

FACULTY CONSULTATION FORUMS MODERATION OF ASSESSMENT AT UOW

Background

In mid-2013 the Moderation of Assessment Working Group was established by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) [originally as the Moderation of Assessment Task & Finish Group], and was tasked to:

- review existing policy and practice on moderation of assessment at UOW, including consideration of good practice at other institutions, and
- create a UOW policy statement and supporting tools around moderation of assessment.

A Context for Moderation of Assessment

Regulatory Requirements

The draft revised Higher Education Standards Framework, which is expected to come into effect from the beginning of 2016, includes the following requirements of Universities in relation to the quality assurance of its courses, assessment methods and grading:

1.4.3 Methods of assessment are consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed, are capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment.

5.3.3 Comprehensive reviews of courses of study are informed and supported by regular interim monitoring, of the quality of teaching and supervision of research students, student progress and the overall delivery of units within each course of study.

5.3.4 Review and improvement activities include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study, including:

- a. analyses of progression rates, attrition rates, completion times and rates and, where applicable, comparing different locations of delivery, and*
- b. the assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses of study.*

Internally, moderation of assessment operates to support assurance that these standards are met, in that it checks alignment with Subject Learning Outcomes and it verifies that allocated marks and grades reflect student performance.

Externally, moderation of assessment is considered to be a part of regular interim monitoring, and external referencing of assessment methods and grading are a critical component of the review and improvement requirements referred to above.

UOW's Renewal of Registration

UOW's registration with TEQSA as a higher education provider expires on 31 March 2018. Submission of our renewal of registration application is due 30 September 2017. The process for re-

registration will actually begin six months earlier in March 2017 when discussions to determine the scope of TEQSA's assessment will commence.

Although this may seem a long way off, it is important that the University prepare for the re-registration process. It is also important that UOW is able to demonstrate that it has a culture of self-reflection and continuous improvement across all its activities.

One aspect of the re-registration process will be the need to demonstrate that the University meets the Higher Education Threshold Standards, which will mean providing evidence UOW has an established, strategic and systematic approach to both internal and external moderation of assessment.

Other Reasons to Moderate Assessment

Research tells us that moderation of assessment is an important quality assurance activity that serves a purpose beyond satisfying legislative requirements. In their paper 'Identifying discourses of moderation in higher education'¹, Adie et al identify four discourses of moderation that higher education staff typically identify with:

Equity: 'Moderation as equity was typified by conversations of consistency and fairness for students which aligned with broader discourses of equity within the university' (p. 973). 'The equity discourse in our study was evident when academics spoke of moderation in terms of enabling them to have confidence in the consistency of their interpretation of the standards amongst other markers, which ensured fairness for all students. It was important that similar standards were seen to be applied across cohorts of students' (p. 973).

Justification: 'Moderation as justification was typified by conversations of confidence in decisions, providing quality feedback, and support to respond to student queries' (p. 973). 'Turning the purpose of moderation towards themselves, moderation provided academics with confidence in the decisions that they had made, so that they could justify their decisions to students if queried as well as providing better feedback on the qualities within a student's work that denoted a standard' (p. 973).

Community building: 'Moderation as community building is typified by conversations of collaborative establishment and review of assessment tasks, criteria, standards, learning experiences and teaching strategies' (p. 974).

Accountability: 'Moderation as accountability is typified by references to distribution of marks; and the unit coordinator as standard setter, final arbiter and expert' (p. 974). 'From the perspective of unit coordinators and academics in our study, moderation was a process made necessary by their responsibility for the marks that they awarded students for assessments' (p. 975).

Similarly, a recent OLT report², found that academic staff identified the following impacts of assessment moderation:

Learning and Research Impact

¹ Adie, L, Lloyd, M & Beutal, D 2013, 'Identifying discourses of moderation in higher education', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, vol. 38, no. 8, pp. 968-977

² Tuovinen, J, Dachs, T, Fernandez, J, Morgan, D, Sesar, J 2015, *Developing and testing models for benchmarking and moderation of assessment for private higher education providers*, Office for Learning and Teaching, Sydney

- Moderation guides you where you want to go (leads to effective changes)
- Moderation is encouraging and affirming of personal practice (reassuring / affirming / validating)

Comparability Impact

- Moderation provides the bigger picture regarding assessment process and impact

Impact on Quality Assurance

- Moderation is a monitoring process to identify problems
- Moderation improves quality control in the development/ design of assessments

Impact on Students

- Moderation enables teachers and learners to become more capable of self-assessment

Impact on Fairness and Equity

- Moderation is a quality control of students' grades (grading is fair)

The current landscape at UOW

Moderation of assessment is not a new concept, and many components of the proposed moderation of assessment model are already well established at UOW, for example:

- Review of assessment design via the Subject Outline approval process and the exam script approval process (via the Code of Practice – Teaching and Assessment (COPTA))
- Use of marking guides (and assessment rubrics) to inform students and support consistency of practice across teaching and marking teams (via COPTA)
- Calibration of teaching and marking team judgment of student learning via pre-marking, mid-marking and post-marking workshops
- Review of marking and grading via the results finalisation and declaration process (via the Standard for the Finalisation of Results)
- Post-marking review of results via the Comparative Student Outcomes process
- External benchmarking through use of external markers of HDR theses and benchmarking of honours projects (via COPTA and the General Course Rules)

The proposed policy provisions have been developed to formalise, and build upon, these practices.

UOW Grade Descriptors

One of the early outputs of the Moderation of Assessment Working Group was the development of UOW Grade Descriptors, which support moderation of assessment by providing a frame of reference, especially within teaching and marking teams, to ensure that assessment practice across the University is appropriate, consistent and fair.

The UOW Grade Descriptors were approved by Academic Senate on 3 December 2014, and are intended to be implemented in a variety of ways, for example as:

- part of COPTA and therefore referenced in the general information section of each Subject Outline
- an inclusion in the subject pack to be uploaded to each subject based Moodle site
- a visually attractive online resource for inclusion on the proposed Moderation of Assessment website

- a resource for staff undertaking the University Learning and Teaching Course or participating in Continuous Professional Development.

Principles for Moderation of Assessment at UOW

The following principles have been identified as a foundation for the development of policy provisions around moderation of assessment:

That UOW's moderation of assessment process will:

- *confirm that assessment is being undertaken appropriately, consistently and fairly;*
- *identify issues related to assessment, both individual and systemic, and enable resolution in a timely manner;*
- *enhance the learning and teaching experience for both staff and students; and*
- *make the best use of existing systems and processes while incorporating those available through technological enhancements to ensure effective use of staff and student time.*

The proposed UOW Moderation of Assessment Model

What will it involve?

The draft policy provisions, which are primarily presented as a Schedule to the Code of Practice – Teaching and Assessment (COPTA), identify activities to assure assessment at each stage of the assessment life cycle, that is: design, delivery, and declaration.

A toolkit is proposed to support these policy provisions, which will provide greater detail and guidance on the range of activities that can be undertaken within the context of moderation of assessment at each of these stages, as well as resources to support the process.

The proposed model provides individual subject coordinators with the scope to identify the most suitable moderation activities for each assessment task within their subject, which can include for example:

- “Design” phase (the design of an assessment task);
 - Review of assessment design by another staff member.
 - Creation and review of assessment rubrics / other tools to aid shared understanding of assessment requirements.
 - Calibration of teaching and marking teams - activities undertaken to create a shared understanding amongst a teaching and marking team of the learning objectives of a subject's assessment tasks and the different standards of student performance in meeting those learning objectives.
- “Delivery” phase (the marking of individual assessment tasks):
 - Consensus marking - markers gather together and mark a sample of the same papers whilst addressing consistency issues as they arise.
 - Blind marking - a second marker assesses a marked assessment task. A ‘clean’ assessment (devoid of marking annotations from the first marker) is provided to the second marker for this purpose. The results of the two markers are compared for consistency.

- Sample marking - using the established marking guides or assessment rubrics, two (or more) markers assess an assessment task independent of one another. The results of the two markers are compared for consistency.
- Rotational marking - the assessment is divided into sections; each section is marked by the same marker.
- “Declaration” phase (the finalisation of subject marks and grades):
 - Post marking review
 - Statistical analysis - the marks are analysed to see if there are variations in the marks. This can include consideration of CSO data etc.
 - Spot checks - random papers are selected to check marking.
 - Check outliers - extreme ‘high’ and ‘low’ scoring assessments are identified to check marking.
 - Check borderline assessments - borderline pass or fails are identified to check marking.
 - Exception reporting through Academic Unit results meetings of any issues that have been identified during the moderation process.
- External benchmarking / peer review

Moderation of Assessment in Practice

The draft policy provisions outline the minimum requirements for assuring standards of assessment at each of the above mentioned phases.

In practice, the minimum requirements of moderation of assessment will involve:

At the task design stage:

Review of the examination paper(s), and/or any other assessment requirements as stipulated within the Subject Outline, by another member of academic staff with appropriate discipline knowledge and academic experience, as nominated by the Head of School responsible for the subject. Where a teaching and marking team has jointly designed the assessment tasks for the subject, these requirements are considered to have been met.

At the marking stage:

Moderation activities, such as sample double marking (e.g. sample = the square root of the total number of assessment scripts, or 10 assessment scripts, whichever is greatest), of all examinations and all major non-examination assessment tasks, i.e. those that assure the learning outcomes, with reference to the marking criteria and assessment rubric. Subject Coordinators may identify examinations and non-examination assessment tasks for which moderation does not add value, for example, tasks that require non-interpretive marking such as 100% multiple choice questions. The implementation strategy (see more below) will identify the frequency at which subjects need to have moderation of assessment undertaken, for example once per calendar year.

At the grade finalisation stage:

The deliberations of the Academic Unit results meeting conducted should involve consideration being given to the pattern of marks and grades awarded within subjects delivered by the Academic Unit, including a comparison of distribution with historical data and across locations, and identification of any subject anomalies, to ensure marks and grades are being awarded appropriately, consistently and fairly.

