

Assessment (HE) Policy

1. Purpose

The purpose of the Assessment (HE) Policy is to outline the assessment framework for Higher Education courses and to identify responsibilities and accountabilities for effective implementation.

2. Policy Statement

The policy is committed to engaging students in active learning, providing prompt feedback on student learning that positively influences subsequent learning and measures students' preparedness for further study. In addition, it defines and protects academic standards and the academic quality of programs of study at a range of levels across the institution.

3. Principles

The policy will adhere to the following principles:

1. Assessment will be *criterion-referenced*;
2. Assessment will be *aligned with the curriculum*;
3. Assessment will be *valid, reliable and fair*;
4. Assessment will include *feedback for improvement*;
5. Assessment will be conducted within a *quality system*;
6. *Assessment will reflect best practice in that discipline.*

4. Scope

This policy applies to all Melbourne Polytechnic Higher Education onshore and offshore courses, academic teaching staff and students.

5. Assessment Items

a) Assessment type and load

Melbourne Polytechnic has a guide (Melbourne Polytechnic Higher Education Assessment Guidelines) on quality teaching, learning and assessment systems and should be followed for the development of a course.

At Melbourne Polytechnic, the course and its subject assessment strategy is defined in the relevant accredited course documentation. The accredited Subject Outline describes the learning outcomes, assessment and pedagogical approach for each subject.

The Student Subject Outline (based on the accredited Subject Outline) is revised prior to every delivery and is the accurate and current descriptor for the delivery of the subject. This includes the outcome from subject moderation.

Assessment methods will be chosen based on validity, reliability, feasibility, cost effectiveness, opportunities for feedback, and impact on learning. The rationale for the choice of each assessment method will be documented and evidence based. Assessment methods must satisfy prescribed professional accreditation requirements or support substantive discipline requirements where required.

Assessment (HE) Policy

b) Assessment Strategy, Weighting and Feedback

1. The Student Subject Outline will clearly define the assessment task, weighting, mark allocation, due date and assessment criteria in a marking rubric.
2. It is recommended that a twelve-credit point subject should have a minimum of three and a maximum of five assessment tasks and include a balance of diagnostic, formative and summative items. The number of tasks may vary in consultation with the Course Advisory Committee. Subjects with credit points which differ from this norm, should pro-rata the number of assessment tasks.
3. The first weighted assessment that contributes to a summative grade must occur within the first three weeks of semester to allow for early feedback opportunities.

c) Hurdle requirements

Hurdle requirements must be described in the Student Subject Outline.

Where a student has obtained 50% or more of the final mark in a subject but has failed to meet the hurdle requirement, supplementary assessment may be offered to meet this requirement. If 'attendance' is a defined hurdle and is stipulated in the Student Subject Outline then any supplementary task or activity must be a reasonable equivalence.

6. Examination and Invigilation

The conduct of examinations and invigilation is aligned to the Quality Policy. Preparing and moderating examinations will be completed each semester by the relevant subject coordinator and/or Head of Program.

7. Marking and Results

a) Marking

Subject Co-ordinators must provide students with transparent marking criteria for all assessment tasks. The Student Subject Outline will describe the marking criteria and include a marking rubric for students.

b) Marking and Feedback

Higher Education subjects are generally graded. Students will be provided with feedback regularly especially following formative assessment tasks to enable them to monitor their progress towards the subject and program learning outcomes, and to determine where improvements can be made to improve their learning.

c) Assessment integrity

All students have the responsibility to adhere to the highest standards of integrity in the preparation and submission of work for assessment.

Activities such as deliberate plagiarism, collusion and cheating will be addressed under the

Assessment (HE) Policy

Academic Integrity Policy.

d) Extension to due date of assessment

Students may request an extension to the due date of an assessment task due to exceptional circumstances. The specific circumstances should be discussed with the Subject Co-ordinator in the first instance.

e) Assessment Moderation

Assessment moderation describes the process of developing uniformity or comparability of assessment judgements:

1. All raw scores at Melbourne Polytechnic are subject to moderation.
2. All fail grades are double marked.
3. Prior to the Chief Examiners Meeting, grade distributions will be reviewed by the Results Review Meeting.

f) Scaling of Marks

Scaling is undertaken on the advice of the Chief Examiners Meeting (CEM) at the review of grade distributions. The scaling methodology may include:

1. Adding a fixed score to a raw score for each student
2. Proportionally increasing the scores for each student by a percentage of the score achieved
3. Other methods that change the distribution while preserving the original rank order within the cohort

g) Final grades

Staff will use the approved Higher Education result codes for grading. When determining the final grade, staff will ensure assessment moderation is applied consistently and fairly. The Chief Examiners Meeting (CEM) is the arbiter of assessment grades and makes the final decision about the awarding of grades. Final grades will be made available on a set date via the intranet. Staff are not permitted to provide students with final results verbally or over the phone. Staff are not permitted to provide students with raw scores for the subject or an assessment piece prior to the final approved individual subject result.

h) Request for Re-assessment

Students who are dissatisfied with their assessment mark may request a re-assessment and should discuss their concerns with the Subject Co-ordinator in the first instance.

i) Supplementary Assessment

Supplementary assessment tasks may be offered to students once for each subject enrolment under the following conditions:

Assessment (HE) Policy

1. In any subject for which a mark of 48% or more has been obtained;
2. In a failed subject for which a mark of 45 – 47% has been obtained, at the discretion of the Chief Examiner’s Meeting, taking into consideration the student’s academic record and the recommendation of the HOP or responsible Senior Lecturer;
3. In any subject where a student failed a hurdle requirement;
4. Result of dispute resolution; or
5. Recommendation of an Academic Progress Panel subsequent to CEM.

