaking the process to assure grade standards for a course: Course Coordinator, Moderator or Grade Reviewer.

8.2 Moderation

8.2.1 Moderation is a rigorous quality review and assurance process to confirm the task's fitness for purpose and the validity, reliability and fairness of the outcome which ultimately ensures that academic standards are met.

8.2.2 Appointment of moderators

8.2.2.1 A moderator is appointed for each course by the Dean prior to the commencement of the teaching session.

8.2.2.2 A moderator will have a combination of discipline knowledge and assessment experience so they can make informed judgements about the assessment processes.

8.2.2.3 The moderator's role is to review and endorse the planned assessment prior to the course's commencement, ensure that academic standards are being judged correctly and verify that the assessment took place as planned.

8.2.3 Forms of moderation

(1) The University requires three forms of moderation, which are consistent across multi-locations and online courses:

(a) pre-assessment moderation: assures the quality of specific assessment elements before they are used for assessment (for example, specific topics for an essay or examination questions);

(b) point of assessment moderation: ensures that academic standards are being judged correctly (for example, by moderating student work to ensure that markers are making consistent and accurate assessment decisions in accordance with the assessment criteria); and

(c) post-assessment moderation: confirms that the results awarded for each task and the student's final mark and grade for the course overall reflect the performance descriptors in the Grades and Grade Point Average (GPA) - Academic Policy.

(2) Pre-assessment moderation

(1) The aim of pre-assessment moderation is to ensure that assessment tasks are fit for purpose, likely to provide valid and reliable evidence of student learning, and compliant with relevant policy documents. Forms of pre-assessment moderation may include:

(a) the markers become familiar with the marking tools to be used in the course and agree on marking processes;

(b) the Course Moderator evaluates examinations for an appropriate match between the examination requirements and duration, the course content and alignment between questions and criteria, and the completeness, clarity and accuracy of the questions or problems;

(c) the Course Moderator evaluates assessment questions/topics for their appropriateness for that course, including consistency with the curriculum design principles; and

(d) the course teaching team meets to discuss expectations of assessment tasks, review criterion-referenced rubrics and mark and discuss a sample paper.

(3) Point of assessment moderation

(1) The aim of moderation at the point of assessment, is to ensure quality of judgements and confirm correct and consistent application of assessment criteria and standards for all tasks in the course. The Course Coordinator and the teaching team will usually engage in point of assessment moderation after each task. For courses where the Course Coordinator is the sole assessor, the Course Moderator will engage in the moderation process with the Course Coordinator.

(2) Point of assessment moderation is an opportunity for a professional dialogue between at least two colleagues about the quality of student work, and the application of standards to that work. This usually takes place after an assessment task has been submitted and a sample has been assessed. A number of moderation strategies may be utilised, including:

(a) expert moderation: an external person with marking expertise in the discipline area marks and comments on a sample – possibly difficult or borderline cases - and provides feedback to the Course Coordinator (refer to External Referencing – Academic Policy and External Referencing: Peer Review of Assessment – Procedures);

(b) blind re-marking: a selection of clean scripts are given to a second marker. Where significant differences between markers are identified, discussion takes place to resolve the differences, identify consensus-driven assessment principles and reach agreement;

(c) selecting scripts for review: the Course Coordinator marks a small sample and provides it to the Course Moderator for review; or a small sample of student work is marked and submitted to the Course Coordinator who moderates it and gives feedback to the course teaching team; or

(d) consensus moderation: the course teaching team meets to review marked samples of student work to reach a consensus about the standard of the work and the mark and grade applied to it.

(3) The sampling of scripts for review will be at each grade level and include student work from all modes/locations where the course is being offered. In the case of a course being offered by a third party, the level of sampling of the marking of assessment tasks will be from at least 10 percent of the student cohort.

(4) The Course Coordinator also monitors and samples the marking of individual members of the course teaching team to establish inter-rater reliability. Individual markers are encouraged to also review a sample of assessments made over several marking sessions to ensure intra-rater reliability.

(5) Moderation must occur before the task results are released to students.

(6) All task results must be recorded in the Grade Book of the LMS.

(4) Post-assessment moderation

(1) For post-assessment moderation, when the Course Moderator and Course Coordinator are satisfied with the moderation process of all tasks within the course, it is complete, and the results, final marks and grades move into the verification stage of the process.

(2) For post-assessment moderation, when a Course Coordinator and a Course Moderator do not agree, the relevant Dean is consulted. The Dean determines the action, if any, that the Course Coordinator is required to take and informs both parties of that decision.

(3) Results and final marks for all courses must be uploaded to the Grade Book within the University's LMS, except for the following types of courses for which the verification and ratification processes are completed manually:

(a) Study Overseas program;

(b) Honours Dissertation;

(c) Progressive Courses (non-examinable components); and

(d) Fee for service/short courses.

(4) The Course Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the task results are correctly entered and that the associated marks and grades are correctly calculated in the Grade Book of the LMS, and correctly submitted to the Interim Result Module (IRM) for verification.

8.2.4 Issues arising out of moderation

(1) When moderation indicates a problem with the marking of tasks/s, an investigation is immediately initiated by the Dean.

(2) When post-assessment moderation identifies that a problem has occurred which affects student grades, corrections must be undertaken immediately under the direction of the Chairperson, School Assessment Moderation and Results Committee.

8.3 Verification

8.3.1 The Course Coordinator and the Course Moderator verify that the assessment tasks were undertaken as advised in the Course Outline and that the moderation process has been completed.

8.3.2 The Course Coordinator determines students' eligibility for supplementary assessment based on their final mark for the course (see Supplementary Assessment - Procedures), and notes this for ratification at the School Assessment Moderation and Results Committee.