Implementation

The requirements of the Design and Declaration phases are, for the most part, not new to policy, and are already seen in practice, across the University. The requirements of the Delivery phase, however, have not been prescribed in policy to date, and as such it is important that the implementation of these requirements is given sufficient consideration, planning and support.

A subgroup of the Moderation of Assessment Working Group has been established to develop an implementation strategy for moderation of assessment. At this stage, the implementation strategy being considered will involve an initial pilot approach, followed by a staggered roll-out, with full operation of the policy requirements seen across the University by Spring Session 2016.

Challenges

The Moderation of Assessment Working Group is cognisant of challenges that need to be addressed in order for the roll-out of the UOW Moderation Model to be successful, including:

- The impact of moderation activities on staff workloads
- The impact of moderation activities on casual teaching staff, and related costs
- A need for resources and support for moderation activities (tools, guides, training)

Implementation planning will take account of these challenges.

Feedback on Implementation

Faculty staff are encouraged to provide feedback on the implementation of moderation of assessment across UOW, including what support and resources will be required to facilitate the implementation.

Related Projects

The following projects intersect with the Moderation of Assessment Project:

- **Review of Code of Practice – Teaching and Assessment**
This is currently being undertaken by the Academic Quality and Standards Unit. The proposed policy provisions relating to moderation of assessment will be incorporated into the final revisions to COPTA that are presented to EPRS and other committees in the future.
- **Assessment and Feedback Task and Finish Group**
The Assessment and Feedback Task and Finish Group has a number of aims relating to improvements and innovations in the area of assessment and feedback at UOW. UEC has recently endorsed draft Assessment and Feedback principles developed by this group, including the following principle relating specifically to moderation of assessment:

“Quality assured: Course convenors and subject co-ordinators will ensure assessment is:

- Consistent: referenced to agreed assessment rubrics and
- Moderated and calibrated: grading decisions are between markers.
- Reviewed: to ensure continuous, incremental improvement of assessment tasks through listening to student feedback.”

- **External Review of Assessment**

With regard to the legislative obligations relating to external referencing of assessment methods and student performance, many Universities have formalised, or are in the process of formalising, inter-university networks and processes to undertake external review of assessment. The UOW Moderation of Assessment Working Group is currently developing a UOW model for external review of assessment, and is in conversation with RMIT, Curtin and QUT with a view to undertaking a pilot external referencing exercise with these institutions to inform the development of internal processes around external review of assessment.

Dr Sara Booth from the University in Tasmania is leading work to establish a formal National Peer Review of Assessment Network to facilitate external peer review of learning outcomes and grow national benchmarking capability.

Consultation

A first draft of the proposed policy provisions relating to moderation of assessment were presented to the Education Policy Review Subcommittee (EPRS) for feedback at its 15 April 2015 meeting.

The Working Group is now in the process of undertaking a comprehensive consultation activity to seek feedback on the proposed model, and in particular, seek input into the implementation process, including the implementation timeframe and approach, as well as what support and resources will be needed for implementation.

The proposed consultation strategy, which is taking place between April and June 2015, includes the following activities:

- University-wide forum
- Faculty-hosted forums
- Presentation at Heads of School meeting
- Committee consultation (EPRS, AQSS, UEC)
- Other methods as identified

Next Steps

Faculty staff are asked to provide feedback on the proposed model for moderation of assessment at UOW (including the draft policy provisions), as well as provide input on the strategy for implementing the moderation of assessment model at UOW.

A final draft of the proposed policy provisions relating to moderation of assessment, which will incorporate feedback received during the consultation process, will be presented to the June 2015 meeting of EPRS for formal endorsement, prior to continuation through the formal committee approval pathway.

Questions or comments may be directed to the Academic Quality and Standards Unit via email to quality@uow.edu.au.

Attachment
Moderation of Assessment Draft Policy Provisions

CODE OF PRACTICE – TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT

Date first approved: 10 October 1997	Date of effect: 10 October 1997	Date last amended: (refer Version Control Table) February 2015	Date of Next Review: December 2013
Approved by	University Council		
Custodian title & e-mail address	Director, Academic Quality and Standards quality@uow.edu.au		
Responsible Faculty/ Division & Unit	Academic Quality and Standards Unit, DVCE Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) Portfolio quality@uow.edu.au		
Supporting documents, procedures & forms of this policy	Schedule 1 : Subject Outline Checklist Schedule 2 : Retention of Assessment RecordsAssuring Standards of Assessment Schedule 3 : Subject Quota Guidelines Schedule 4: Retention of Assessment Records		
References & Legislation	State Records Act 1998 (General Disposal Authority – University Records GDA23 and Committees GDA 2) Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW) Academic Advice to Students Policy Academic Review Policy Code of Practice – Honours Code of Practice - Research Code of Practice – Student Professional Experience Course Approval Guidelines Course Progress Policy Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy Delegations of Authority Policy Disability Policy – Students General Course Rules Good Practice Assessment Guidelines Graduate Qualities Policy IP Student Assignment of Intellectual Property Policy Records Management Policy Research Misconduct Policy Respect for Diversity Policy Standards for the Finalisation of Academic-Student Results Standard on Courses Student Academic Consideration Policy Student Charter Student Conduct Rules Subject Approval Guidelines University Examination Rules University Privacy Policy UOW Academic Review Policy		
Audience	Public : accessible to anyone		

Formatted: Default Paragraph Font

Submit your feedback on this policy document using the [Policy Feedback Facility](#).

Contents

<u>1 Purpose</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>2 Definitions</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>3 Application & Scope</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>4 Policy Principles</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>5 Responsibilities</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>6 Subject Outlines</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>7 Assessment Practice</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>8 Assessment of Honours Projects</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>9 Retention of Assessment Records</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>10 Student Complaints</u>	<u>15</u>
<u>11 Version Control and Change History</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>Schedule 1 – Subject Outline Checklist and General Advice</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>Schedule 2 – Assuring Standards of Assessment</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>Schedule 3 – Subject Quota Guidelines</u>	<u>24</u>
<u>Schedule 4 – Retention of Assessment Records</u>	<u>26</u>

1 Purpose

1. This Code sets out:

- a. the University of Wollongong's approach to effective learning, teaching and assessment and the principles underlying teaching and assessment practice; and
- b. specific responsibilities in relation to learning, teaching and assessment, as well as procedures for teaching staff.

2 Definitions

Word/Term	Definition
Academic unit	<i>Faculty, School, Unit, Program or Discipline.</i>
Assessment task	<i>Activity which a student is required to complete to provide a basis for an official record of achievement or certification of competence in a subject (e.g. examination, test, take-home examination, quiz, assignment, essay, laboratory report, demonstration, folio of creative work, performance, written or oral presentation, participation).</i>
<u>Benchmarking</u>	<i><u>A learning process structured so as to enable those engaging in the process to compare their service/activities/products in order to identify their comparative strengths and weaknesses as a basis for self-improvement (Jackson and Lund (2000)).</u></i>
<u>Calibration</u>	<i><u>Activities undertaken to create a shared understanding amongst a teaching team of the learning objectives of a subject's assessment tasks and the different standards of student performance in meeting those learning objectives.</u></i>
Casual teaching employee	<i>A person engaged as such by the hour and paid on an hourly basis (UOW – Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement 2005).</i>
Course	<i>A course is a program of study consisting of a subject or combination of subjects and other requirements as specified in the relevant course structure that leads to a higher education award.</i>
Delegated authority	<i>A person given delegated authority under the Delegations of Authority Policy.</i>
Honours Examiner	<i>An appropriately qualified person with relevant expertise and with responsibility for the assessment of an Honours Project undertaken as a required component of an Honours Degree</i>
Faculty examination	<i>Test, examination, quiz or in-class review conducted by an academic unit.</i>
Fractional teaching staff	<i>Employment less than full-time employment, for which all entitlements are paid on a pro-rata basis calculated by reference to full-time employment. Fractional employment may be either on a continuing or fixed-term basis (UOW – Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement 2005).</i>
Group work	<i>An assessment task which involves two or more students contributing to an assessment task.</i>

Head	<i>A member of academic staff who is ultimately responsible for the matters set out in 5.2 of this Code.</i>
Honours Degree	<i>An undergraduate qualification that qualifies individuals who apply a body of knowledge in a specific context to undertake professional work and as a pathway for research and further learning, and that otherwise meets the requirements of Level 8 of the Australian Qualifications Framework.</i>
Honours Project	<i>A component of study within the Honours Degree that involves project work and/or a piece of research and scholarship with some independence and that is discipline specific, inter-disciplinary or joint</i>
In writing	<i>Written information delivered in hard copy or electronically.</i>
<u>Moderation</u>	<p><i><u>A quality assurance process by which an individual or group confirms that assessment is undertaken appropriately, consistently and fairly. Moderation activities include:</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• <u>Reviewing and approving assessment requirements as detailed in the Subject Outline</u></i> <i>• <u>Reviewing and approving examination papers</u></i> <i>• <u>Establishing assessment rubrics for assessment tasks</u></i> <i>• <u>Establishing detailed marking criteria for assessment tasks</u></i> <i>• <u>Reviewing marked assessment scripts to ensure that scripts have been assessed appropriately, consistently and fairly</u></i> <i>• <u>Reviewing distribution of marks and grades within a subject</u></i> <i>• <u>Undertaking external benchmarking to verify that assessment practice at UOW is consistent with that of other higher education providers</u></i>
<u>Moderator</u>	<i><u>A person who conducts quality assurance of teaching and learning in accordance with this Code.</u></i>
Reasonable adjustment	<i>An adjustment is reasonable in relation to a student with a disability if it balances the interests of all parties affected.</i>
Student	<i>A person registered for a course.</i>
Subject Coordinator	<i>Academic staff member with nominated responsibility for the subject.</i>
Subject Outline	<i>The document in hard copy or electronic format governing content, delivery and assessment of material for a subject.</i>
Supervisor	<i>A member of academic staff who is appropriately qualified and has relevant expertise to oversee the progress of the Honours Project.</i>
Teaching staff	<i>Any person who carries out teaching responsibilities under the authority of the Head of an academic unit.</i>
<u>Teaching team</u>	<i><u>A group coordinated by a Subject Coordinator, and comprised of permanent and casual teaching staff who may be based either onshore or offshore. The Subject Coordinator is responsible for the leadership of the whole Teaching Team, aspects of the curriculum</u></i>

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 +
Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27
cm

Formatted Table

	<i>and the practical delivery of the subject.</i>
University examination	A formal examination including a supplementary examination conducted by the <i>Academic Registrar's Student Services</i> Division.