8. Alternative Arrangements

a) Students with disabilities

Students with identified disabilities or needs can request assessment tasks to be modified to ensure equal access and opportunity. Refer to the *Policy To Support Students With Disabilities*.

b) Special Consideration

An application for special consideration may be made by a student on the following grounds:

1. That the student’s work at any time during the academic year has to a substantial degree been hampered by illness or other cause;
2. That the student has been prevented by a serious or disabling illness or other significant cause from preparing or presenting for all or part of a component of assessment; or
3. That the student was to a substantial degree adversely affected by illness or other cause during the performance of a component of assessment.

Melbourne Polytechnic may grant one of the following outcomes:

- Deferred examination
- Special assessment task

Students who disagree with the decision, should speak with the Head of Program in the first instance.

9. Complaints and appeals

If a student is not satisfied with a decision relating to one of the following matters, they can lodge an appeal using the *Student Complaints and Appeals Policy*).

- Special consideration
- Re-assessment
- Supplementary assessment

Assessment (HE) Policy

10. Definitions

For this policy, the following definitions apply:

Assessment Moderation: Assessment moderation refers to an analysis of the performance of an individual assessment item or the collective assessment strategy in a subject or a course

Criterion Referenced Assessment: Criterion referenced assessment refers to the use of defined objective criteria against which expected student performance is measured

Diagnostic Assessment: Assessment that is used to measure aptitude or preparedness for study, to identify possible learning deficiencies or to determine learning pathways

Formative Assessment: An assessment that is used to provide students with feedback on progress which can then be incorporated in subsequent assessment tasks and learning activities

Hurdle Task: A hurdle task in an assessment item refers to any condition, which must be completed for the task to be passed, and the subject to be passed

Marking rubric: A scoring guide used to evaluate the quality of students' work

Summative Assessment: An assessment that is used as a measure of performance in a subject or course

Subject Moderation: Subject Moderation refers to the review of a subject's learning outcomes and assessment tasks. Subject Moderation is normally undertaken by an academic not teaching in the subject prior to the delivery of that subject

Scaling of Marks: Scaling refers to the adjustment of a group of marks of an entire class or a subset of that class or of individual marks or compiled marks.

Weighting: Assessment 'weighting' refers to the contribution of an individual assessment task to the overall subject's score.

11. Responsibility and Accountability

Task	Responsibility	Notes
Set, moderate and mark assessment components within the parameters of the accreditation documentation, which is reflected in the approved Student Subject Outline.	Academic staff	
Responsible for the integrity of the Student Subject Outline which describes the assessment expectations. Ensure that the Student Subject Outline is available via Moodle (Learning Management System)	Subject Coordinator	

Assessment (HE) Policy

during or before the first week of the academic semester.		
Ensures no changes to assessment tasks, timing or weightings can be made after the conclusion of Week 1 of the semester.	Subject Coordinator	
Providing timely and meaningful assessment feedback to students.	Academic staff	
Approve extension to due dates	Subject Coordinator	
Approve special requirements and special consideration	Head of Program	
Responsible for examinations and invigilation	Head of Program	
Review examination process and identify opportunities for improvement and action.	Head of Program	
The Chief Examiners Meeting is the principle arbiter for academic progress assessment moderation, the awarding of grades, supplementary assessment and endorsing students eligible for awards.	Head of School	
Handle requests for re-assessment	Subject Coordinator and then Head of Program	
Responsible for leading ongoing continuous improvement review process of assessment strategies in the degree program according to the <i>Higher Education Course Review procedure</i> .	Head of Program	
Responsible for monitoring the appropriateness of assessment strategies within the course and receive relevant reports.	The School Higher Education Committee (SHEC)	
Responsible for identifying and leading any ongoing institutional review of higher education assessment strategies in consultation with the Academic Board (AB).	Director of College	

Assessment (HE) Policy

12. Supporting Documents and Templates

[Assessment \(HE\) Procedure](#)

[Assessment \(HE\) Guidelines](#)

[Student Complaints and Appeals Policy](#)

13. Policy Control

Approving authority	<i>Academic Board</i>
Date approved	<i>12 May 2017</i>
Date effective	<i>12 May 2017</i>
Policy category	<i>Learning and Teaching</i>
Edition	<i>1</i>
Review date	<i>May 2020</i>