8.3.3 The Course Coordinator provides a commentary on the moderation process and the grades awarded compared to previous iterations. A commentary on the outcomes for the student cohort is also required if there are 20 students or more in the course.

8.4 Ratification

8.4.1 A School Assessment Moderation and Results Committee (SAMRC) is convened in each School at the conclusion of each teaching period.

8.4.2 The SAMRC will make recommendations on the following matters:

(a) the grades or grade notations for all students enrolled in a course, ensuring that the results are awarded properly and reflect the levels of performance of individual students;

(b) the allocation and spread of results for each course, ensuring that any modification or scaling of marks has been applied fairly, systematically and for sound academic reasons; and

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

(c) in exceptional circumstances, following consultation with the relevant Dean and Course Coordinator, it may recommend a variation in the final marks.

8.4.3 In making a recommendation on the grades, the SAMRC:

(a) ratifies the Course Coordinator's decisions on students' results and interim and final mark and grades, including those eligible for supplementary assessment; and

(b) provides the Program Coordinator with a summary of the final results and grades, moderation, verification and ratification process for the teaching period for consideration in the Annual Program Monitoring (APM) process. The report will also include comparative data with summary or selected course performance in comparison to the previous teaching period.

8.4.4 Verification and Ratification are processed through the IRM.

8.5 Submission and approval of results, final marks and grades

8.5.1 The Dean has the final responsibility to approve the grades in courses offered in their School. With approval from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), this authority may be delegated to the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching.

8.6 Final mark process

8.6.1 Dean approval

Step 1: The Dean approves and submits the final marks for each teaching period via the IRM to Student Services and Engagement by the date specified by the Academic Registrar and Director, Student Services. Any outstanding results (e.g. GP, IN) must be finalised no later than six (6) weeks after the release of grades date.

Step 2: The Dean may determine a different grade for a student from that recommended by the SAMRC or the Course Coordinator after consultation with the Chairperson, SAMRC and the Course Coordinator. Where the Dean is also the Course Coordinator, the decision will be delegated to an appropriate senior academic staff member.

Step 3: Following the release of final marks and grades, the Dean is responsible for advising Student Services and Engagement of any amendments to final marks and grades previously submitted.

8.6.2 Student Services and Engagement release of grades

Step 1: Student Services and Engagement will notify students of their final marks and grades on behalf of the Dean by the due date.

8.7 Error in the computation of the final grade

8.7.1 When an error in the computation of the Final Grade is identified after the release of final grades, a recalculated mark and, where appropriate an amended grade, will apply.

8.7.2 Course Coordinator

Step 1: The Course Coordinator checks the results for all students in all assessment items in the LMS. Any necessary adjustments are made and the results are then resubmitted to the IRM.

Step 2: The Course Coordinator provides an interim results report to the relevant Dean, which summarises the students who have had their mark recalculated, the new mark awarded, any grade amendments and the reason for the error.

8.7.3 Dean approval

Step 1: The relevant Dean may approve the recalculated grades, taking into consideration the time since the grades were released, the potential consequences to the students and equity across the affected student cohort.

Step 2: If approved by the Dean, the adjusted grades are submitted to the student information system to be applied to the students' records.

Step 3: Following consultation with the relevant School, Student Services and Engagement communicates with all affected students, informing them of the rationale for the changed grade, available processes in the case of additional assessment and information about support services.

Step 4: At the discretion of the Dean, students who have received an incorrect grade may be eligible for an additional assessment task to assess their achievement against the course learning outcomes.

In cases where the Dean determines that additional assessment is required, the interim notation of AE (Alternative Examination) or AO (Alternative Assessment) is applied. If a student is eligible for both alternative assessment and supplementary assessment, then alternative assessment (AE/AO) will be applied, and is not restricted to a Pass/Fail result.

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.

8.8 Review of assessment and final grade

8.8.1 The process for students to seek a review of their result in an assessment task or their final grade, is identified in the Review of Assessment and Final Grade – Procedures.

9. Records management

9.1 Effective recordkeeping and records management is implemented in relation to all assessment, including review of assessment, in line with the Information Management Framework – Governing Policy and associated procedures. Reviews will be documented, with all parties keeping relevant and complete records.

10. Appendix 1 – Roles and Responsibilities

1. Course Coordinator

  • Moderate marks and grades

2. Course Coordinator and Moderator

  • Verify final marks and grades

3. School Assessment Moderation and Results Committee (SAMRC)

  • • Provide advice and recommendations to the Dean and ratify final marks and grades

4. Dean

  • Approves final marks and grades

RELATED DOCUMENTS

• Assessment: Courses and Coursework Programs - Academic Policy

• Central Examinations - Procedures
• Coursework Curriculum - Academic Policy
• Coursework Curriculum - Procedures
• Deferred Examinations - Procedures
• Grades and Grade Point Average (GPA) - Academic Policy
• Review of Assessment and Final Grade - Procedures
• Student Conduct - Governing Policy
• Students with a Disability - Operational Policy
• Supplementary Assessment - Procedures
• Work Integrated Learning (Placement) - Procedures

LINKED DOCUMENTS

• Assessment: Courses and Coursework Programs - Academic Policy

RELATED LEGISLATION / STANDARDS

• Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 (Qld)
• Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth)
• Australian Qualifications Framework
• Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth)
• Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld)

usc.edu.au/policy

University of the Sunshine Coast | CRICOS Provider Number: 01595D | Correct as at 21 May 2024
Hard copies of this document are uncontrolled and may not be current.