3 Application & Scope

1. This Code applies to teaching, learning and assessment of all undergraduate and postgraduate coursework subjects at the University of Wollongong that are taught onshore and offshore, including coursework subjects where the primary or only assessment task is a research or creative project or an Honours Project. This Code should be read in conjunction with other, related policies.
2. The Code does not apply to the University of Wollongong in Dubai.
3. In conjunction with this Code, coursework subjects worth 24cp or more where the primary or only assessment task is an Honours Project should apply the Code of Practice – Honours for aspects such as the orientation, management and supervision of students. This does not preclude the application of the Code of Practice – Honours to subjects within an Honours Degree where the Honours Project is worth less than 24cp.

4 Policy Principles

1. The University has a responsibility to provide a
- 4.2. quality learning environment for students in accordance with its Strategic Plan *and broader legislative and regulatory requirements.*
- 2.3. The University values good teaching and assessment practice and is committed to providing an effective learning environment for its students. To this end, the University has in place quality assurance processes and procedures to support effective teaching and *appropriate, consistent and fair* assessment practices. Underlying these processes and procedures are the principles of equity, *consistency,* transparency and collegiality.

5 Responsibilities

Faculty

1. The Faculty is responsible for monitoring and ensuring the quality of its educational policy, practice and procedure, primarily through the Faculty Education Committee. These specific responsibilities include:
 - a. ensuring that University procedures for the approval of new courses and new subjects are followed (see the Course Management policy documents);
 - b. applying appropriate documented quality *control-assurance* mechanisms to approve new and amended courses and subjects with clear delegation for approval and appropriate record management;
 - c. ensuring that courses or subjects promote the development of the Faculty/discipline Graduate Qualities prepared in accordance with the Graduate Qualities Policy;
 - d. ensuring that courses and subjects are systematically reviewed in accordance with the University's Academic Review Policy, and improvements to individual subjects are communicated to students through Subject Outlines;
 - e. facilitating the sharing of information on best practice in teaching and assessment among colleagues;
 - f. ensuring that students are given adequate notice (through the subject database) of the imposition of subject quotas prior to the completion of the previous session so that students can arrange their course plans to fulfil the requirements for majors, core subjects and/or electives (see Schedule 3 of this Code – Subject Quota Guidelines);

- g. identifying subjects where the primary or only assessment task is a research or creative project, and ensuring that these are offered in accordance with clause 5.4;
- h. ensuring that assessment methods and practices applied throughout each academic unit are quality assured using the moderation activities as detailed in Schedule 2 of this Code so that assessment is carried out appropriately, consistently and fairly.
- ~~h.i. ensuring that all examinations and tests assessment tasks conducted by the Faculty or the Academic Registrar's Division support the attainment of - are moderated within the Faculty to confirm that they address~~ the stated learning outcomes of the subject, are appropriate to the level of the subject, ~~and have been reviewed and approved within the Faculty to ensure they~~ are clearly set out, free from error and, ~~in the case of University and faculty examinations,~~ are of a duration appropriate to the demands of the ~~examination~~ paper's content.
- ~~h.j. establishing documented procedures for conducting in-session tests faculty examinations;~~
- ~~h.k. ensuring that all requirements of the University's Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results are met;~~
- ~~h.l. ensuring the establishment of criteria for the assessment of class participation, where appropriate;~~
- ~~h.m. drawing students' attention to their procedural and substantive rights and responsibilities contained in this Code and in the Student Charter;~~
- ~~h.n. ensuring that a copy of each current Subject Outline for the session in which the subject is on offer is held in a central location within the Faculty and is available to students, academic staff and professional services staff;~~
- ~~h.o. ensuring that a copy of each Subject Outline is provided to the Faculty Librarian no later than the first week of the session in which the subject is on offer;~~
- ~~h.p. ensuring reasonable adjustment within the teaching, learning and assessment environment for students with a disability in accordance with the Disability Policy - Students;~~
- ~~h.q. responding to any academic complaints initiated by students in accordance with the Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy;~~
- ~~h.r. ensuring that allegations of academic or research misconduct by students undertaking coursework are investigated in accordance with the Student Conduct Rules and associated procedures or the Research Misconduct Policy; and~~
- ~~h.s. appointing a Course Progress Advisor to provide academic advice in accordance with the Course Progress Policy, and making this information available to students on the Faculty's website.~~

Head of Academic Unit

2. The Head of Academic Unit is responsible for:
- ensuring that academic staff are familiar with and comply with procedures relevant to Teaching and Assessment as set out in Section 5.1 above of this Code.
 - having in place processes to ensureing that a Subject Outline is prepared by Subject Coordinators for each subject offered by the academic unit, that it meets the requirements of Schedule 1 of this Code ('Subject Outline Checklist and General Advice') and is signed off as satisfying Faculty procedures;
 - ensuring that a copy of each current Subject Outline, for the session in which the subject is on offer, and any amendments, is forwarded to a central location within the Faculty or academic unit and is available to students, academic staff and professional services staff;
 - ~~ensuring that examinations and tests conducted by the Faculty or the Academic Registrar's Division have been reviewed and approved so that they are clearly set out, free from error and are of a duration appropriate to the demands of the examination~~

~~paper's content; ensuring, prior to their delivery, that assessment methods and practices applied throughout the Academic Unit have been quality assured using the moderation activities as detailed in Schedule 2 of this Code to confirm that assessment is carried out appropriately, consistently, and fairly. This will include ensuring that assessment tasks:~~

- ~~i. address the stated learning outcomes of the subject,~~
- ~~ii. are appropriate to the level of the subject,~~
- ~~iii. are clearly set out, free from error, and,~~
- ~~e-iv. in the case of examinations and in-session tests, are of a duration appropriate to the demands of the paper's content~~
- e. ~~ensuring that subjects offered within the Academic Unit, and the assessment tasks contained within, are subject to periodic review in accordance with the Course Review Procedures; ensuring that quality assured assessment methods and practices are applied throughout the academic unit and that assessment is carried out fairly, objectively and consistently;~~
- f. ensuring that full-time and fractional or casual teaching staff are available to students for consultation in accordance with 5.5 of this Code;
- g. ensuring every subject has an assigned Subject Coordinator specified in the subject database;
- h. where a quota is applied to a subject, determining which students will be offered a place in the subject based on the criteria in section 15 of the Subject Quota Guidelines (Schedule 3 to this Code);
- i. ensuring that all applications for academic consideration are dealt with according to the provisions of the Student Academic Consideration Policy;
- j. ensuring that the academic unit complies with the requirements of the Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results;
- k. participating, where required, in investigations of alleged academic or research misconduct by a student undertaking coursework in accordance with the Student Conduct Rules and associated procedures or the Research Misconduct Policy;
- l. attending each meeting of the Faculty Assessment Committee or appointing a nominee from the academic staff to attend in their absence; and

Formatted

Subject Coordinator

3. The Subject Coordinator is responsible for the academic integrity of subjects taught. Specific responsibilities include:
 - a. the preparation and distribution of a Subject Outline for each subject taught in accordance with the requirements of the Code as set out in 5.2(b) and 5.2(c) and Schedule 1 of this Code;
 - b. ensuring that subject material is at an appropriate standard for both its level and the course in which it is offered;
 - c. providing opportunities for students to develop the Faculty/Discipline Graduate Qualities relevant to the subject (contributing to the UOW Graduate Qualities);
 - d. where content has been changed, or a new subject is being offered, ensuring that the Faculty Librarian receives notification of new reading materials in a timely manner;
 - e. where more than one member of staff is teaching a subject, ensuring good processes and communication with other teaching staff so that there is consistency in terms of subject learning outcomes, delivery of subject, assessment and other quality assurance matters;
 - f. obtaining formal approval from the Faculty Executive Dean for the imposition of a quota on a subject, in accordance with the timeframes and procedures in Schedule 3 of this Code - Subject Quota Guidelines;

- g. ensuring appropriate variation in assessment tasks in successive subject instances to avoid the potential for academic misconduct by students;
- h. undertaking moderation activities to ensure appropriate, consistent and fair assessment within each subject taught, in accordance with Schedule 2 of this Code – Assuring Standards of Assessment;
- ~~h.i.~~ submitting all examinations and in-session tests to the Head of Unit or delegated authority for review and approval;
- ~~h.j.~~ examining allegations of, and if appropriate, undertaking investigations of alleged academic or research misconduct by a student undertaking coursework in accordance with the Student Conduct Rules and associated procedures or the Research Misconduct Policy;
- ~~j.k.~~ ensuring marks for individual assessment tasks, or composite marks up to 10% for equivalent tasks worth 3% or less, are entered into SMP at or before the time the mark is provided to the student so that a central record is maintained, in accordance with Schedule 2-4 of this Code.
- ~~k.l.~~ Where it is not practical to maintain individual assessment task marks in SMP, ensuring result spreadsheets are kept in the University's network drive so that they are included in periodic IT back up exercises, in accordance with Schedule 2-4 of this Code;
- ~~l.m.~~ submitting subject marks to, and attending, the relevant Assessment Committee according to Faculty procedures;
- ~~m.n.~~ archiving exam papers and answer sheets in a central Faculty repository within 21 days of the release of results, in accordance with Schedule 2-4 of this Code.
- ~~n.o.~~ responding to student academic consideration applications in accordance with the Student Academic Consideration Policy.
- ~~o.p.~~ ensuring recommended reasonable adjustments (consistent with UOW's responsibility to apply the Disability Standards for Education 2005) are implemented for students registered with UOW Disability Services (note: Student Support Advisers provide advice and assistance and can facilitate reasonable adjustment provisions at the faculty level for each student registered with Disability Services); and
- ~~p.q.~~ ensuring that students at risk of failure, consistent with the Course Progress Policy, are reminded of the learning support services available; and
- ~~q.r.~~ ensuring students enrolling late in a subject have access to an approved Subject Outline and any other relevant subject or academic unit information.

Supervisor (Research or Creative Projects)

4. For subjects where the primary or only assessment task is a research or creative project, a supervisor must be identified for each student undertaking the subject. This role may be undertaken by the Subject Coordinator, or where necessary, other members of the teaching staff may be allocated as supervisor. The overriding responsibility of a supervisor is to provide continuing support to students under their supervision in researching and/or producing a research or creative project to the best of the student's ability. Specific responsibilities include:
 - a. assisting students to develop a plan for completing the research or creative project within an appropriate timeframe;
 - b. maintaining regular contact with students in order to monitor their progress;
 - c. providing timely and helpful written feedback to students on any submissions and to assist them to develop solutions as problems are identified;
 - d. advising students and the subject coordinator of inadequate progress or work below the standard generally required and to suggest appropriate action (including referral to learning development where required); and

- e. ensuring that responsible research practices are maintained as per the Code of Practice – Research.
5. The above provisions do not apply to Honours Projects. Supervision responsibilities for such Honours Projects are outlined in the Code of Practice – Honours.

Teaching Staff

6. Specific responsibilities of teaching staff include:
- a. Assessing students' work appropriately, fairly, ~~objectively~~ and consistently, and in accordance with the requirements of Section 7 this Code;
 - b. providing students with adequate and timely feedback on performance taking into account the Good Practice Assessment Guidelines (refer to Section 7 of this Code);
 - c. offering fair access to consultation with students by appropriate means during session. Appropriate means may include face to face, online, email, videoconference or telephone conference, and should include provision for students to meet with teaching staff if required. "Fair access" means that:
 - i. full-time staff will make available an average of four hours consultation time per week during session, although the distribution of this may vary over the session;
 - ii. fractional and casual staff will be available for a proportion of this time as determined by the Head of Academic Unit.

The times and means of staff availability for consultation must be approved by the Head of Academic Unit, and must be displayed publicly in the academic unit and clearly explained in each subject outline.
 - d. implementing learning, teaching and assessment strategies that foster the development of the Faculty/discipline Graduate Qualities relevant to the subject (contributing to the UOW Graduate Qualities);
 - e. communicating with the Subject Coordinator about matters concerned with students' academic progress, including Student Academic Consideration;
 - f. granting extensions to students only in accordance with the Student Academic Consideration Policy;
 - g. identifying and acting upon possible cases of academic or research misconduct by a student undertaking coursework in accordance with the Student Conduct Rules and associated procedures or the Research Misconduct Policy;
 - h. recognising and accommodating diversity within student learning, where appropriate;
 - i. maintaining the principles set out in the University's Privacy Policy regarding the confidentiality of personal information, including marks;
 - j. referring students, where appropriate, to the relevant support services within the University;
 - k. before departing on any granted leave, ensure that all assessment work and other commitments have been completed, marks have been forwarded to the relevant Assessment Committees and arrangements have been made for another member of the teaching staff to answer any enquiries about subject results, exam results and supplementary assessments; and
 - l. notifying the Head of Unit, or the Executive Dean, as appropriate, of potential or actual conflicts of interest which could unduly advantage, or disadvantage, a student in accordance with the Conflict of Interest Policy.

Casual Teaching Employees and Fractional Teaching Staff Coordinating Subjects

7. Casual teaching employees and fractional staff appointed as Subject Coordinators are expected to meet the general requirements and responsibilities set out in sections 5.3 to 5.6 of this Code as determined by the Head of Academic Unit.
8. If a casual teaching employee or fractional staff member is unable to carry out the responsibilities set out in sections 5.3 to 5.6 of this Code, it is the responsibility of the Head of Academic Unit to delegate these responsibilities to another member of ~~the~~ teaching staff.

6 Subject Outlines

1. Subject Outlines must be developed for each undergraduate and postgraduate coursework subject offered by the University.
2. Subject Outlines must ~~reflect clearly state~~ the ~~intended approved~~ learning outcomes of the subject.
3. Subject Outlines must include the information prescribed in Schedule 1 of this Code and any other special requirements demanded by the subject.
4. Subject Outlines may vary in order to accommodate local differences, for example to lists of prescribed reading or key references, where a subject is taught offshore.
5. Subject Outlines must outline which Faculty or discipline graduate qualities are addressed in the subject, and direct students to where they can find further information about these qualities and their link to the UOW Graduate Qualities.
6. Subject Outlines must be ~~distributed made available~~ to students ~~prior to the start of session by the end of the first week of session~~ or, where assessment methods and practices are finalised after consultation with students enrolled in the subject, no later than the second week of ~~formal~~ session.
7. Subject Outlines may be ~~distributed made available~~ to students in either hard copy or electronically. Where a Subject Outline is distributed electronically, a hard copy must be provided to students on request.
8. ~~Learning activities and the assessment of student learning must be undertaken as specified in the Subject Outline. Content and assessment in the subject must be as specified in the Subject Outline.~~
9. After ~~distribution release~~ of the Subject Outlines to students (refer to 6.6 of this Code), any changes to the Subject Outlines which might adversely affect students' engagement ~~of in~~ the subject must only be made in exceptional circumstances. The following procedures must be undertaken prior to making the changes:
 - a. affected teaching staff must be notified of the intended change;
 - b. all students enrolled in the subject must be consulted and have the opportunity to provide feedback; and
 - c. approval in writing must be obtained from the Head of Unit and counter-signed by the ~~Executive~~ Dean of the Faculty.

7 Assessment Practice

Assessment Methods and Tasks

1. ~~Assessment methods must:~~
 - a. ~~assure learning against the stated subject learning outcomes, and, where applicable, the major study and/or course learning outcomes.~~
 - b. ~~reflect the level of complexity of required student performance, and~~
 - c. ~~have a weighting appropriate for the learning outcomes being assessed be appropriate for the intended learning outcomes for a subject and/or course.~~
2. Assessment methods may require reasonable adjustment for students ~~registered~~ with a disability.

Formatted: Outline numbered +
Level: 3 + Numbering Style: a, b, c, ...
+ Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left +
Aligned at: 2.15 cm + Tab after: 2.95
cm + Indent at: 2.95 cm

3. Clear **and appropriate** criteria must be developed **and used** for marking all assessment tasks in a subject and details of the criteria must be communicated to students in the Subject Outline.
4. No single assessment task will count for more than 70% of the final mark for the subject, except in subjects designated as research or creative projects **or with approval from the Head of School**.
5. At least one assessment task for each subject must require students to produce written work (e.g. essay, problem solving exercise, short answer exercise, **or documented creative work**).
6. Group work must be assessed by means which allow the real contribution of each member of the group to be determined, taking into account the Good Practice – Assessment Guidelines. Group work must not constitute more than 50% of assessment for a subject unless approved by the Faculty.
7. Where attendance requirements are set for a subject, attendance records must be kept. Marks cannot be awarded for attendance per se.
8. Where class participation is used for assessment a record must be kept by the academic staff member conducting the class, taking into account the Good Practice – Assessment Guidelines, and retained in accordance with Schedule **2-4** of this Code.
9. Where scaling is used in a subject, the method of scaling must be clearly stated in the Subject Outline and it must preserve the rank order within a cohort (refer to Schedule 1 of the Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results). No mark can be scaled down after the Release of Results by the **Academic Registrar's Student Services** Division.
10. Whether supplementary assessment will be offered to eligible students by the Faculty in accordance with the Supplementary Assessment Guidelines must be stated in the Subject Outline.
11. Due dates for assessment tasks cannot be set during the study recess period, except with the prior approval of the Head of Academic Unit.

UOW Grade Descriptors

- 12. The UOW Grade Descriptors describe student performance at each of the University's grade levels and must be communicated to students in the Subject Outline.**
- 13. Staff should refer to the UOW Grade Descriptors:**
 - a. prospectively when designing assessment tasks and marking criteria and when marking assessments, including using them as a basis for crafting marking rubrics, and**
 - b. retrospectively when undertaking benchmarking and review of marking and grading.**
- 14. The UOW Grade Descriptors also provide a frame of reference for moderation of assessment activities, especially within teaching teams, to ensure that assessment practice across the University is appropriate, consistent and fair.**

Formatted: Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.8 cm + Tab after: 1.6 cm + Indent at: 1.6 cm

Formatted: List-Numbered

Feedback to Students

- 15. Supportive, constructive and timely feedback is an essential component of the learning process as it enables students to build on their positive achievements and have a clear sense of what they need to do to improve, with subsequent opportunities provided to act on the feedback and to put the advice given into practice.**
- 42-16.** Appropriate and useful feedback on performance in each assessment task (with the exception of a final examination) must be provided to students, taking into account the Good Practice – Assessment Guidelines.
- 43-17.** Feedback on at least one assessment task must be provided prior to the deadline for students to withdraw from a subject without academic penalty.
- 44-18.** Feedback on assessment tasks must be provided in time to enable students to improve their performance in areas of knowledge or skill development before further assessment.

- 45-19. Assessment tasks, with the exception of a final examination, must be marked and made available for collection within 21 days of the submission date unless otherwise specified in the Subject Outline.
- 46-20. Assessment tasks that are relevant for a final examination in a subject must be marked and made available for collection prior to the start of the examination period.
- 47-21. Except in subjects which use pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory as part of their grading system, assessment tasks must be awarded a numerical mark.
- 48-22. Following the Release of Results by the [Academic Registrar's Student Services](#) Division, students have the right to obtain their final examination marks from the Subject Coordinator and to view and discuss the paper with the Subject Coordinator or, if not available, the Head of Academic Unit or nominee.

Procedures for Managing Submission and Return of Written Assessment Tasks

- 49-23. Each academic unit must have written procedures, as specified in Schedule 1 of this Code, for the submission and return of written assessment tasks that provide safeguards against claims of non-receipt and non-return.
- 20-24. Where assessment tasks are submitted electronically, an appropriate system for receipting must be used.
- 24-25. Dates and times for submission of assessment tasks must be specified in the Subject Outline for each subject.
- 22-26. Students who do not meet the specified deadline for an assessment task will be penalised as set out in the Subject Outline.
- 23-27. Extensions may be given to students only in accordance with the Student Academic Consideration Policy.

Faculty Examinations

- 24-28. The Faculty is responsible for setting the procedures [for](#) and supervising [in-session testsfaculty examinations](#), taking into account the requirements set out in this Code, and the following University policies:
- Workplace Health and Safety Policy,
 - Disability Policy – Students, and
 - Respect for Diversity Policy.
- Refer to the Good Practice Assessment Guidelines – In-session Tests.
- 25-29. The dates and times for [in-session testsfaculty examinations](#) must be set out in the Subject Outline in accordance with Schedule 1 of this Code. Alternative arrangements for students who are unable to attend [in-session testsfaculty examinations](#) must be made in accordance with the Student Academic Consideration Policy.

Determination of Final Results

26. The Faculty must follow the processes for determining and declaring students' marks and grades as stipulated in the Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results [which also set out the roles and](#)
- 27-30. ~~The~~ responsibilities of the Faculty Assessment Committee and the Academic Unit Assessment Committee ~~are set out in the Standards for the Finalisation of Academic Results.~~
- 28-31. In accordance with the General Course Rules:
- an approved grade of performance and an overall mark (except where a subject is marked on a pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis) will be determined, declared and released for each subject in which a student is enrolled; and,

b.a Withheld result may be granted in a subject and must be declared ten weeks after the release of results date, or later only if an extension has been approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

~~29-32.~~ Unless otherwise approved, the final assessment mark for each student in a subject shall be determined on the scale of 0 to 100% by the methods set out in the Subject Outline.

~~30-33.~~ Where an incorrect grade or mark has been declared as a result of an administrative error, the amended result(s) must be approved as per the Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results for late or amended results.

~~34-34.~~ The approved grades of performance for undergraduate subjects, honours programs and postgraduate subjects are set out in the General Course Rules.

8 Assessment of Honours Projects

Assessment of Honours Projects with a weighting of 24 credit points or more

1. The requirements set out in this section apply to the assessment of an Honours Project with a weighting of 24 credit points or more. Honours Degree courses that include a project with a lesser weighting may also choose to adopt the procedures set out in this section.
2. Documented quality assurance processes must be in place in each academic unit to ensure the independent, transparent and impartial assessment of all Honours Projects.
3. All procedures and processes concerning the assessment of Honours Projects must be approved by the relevant Faculty Education Committee and identified in the Honours Guide for that Faculty, Academic Unit or course.
4. The assessment of an Honours Project is to be undertaken by two honours examiners. Where possible, at least one of the honours examiners should be external. An honours examiner is external when the honours examiner is external to the Academic Unit and may be external to the Faculty or to the University.
5. Notwithstanding clause 8.4, each Academic Unit must externally benchmark the standard of honours projects in each Honours Degree course against comparable Australian universities at least once every three (3) years. External benchmarking may involve:
 - 5.1. the use honours examiners from another Australian university for the examination of a representative sample of Honours Projects; or
 - 5.2. review of a representative sample of Honours Projects by academics from at least one other Australian university as part of quality assurance of the standard of Honours Projects.

Choice of Honours Examiners

6. Honours examiners shall be chosen by the Supervisor in consultation with the head of the Academic Unit (who may delegate this function to the Honours Coordinator).
7. A Supervisor cannot examine an Honours Project with a weighting of 24cp or more that they have supervised.
8. To be suitable for the role, an honours examiner must be familiar with the expectations and requirements of an Honours Degree course. They must also:
 - a. hold an AQF Level 9 qualification or higher, or equivalent; and
 - b. be an active researcher or have a proven research record; or
 - c. have previous successful experience in supervision or examination of Honours Degree students; or
 - d. have some research experience and have substantial specialised knowledge in the subject matter of the Honours Project.

Examination Process

9. Honours examiners are to be given up to three weeks to provide a report to the relevant Assessment Committee, to enable the Faculty to meet University deadlines for the declaration of marks and for students to be considered for scholarships and/or graduation.
10. Honours examiners shall be provided with a clear written brief which covers the following:
 - a. the essential requirements of the course;
 - b. marking procedures, including the method of (and deadline for) reporting their assessment the relevant Academic Unit;
 - c. clear marking criteria for use in assessing the Honours Project;
 - d. the relative weighting of the Honours Project compared with other assessment components;
 - e. the requirement that honours examiners submit independent results;
 - f. any other matters that the Academic Unit considers appropriate.
11. Until the assessment of an Honours Project is complete and a report is submitted by an honours examiner, all communication between the honours examiner and the University regarding the Honours Project shall be directed through the Honours Coordinator, or the head of the relevant Academic Unit or, if the head of the Academic Unit is the Honours Degree student's Supervisor, another nominated academic.
12. Honours Degree students and Supervisors shall not contact any honours examiner concerning the assessment of the Honours Project until the reports of all honours examiners are returned to and acted on by the Assessment Committee of the Academic Unit.
13. Supervisors should be permitted to view the assessment reports and raise issues or points of clarification prior to the Academic Unit or Faculty Assessment Committee meeting.
14. The assessment reports from the honours examiners and the marks recorded for both the Honours Project and any coursework components are to be forwarded to the relevant Assessment Committee for final declaration of mark.
15. The names of the honours examiners and copies of the honours examiners' reports will be made available to the student after the final mark has been declared.
16. Each Faculty shall have written procedures for dealing with discrepancies between honours examiners' marks for an Honours Project, approved by the Faculty Education Committee. These procedures shall be communicated to students in the Honours Guide.
17. Where there is a discrepancy of more than ten percentage points between the marks determined by any two honours examiners, and the discrepancy cannot be resolved by discussion between the honours examiners, an additional marker shall be appointed by the head of the Academic Unit to assess the Honours Project. When this delays the assessment process, the Honours Degree student should be notified that further advice has been sought.
18. Each Faculty must have written procedures that specify:
 - a. the role of additional honours examiners (for example, whether they are 'blind' honours examiners who are not provided with previous honours examiners' reports or adjudicators who have access to those reports);
 - b. how a final mark is to be determined following a report by an additional honours examiner and;
 - c. where the additional honours examiner is an adjudicator, the criteria for selecting that honours examiner.
19. The Academic Unit Assessment Committee (where appropriate) is responsible for recommending the overall Honours mark to the Faculty Assessment Committee but, in all cases, the Faculty Assessment Committee declares the final mark.

Assessment of Honours Projects with a weighting of less than 24 credit points

20. The owning Faculty of an Honours Degree course that includes an Honours Project with a weighting of less than 24 credit points may choose to adopt the assessment procedures set out in section 8.1 - 8.18.
21. Where the procedures set out in section 8.1 - 8.18 are not adopted, section 7 of the *Code of Practice - Teaching and Assessment* applies to the assessment of the Honours Project.
22. In addition, the Academic Unit must have written procedures, approved by the Faculty Education Committee, that state:
 - a. how honours examiners are chosen;
 - b. where any of the honours examiners are external to the university, how their qualifications are assessed and how they are briefed;
 - c. the role of the Supervisor in the assessment of the Honours Project;
 - d. the relationship that should exist between Supervisor(s) and honours examiner(s) during the assessment process (e.g. what contact can take place);
 - e. where there is more than one honours examiner, how discrepancies between the marks allocated by honours examiners should be resolved.
23. Where the Supervisor also acts as an honours examiner of an Honours Project with a weighting of less than 24cp they have supervised, there must be at one additional honours examiner appointed to assess the Honours Project.
24. All assessment procedures concerning Honours Projects shall be set out in the Honours Guide.

9 Retention of Assessment Records

1. Schedule ~~2-4~~ to this Code – the Retention of Assessment Records sets out the procedures by which academic staff, academic units and Faculties and the [Academic Registrar's Student Services](#) Division are required to retain assessment documents in order to meet the University's obligations under the State Records Act 1998.
2. It is the academic or business unit's responsibility to ensure physical retention and disposal of documents (any format, including electronic) is consistent with the State Records Act 1998 and the University's Records Management Policy.
3. Assessment records must be retained as prescribed by Schedule 2 of this Code.

10 Student Complaints

1. A student who has a complaint regarding adherence to any of the requirements in this Code should be referred to the complaint resolution procedures contained in the Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy.
2. Student academic consideration is available to students whose work is affected by serious documented illness or misadventure. (Refer to Student Academic Consideration Policy.)

Complaints concerning Assessment Outcomes – Honours Projects

3. Where the assessment of an Honours Projects is subject to moderation processes involving the use of two honours examiners to examine the Honours Project, there is no provision for an academic review of the mark or grade awarded for an Honours Project.
4. Any student with a complaint regarding any other aspect of the outcome of the Honours Project should pursue their concerns by making a complaint using the Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy.
5. Inadequate supervision or other arrangements during the period of study will not be taken into consideration in reviewing the assessment of an Honours Project, unless documented efforts have been made by the Honours Degree student to report these issues which have not been adequately addressed.

11 Version Control and Change History

Version Control	Date Effective	Approved By	Amendment
1	10 October 1997	University Council	Amendments to code to provide for students to have at least a 7 day study break before exams.
2	24 November 1999	Academic Senate	Amendments to provide for email submission of assignments
3	18 August 2000	University Council	Amendments to obligations relating to periods for retention of assessment items.
4	18 October 2000	Academic Senate	Amendments to Section 1.2
5	1 January 2004	Academic Senate	Amendments to sections 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and 8.4
6	11 February 2005	University Council	Amendments to Schedule 2
7	9 November 2005	Academic Senate	Amendments to Schedule 2 relating to retention of records
8	8 March 2006	Academic Senate	Amendments to Schedule 3 in order to comply with records management legislation.
9	1 January 2008	University Council	Consequential amendments on the approval of the Graduate Qualities Policy
10	1 November 2007 (Schedule 1) and Autumn Session 2008	University Council	Major review and revision triggered by changes to Student Conduct Rules and Assessment Committee Standards. New Schedule 1 Subject Outline Checklist.
11	December 2007	Vice Principal (Administration)	Minor amendments: References to Student Academic Consideration Policy replacing Special Consideration Policy; references to Rules for Student Conduct & Discipline replaced by Student Conduct Rules and accompanying procedures.
12	5 February 2009	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	Migrated to UOW Policy Template as per Policy Directory Refresh
13	19 June 2009	University Council	Minor amendments to clauses 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, and 5.4 to clarify requirements when offering subjects where the primary or only assessment task is a research or creative project.
14	13 August 2009	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	Minor amendment to replace reference to SEDLOs with reference to Student Support Advisers.

15	9 March 2010	Vice-Principal (Administration)	Future review date identified in accordance with Standard on UOW Policy
16	Autumn Session 2011	University Council – 3 Dec 2010	Major Review.
17	16 January 2013	Vice-Principal (Administration)	Updated to reflect changes from DVC(A) to DVC(E) and OHS to WHS.
18	8 February 2013	University Council	Amendments to Schedule 1, Clause 12 regarding information to be provided to students in subject outlines regarding academic integrity and plagiarism.
19	13 February 2014	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)	Updated to reflect changes from Dean of Students to Student Ombudsman.
20	11 April 2014	University Council	Amendments to reflect the implementation of the new Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results, which replace the previous Assessment Committee Standards and Assessment Guidelines – Scaling.
21	Spring Session	University Council	Addition of the provisions now in section 8 regarding the assessment of Honours projects and section 10.3-10.4 regarding the grievances processes specific to Honours students.
22	Autumn Session 2015	University Council	Amendments to reflect the implementation of the new Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy, which replaces the previous Academic Grievance Policy (Coursework and Honours Students).
<u>23</u>	<u>TBA</u>	<u>University Council</u>	<u>Amendments to include additional requirements relating to moderation of assessment, including addition of Schedule 2 – Assuring Standards of Assessment.</u>

Schedule 1 – Subject Outline Checklist and General Advice

1. It is University policy that a Subject Outline must be developed for every undergraduate and postgraduate coursework subject (refer to 6.1 of this Code). All commitments and requirements of staff and students stipulated in a Subject Outline must be adhered to.
2. Subject Outlines must be approved in accordance with this Code.
3. The information in the Checklist below must be included in the Subject Outline as a minimum requirement (refer to 6.3).
4. The information under General Advice must be provided to every student at least once each session. General Advice can be provided as part of the Subject Outline, or in an Academic Unit-produced handbook, guide or information package. General Advice must be distributed in the same way as Subject Outlines (see sections 6.6 and 6.7 of the Code of Practice – Teaching & Assessment).

Subject Outline Checklist

Section A - Subject Information

The following information must be included in each Subject Outline.

1. Name of Faculty and academic unit
2. Subject code and title in full and the number of credit points allocated to the subject
3. Modes of delivery
4. Locations of delivery
5. The following details:
 - a. subject coordinator including name, office location, telephone number, and consultation modes and times (where possible);
 - b. where possible, identification of lecturer/s and tutor/s, telephone numbers, and consultation modes and times.
6. Intended learning outcomes of the subject
7. The Faculty or Discipline Qualities addressed in the subject, and advice on where students can find further information about these Qualities and how they link with the University's Graduate Qualities
8. [The UOW Grade Descriptors](#)
- ~~8-9.~~ Mandatory minimum attendance requirements, where relevant (in accordance with General Course Rule 8.8).
- ~~9-10.~~ Tutorial/laboratory times, where possible
- ~~10-11.~~ List of prescribed reading
- ~~11-12.~~ List of key references, including the statement (where relevant) that recommended readings are not intended as an exhaustive list and that students should use the Library catalogue and databases to locate additional resources.
- ~~12-13.~~ Any materials that should be purchased
- ~~13-14.~~ Any recent changes made to the subject, and the reason(s), for example in response to feedback from student surveys or external reviews
- ~~14-15.~~ Clear advice on where students will find other relevant Faculty or University information, such as in a Faculty handbook or guide, as set out in the General Advice section below.

Section B - Assessment Information

The following information must be included in the Subject Outline.

1. Details of the assessment tasks to be used to assess the subject.
2. Weight to be given to each assessment task in determining the final result.
- ~~3.~~ 3. Details of criteria used to assess each assessment task ~~or details of where the criteria can be found. The [Good Practice – Assessment Guidelines] outline acceptable minimum standards for marking criteria, identify University-wide Grade Descriptors, and include good practice examples and templates for assessment rubrics that can be used and adapted by teaching teams.~~
- ~~3-4.~~ 3-4. Details of moderation activities that will be undertaken within the subject.
- ~~4-5.~~ 4-5. Where a student is required to perform to a specified level in an assessment task in order to gain a pass for the subject, a statement that students who do not meet the minimum performance level requirements as set out in the Subject Outline will be given a Fail grade or TF (Technical Fail) grade on their Academic Transcript, in accordance with the General Course Rules.
- ~~5-6.~~ 5-6. Requirements on student contributions to tutorials and/or seminars and details of criteria for assessing such contributions.
- ~~6-7.~~ 6-7. Where marks in a subject are routinely scaled, the method of scaling used.
- ~~7-8.~~ 7-8. Dates for submission or presentation of any assessment task and times, where relevant.
- ~~8-9.~~ 8-9. Clearly stated penalties for late submission of assessment tasks.
- ~~9-10.~~ 9-10. Whether supplementary assessments are offered by the Faculty to eligible students under the Supplementary Assessments Guidelines.
- ~~10-11.~~ 10-11. The details of the type of referencing system to be used for written work.
 - a. the Author-Date (Harvard) referencing system is the University's default referencing system to be used in the absence of a documented faculty/school preferred referencing styles. Include a link (Refer to the Library Referencing and Citing link); or
 - b. if a faculty/school preferred referencing style is to be used include this link (Refer to UOW Referencing Style Guides).
- ~~11-12.~~ 11-12. Use of internet resources and any restrictions placed on use of internet sources.
- ~~12-13.~~ 12-13. A reference to the University's Academic Integrity & Plagiarism Policy, along with the statement below:

"The University's Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy, Faculty Handbooks and subject guides clearly set out the University's expectation that students submit only their own original work for assessment and avoid plagiarising the work of others or cheating. Re-using any of your own work (either in part or in full) which you have submitted previously for assessment is not permitted without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism can be detected and has led to students being expelled from the University.

The use by students of any website that provides access to essays or other assessment items (sometimes marketed as 'resources'), is extremely unwise. Students who provide an assessment item (or provide access to an assessment item) to others, either directly or indirectly (for example by uploading an assessment item to a website) are considered by the university to be intentionally or recklessly helping other students to cheat. This is considered academic misconduct and students place themselves at risk of being expelled from the University."
- ~~13-14.~~ 13-14. If relevant, dates, time and location of in-session tests.
- ~~14-15.~~ 14-15. The following procedures for assessed work must be included in the Subject Outline:
 - a. Method of submitting each assessment task (e.g. hard copy, online, email).
 - b. Arrangements for acknowledging submission of written work.
 - c. Procedures for the return of assessed work.

Formatted: Not Highlight

- d. Procedures for the retention of written work.

General Advice

1. The general advice in this section must be provided to students at least once every session in which the student is studying. The Subject Outline must direct students to where they can find this advice (such as in a Faculty handbook or guide).
2. References to the following University policies and relevant faculty procedures must be included with web links:
 - a. Code of Practice – Teaching and Assessment
 - b. Code of Practice – Research, where relevant
 - c. Code of Practice – Honours, where relevant
 - d. Student Charter
 - e. Code of Practice – Student Professional Experience, where relevant
 - f. Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy
 - g. Student Academic Consideration Policy
 - h. Course Progress Policy
 - i. Graduate Qualities Policy
 - j. Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy
 - k. Inclusive Language Guidelines
 - l. Workplace Health and Safety, where relevant
 - m. Intellectual Property Policy
 - n. IP Student Assignment of Intellectual Property Policy, where relevant
 - o. Policy on Ethical Objection by Students to the Use of Animal and Animal Products in Coursework Subjects, where relevant
 - p. Human Research Ethics Guidelines, where relevant
 - q. Animal Research Guidelines, where relevant
 - r. Student Conduct Rules and accompanying Procedures or Research Misconduct Policy for research students
3. Reference to where students can access information on student support services and facilities.
4. Where relevant, guidelines on the use of email to contact teaching staff, mobile phone use in class, and information on or a link to the University guide to eLearning 'Netiquette'. (<http://www.uow.edu.au/student/elearning/netiquette/index.html>).

Formatted: Outline numbered +
Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ...
+ Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left +
Aligned at: 0.8 cm + Tab after: 1.6
cm + Indent at: 1.6 cm

Schedule 2 – Assuring Standards of Assessment

1. The University of Wollongong is committed to the quality assurance and quality enhancement of assessment, and to its legislative obligation to ensure consistent and appropriate assessment through course management and coordination including moderation procedures.
2. Moderation is an important academic activity that contributes to the quality assurance of assessment, providing a level of assurance that assessment practice across the University is appropriate, consistent and fair.
3. Moderation also has a quality enhancement role as it contributes to the continuous improvement of assessment practices and to sharing and development of good practice among colleagues and with students.
4. In the spirit of the outcomes identified in clause 2 and 3, moderation activities should be undertaken to contribute to (as necessary):
 - a. the design of an assessment task;
 - b. the marking of individual assessment tasks; and
 - c. the finalisation of subject marks and grades

Facilitation of Moderation at the Course and Subject Design Stage

5. The moderation process can be facilitated at the course and subject design stage by implementation of the following activities:
 - a. development of course level rubrics that assist to measure the differing levels of attainment of the course learning outcomes;
 - b. development of major study level rubrics (where applicable);
 - c. development of subject level rubrics that are consistent with and articulate from the course level rubrics and major study level rubrics (where applicable), and that assist in measuring the differing levels of attainment of the subject learning outcomes;
 - d. development of assessment task level marking rubrics that are consistent with and articulate from the subject level rubrics and that assist in measuring the differing levels of attainment of the requirements of the assessment task.
6. The UOW Grade Descriptors should be used at this stage as a starting point from which assessment and subject-, major- and course-level rubrics can be developed.
7. Where a subject is taught by a teaching team, all members of the team should be involved in and contribute to the development of rubrics at the assessment task level, as appropriate and feasible, to foster a shared understanding of the assessment requirements and agreement on the expectations around student performance.

Moderation at the Assessment Task Design Stage

8. All assessment tasks must be moderated at the design stage to ensure:
 - a. that the assessment tasks are consistent with and support attainment of the subject learning outcomes and the assessment requirements of the subject;
 - b. that, where the subject is a core subject, a capstone subject or an elective subject that supports the course or major study learning outcomes, the assessment tasks are appropriately aligned to the course or major study learning outcomes;
 - c. that the assessment tasks are appropriate and fair;
 - d. that the expectations and instructions for the assessment tasks are clear; and
 - e. that the academic challenges the assessment tasks present are consistent with the level of the subject.

9. At this stage, moderation requirements are, at a minimum, review of the examination paper(s), and/or any other assessment requirements as stipulated within the Subject Outline, by another member of academic staff with appropriate discipline knowledge and academic experience, as nominated by the Head of School responsible for the subject.
10. Where a teaching team has jointly designed the assessment tasks for the subject, the moderation requirements stipulated in clause 9 are considered to have been met.
11. The Good Practice Assessment Guidelines provide guidance to staff on designing quality assessment tasks, including how to set clear assessment criteria, and can also be used by moderators to assess the quality and appropriateness of an assessment task.

Calibration of Teaching Teams

12. Where a subject is taught by a teaching team, the Subject Coordinator must institute sound quality assurance practices around the delivery of the subject, including:
 - a. implementing formal processes to ensure the consistency of subject delivery and equity of learning and teaching standards;
 - b. engaging the input of the teaching team in designing the subject to ensure that it clearly links meaningful assessment tasks with subject content, learning outcomes and identified graduate qualities;
 - c. taking steps to ensure consistency and equity of standards in subject delivery if the subject is being taught at multiple locations;
 - d. undertaking calibration activities to ensure a shared understanding of the marking criteria by the teaching team; and
 - e. establishing processes to promote consistency in marking and in the amount and quality of feedback provided to students.

Moderation at the Assessment Marking Stage

13. Moderation at the assessment marking stage must be undertaken to ensure that scripts have been assessed appropriately, consistently and fairly, and to validate any calibration activities that have been undertaken by the teaching team.
14. As a minimum, moderation at the assessment marking stage must be undertaken for all examinations and for all major non-examination assessment tasks, i.e. those that assure the learning outcomes. Subject Coordinators may identify examinations and non-examination assessment tasks for which moderation does not add value, for example, tasks that require non-interpretive marking such as 100% multiple choice questions.
15. Moderation may be undertaken for other assessment tasks at the Subject Coordinator's discretion.
16. The Moderation Toolkit provides guidance on the range of moderation activities that may be undertaken at the assessment marking stage.
17. A record of the moderation of assessment items must be retained by the Subject Coordinator.
18. Any significant concerns about the pattern of marks and grades for an assessment task should be discussed and resolved between the Subject Coordinator, the original marker, and the moderator(s).
19. The assessment requirements of all Honours Projects of a value of 24cp or more, as stipulated in section 8 of this code, are considered to meet the above moderation requirements at the assessment marking stage.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Moderation at Grade Finalisation Stage

20. Moderation occurs at the point of grade finalisation as part of the deliberations of the Academic Unit results meeting conducted as provided in the Standard for the Finalisation of Student Results.

21. Consideration will be given to the pattern of marks and grades awarded within subjects delivered by the Academic Unit, including a comparison of distribution with historical data and across locations, and identification of any subject anomalies, to ensure marks and grades are being awarded appropriately, consistently and fairly.
22. Where a moderation activity has identified anomalous student results, or any other issue related to assessment practice within the subject, this will be reported through the assessment committee process.

Moderation of UOW Courses Delivered by a Third Party

23. Comprehensive quality assurance processes are required for all teaching and learning activities of UOW courses delivered by a third party. Refer to [Collaborative Delivery of a UOW Course Quality Assurance Policy] for further information of quality assurance requirements.

Assessment Practice Review Post- Declaration of Results

24. Once results for a session have been declared, the following review activities should be undertaken as part of the University's commitment to continuous improvement.

External Benchmarking

25. The University has obligations under the Higher Education Standards Framework to ensure that assessment requirements, marking criteria, assessment rubrics and student performance within selected subjects within each course offered by the University are externally benchmarked against similarly accredited courses offered by other higher education providers at least every five years.
26. As a minimum, external benchmarking must be undertaken for all summative assessment tasks within each capstone and cornerstone subject offered within a course every five years.
27. Where a course is subject to a formal external accreditation process that includes benchmarking of assessment, the external benchmarking requirements stipulated in clause 26 are considered to have been met.
28. Outcomes of external benchmarking activities should be taken into consideration during subsequent delivery of the subject, including during:
- a. course, subject and assessment design;
 - b. teaching team calibration;
 - c. marking; and
 - d. grade finalisation

Review of Student Performance

29. The University routinely conducts comparative analyses of student learning outcomes across locations as a way of monitoring equivalence via the Comparative Student Outcome process. This analysis includes the use of equivalent performance measures for domestic and international students to facilitate comparison and analysis on relevant dimensions of performance.
30. The University may also analyse other student performance and teaching evaluation data to identify potential issues with, or improvement opportunities for, assessment design and/or subject delivery.

Implementation

31. Implementation of moderation requirements as specified in this Code must be undertaken for every subject offered by the University by Spring Session 2016.
32. An implementation strategy for the above moderation requirements will be determined in close consultation with relevant stakeholders within each Faculty.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 0.8 cm, No bullets or numbering

42 Schedule 3 – Subject Quota Guidelines

1 Introduction/Background

1. Subject quotas may be imposed in order to efficiently and equitably manage the University's learning and teaching resources.

2 Scope/Purpose

1. These guidelines are to be taken into account in imposing quotas for subject delivered onshore at the University and subjects comprising University of Wollongong award courses that are offered offshore and are maintained on the UOW Subject Database.

3 Definitions

Word/term	Definition (with examples if required)
Quota	A quota is a specified maximum number of students allowed to enrol in a subject instance.
Session	Has the same meaning as specified in the General Course Rules
Student	Has the same meaning as specified in the General Course Rules .
Subject	A self-contained unit of study identified by a unique code on the Subject Database
Subject instance	A unique code allocated to each location and timeframe in which a subject is offered (e.g. MARK101 is a subject, and each session and location specific offering of the subject will have a unique subject instance code)

4 Notice and Approval Provisions

1. The introduction of quotas and changes to quotas must be approved by the **Executive** Dean of the Faculty offering the subject, following consultation with the Head of School. If the quota is likely to have an adverse **effect-effect** on students' course progress, or on other schools within the faculty, the matter should also be referred to the Faculty Education Committee for comment.
2. If quotas are to be imposed in respect of a subject instance, students must have adequate notice provided prior to the completion of the preceding session. The notice must be sufficient to enable students to arrange their course plans to fulfil requirements for majors, core and/or elective subjects.
3. Notification should be by way of an appropriate entry on the Subject Database or by other appropriate means. Where other means are used, this should be notified no later than the preceding November for subjects offered in Autumn Session in the following academic year, or at the commencement of Autumn Session for subjects offered in Spring Session.
4. A quota should only be imposed on the basis of acceptable reasons, such as:
 - a. availability of laboratory facilities is limited and not able to be increased;
 - b. availability of clinical training facilities is limited and unable to be increased;
 - c. availability of other teaching facilities is limited and unable to be increased;
 - d. availability of professional experience opportunities is limited and unable to be increased;
 - e. availability of supervision is limited and unable to be increased;
 - f. availability of staff to manage activities is limited and unable to be increased;

- g. impact of proposed assessment tasks is significant and requires limits to be imposed on student numbers; and/or
 - h. availability of teaching resources is scarce and unable to be increased.
5. In exceptional circumstances, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) may approve an application for a subject quota to be imposed on a subject up to 2 weeks before the start of the session in which the subject is being offered.

5 Criteria for Determining Student Selection

1. Where a subject quota is applied, the Head of Unit must determine which students should be offered entry to the subject based upon the following criteria:
 - a. a student's need to complete the subject to fulfil the requirements of a declared major and/or core requirements;
 - b. other subject enrolment options available to the student;
 - c. any special needs relating to a student with a registered disability; and
 - d. any special requirements arising from the needs of a student who is a member of another DEEWR-DIICCSRTE defined equity category.
2. The academic unit may adopt additional criteria in addition to those set out in section 15.11 above.

6 Roles & Responsibilities

1. Subject Coordinators are responsible for:
 - a. Identifying and seeking approval for subject instances where a subject quota should be applied;
 - b. Ensuring the Subject Database is promptly updated to display subject quotas for each affected subject instance; and
 - c. In consultation with the Head of Unit, setting additional criteria for determining selection of students to be offered entry to subjects with a subject quota.
2. Heads of Unit are responsible for determining which students will be offered a place in a subject to which a quota applied in accordance with the criteria in section 15 of these Guidelines.
3. Faculty Executive Deans are responsible for approving applications for the imposition of subject quotas on being satisfied of the existence of acceptable reasons for the imposition of a quota.
4. The Academic Registrar's Student Services Division is responsible for overall management of the Subject Database.

Schedule **2.4** – Retention of Assessment Records

Preamble

1. The State Records Act 1998 and the University's Records Management Policy place specific restrictions on the release, retention and return of students' academic work (assessment and examinations) and the records and documents relating to the assessment of students' work. The assessment of student work is a public activity, and processes for the retention of assessment records should be conducted within the constraints provided by the University Privacy Policy and the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998.
2. This Schedule for Retention of Assessment Records sets out the procedures by which Academic staff, Academic Units and Faculties and the ~~Academic Registrar's~~ Student Services Division are required to retain assessment records in order to meet the University's obligations under the State Records Act 1998.
3. It is the academic or business unit's responsibility to ensure physical retention and disposal of documents (any format, including electronic) is consistent with the State Records Act 1998 and the University's Records Management Policy. For information on the physical retention and disposal of records contact the Records System Administrator on 4221 4374.

Definitions

4. The term 'assessment' used in this schedule is consistent with the definition in the State Records Act 1998 – "the process of testing knowledge and understanding of candidates for degrees, programs etc by examination and other techniques."

Related Legislation and Policies

State Records Act 1998 (Refer to General Disposal Authority– University Records GDA23)

State Records Act 1998 (Refer to General Disposal Authority – Committees GDA2)

Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act, 1998 (NSW).

UOW Records Management Policy

University Privacy Policy

UOW Code of Practice – Teaching and Assessment

UOW Standards for the Finalisation of Student Results

Activity	Retention requirement	Disposal/ Custody/ Transfer	Responsibility
1 Assessment Policy and Procedures			
1.1	Master set of policies	Retain 10 years after policy superseded.	Required as State Archives ARD
1.2	Master set of procedures	Retain minimum 10 years after procedure superseded.	Then destroy ARD
1.3	Records relating to the development and maintenance of policies and procedures.	Retain minimum 10 years after policy or procedure superseded.	Then destroy ARD
2 Assessment Committees - records and minutes			
2.1	Master set of minutes, agenda and related papers.	Retain for minimum of 5 years after action completed or decision made.	Then destroy Faculties
3 Subject resources and material used in course delivery			
3.1	Including subject outlines, assignment lists, study guides etc.	Retain at least until no longer required for teaching or other purposes e.g. historical records and later student requests for Advanced Standing (10 years is recommended).	Then destroy Faculties
4 Student Academic Misconduct			
<p>All records and documents relating to student academic misconduct and particularly to misconduct which may affect academic grades or assessments such as plagiarism or cheating in exams. Includes investigations, appeals, reporting, notification, allegations, recommendations and disciplinary action taken.</p> <p>NB: ARD will continue to maintain the database on student academic misconduct.</p> <p>NB: See 4.5 for cases that involve abuse or neglect of children.</p>			
4.1	Records relating to disciplinary proceedings where a student is found to have committed a breach and serious disciplinary action is taken.	Retain for minimum of 6 years after date of graduation or discontinuation of course of study.	Then destroy Faculties ARD
4.2	Records relating to disciplinary proceedings where a student is found to have committed a breach but minor or no disciplinary action is taken.	Retain for a minimum of 2 years after date of graduation or discontinuation of course or study.	Then destroy Faculties ARD

4.3	Records relating to preliminary/fact finding investigations of misconduct that were not proceeded with and disciplinary matters where a student is found not to have committed a breach. This includes allegations found to be false, vexatious, unsubstantiated or misconceived or could not be proven.	Retain for minimum of 1 year after action completed.	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
4.4	Meeting papers, including master set of minutes and agenda of student discipline and conduct committees	Retain for minimum of 10 years and action completed.	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
4.5	Records of cases involving suspected or proven abuse or neglect of children.	Retain for minimum of 99 years after action completed.	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
5 Student Complaints & Appeals/Academic Consideration Requests				
<p><i>Appeals, grievances and complaints relating to examination/assessment results</i></p> <p><i>Requests from students that student academic consideration be given due to circumstances which affected their performance in an examination or assessment activity.</i></p>				
5.1	Records and documents relating to appeals, reassessment, academic consideration, grievances and complaints.	Retain for minimum of 5 years after that date of graduation or discontinuation of course of study.	Then destroy	ARD Faculties Student Ombudsman
6 Student Assessment Tasks – assessment by written or oral examination, assignments, presentation, thesis, etc.				
<p><i>This relates to students' assessment tasks which have been made available for collection but are unclaimed and remain in the custody of the Academic Unit or Faculty.</i></p> <p><i>Thesis refers to Research Paper worth at least 24 credit points.</i></p> <p><i>Minor Thesis refers to Research Paper worth less than 24 credit points.</i></p> <p><i>NB: This does not relate to the Libraries requirements on the retention of theses.</i></p>				
6.1	Assessment work with the exception of theses.	Retain at least until the end of the appeal period, with the exemption of theses (appeal period is 21 days after distribution of mark or release of final grade – refer to Coursework Student Academic Complaints Policy.	Then destroy	Faculties
6.2	Theses submitted or completed by students for the purposes of assessment or evaluation.	Retain for minimum of 3 years after date of submission unless the faculty has a policy to retain	Then destroy	Faculties

		theses.		
6.3	Exam answer papers	Retain for 1 year after end of the examination period.	Then destroy	Faculties
6.4	Professional Experience – administrative records for arrangements and liaison with placement providers.	Retain for minimum of 1 year after action completed.	Then destroy	Faculties
6.5	Professional Experience – summary records for courses of study where the number of hours completed and proof of satisfactory performance may be required for accreditation purposes (e.g. nursing and teaching professional experience).	Retain for 50 years after completion of course of study.	Then destroy	Faculties
7 Results				
<p><i>Grading/marking of individual assessment components of a subject or course such as assignments, essays, theses.</i></p> <p><i>All individual assessment task marks, or composite marks up to 10% for equivalent tasks worth 3% or less, must be entered into SMP at or before the time the mark is provided to the student so that a central record is maintained. Where it is not practical to maintain individual assessment task marks in SMP, result spreadsheets should be kept in the University's network drive so that they are included in periodic IT back up exercises.</i></p> <p><i>NB This does not include the final grade of a subject or course or the actual assessment items</i></p>				
7.1	Any records relating to the marking, or grading of individual assessment components of a subject or course e.g. class rolls, spreadsheet of results. NB: These records need to be retained to allow students the opportunity to appeal.	Retain for minimum of 1 year after end of appeal period.	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
7.2	Records of determination of final results/grades	Retain for minimum of 1 year after end of appeal period.	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
7.3	Records relating to appeals of grades.	Retain for minimum of 1 year after action completed.	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
7.4	Records relating to changes to assessment results	Retain for minimum of 6 years after completion or discontinuation of course or program of study.	Then destroy	ARD Faculties
8 Transcripts/final results				
<p><i>The official record of the marks/grades achieved by a student in the course of the degree or program undertaken.</i></p>				

8.1	Student academic transcript/final results		Required as State Archives	ARD
8.2	Final grades of non-award courses.	Retain for minimum of 75 years after action completed.	Then destroy	ARD Faculties
8.3	Results of externally accredited courses (e.g. VETAB).	Retain for minimum of 30 years after action completed.	Then destroy	ARD Faculties
8.4	Paper records of student academic transcript/final results which have been converted to electronic format and records relating to requests for academic transcripts.	Retain until no longer required for reference purposes.	Then destroy	ARD
8.5	Records relating to requests for verification of qualifications or graduation status.	Retain for minimum of 1 year after action completed.	Then destroy	ARD
<p>9 Records and administrative arrangements for examinations and assessment activities e.g. classes, tutorials and laboratory sessions. Includes supervision, timetabling, eligibility lists, provision of materials, objections to taking part, special accommodation arrangements</p>				
9.1	Records relating to attendance e.g., rolls, sick leave forms, medical certificates.	Retain for 1 year after end of the examination period	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
9.2	Records relating to attendance for professional experience where students are working with children e.g. nursing and education	Retain for minimum of 10 years after action completed.	Then destroy	Faculties
9.3	Records relating to administration of examinations and assessment activities	Retain until no longer required for reference use	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
9.4	Examinations – master set of question paper.		Required as State Archives	Faculties
<p>10 Records relating to assessment of students in order to identify those whose progression may require intervention e.g. Minimum Rate of Progress. Includes decisions, requests from students to 'show cause', notification of exclusion and conditional enrolment, documentation from students, monitoring of student progress and appeals</p>				
10.1	Records relating to assessment of students in relation to minimum rate of progress.	Retain for minimum of 6 years after student has completed or discontinued course of study	Then destroy	Faculties ARD
10.2	Records of committees (including ad hoc committees)	Retain for minimum of 6 years	Then destroy	ARD

	responsible for assessing student progression cases.	after action completed.		Faculties
11 Supervision of Higher Degree Research Students				
Supervision of higher degree students (e.g. Masters & PHD level students).				
11.1	Records, policies and procedures relating to the supervision of Higher Degree Research Students, including advice and liaison between a supervisor and student.	Retain for 7 years after Higher Degree awarded.	Then destroy	Research Office
11.2	Records relating to appointment of thesis examiner, assessors and supervisors.	Retain for 7 years after Higher Degree awarded.	Then destroy	Research Office
11.3	Thesis examiners/assessors' reports and related records.	Retain for 7 years after Higher Degree awarded.	Then destroy	Research Office
11.4	<i>Theses or other significant work.</i>	<i>Retain for 7 years after Higher Degree awarded.</i>	<i>Copy retained in Library</i>	Research Office



DRAFT