



Assessment Procedure

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Web Link | |
| Category | Procedures |
| Version | 1.1 |
| Policy Contact | Director of Academic Programs |
| Approving Authority | Director of Academic Programs (DAP) |
| Endorsing Authority | Head of School |
| Approval Date | 31.10.23 |
| Effective Date | 31.10.23 |
| Review Date | 4.8.26 |
| Related Documents | Assessment Policy Academic Integrity Policy and associated Procedure Academic Progression Policy and associated Procedure Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Policy and associated Procedure Program and Unit Policy and associated Procedure Records Management Procedure Student Charter |

1. Purpose

- 1.1 This procedure supports the [Assessment Policy](#) of the Australian Institute of Police Management (AIPM). It sets out the principles for the design and management of assessment, and the processes for submission, extensions to due dates, feedback and marking of assessment in units.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This procedure applies to all higher education programs offered by the AIPM.

3. Key Principles

- 3.1 All assessment at the AIPM must be designed and implemented in accordance with the principles set out in the [Assessment Policy](#) and the requirements set out in this procedure.
- 3.2 Assessment tasks must promote learning and allow students to demonstrate their knowledge and skills on meaningful, practice-orientated tasks that will prepare students for future learning and practice (refer [Assessment Policy clauses 3.8 and 3.11](#)).
- 3.3 In conjunction with the [Program and Unit Policy](#), the unit profile for each unit must include (or specify the location of) all required information about assessment for that unit, including but not limited to:

- Assessment criteria, standards and due dates for each assessment task.
 - Method of weighting and aggregating the pieces of assessment, the use of any hurdle requirements, and the method used to determine a final grade.
 - Mechanisms for submitting drafts and final written tasks through the academic integrity system, Turnitin.
 - Processes for seeking extensions.
 - Penalties for the late submission of an assessment task.
 - In the case of oral assessment items, whether the items will be recorded, the reason for the recording, and how the recording will be held and treated in confidence.
 - In the case of examinations, the format of the examination and permitted materials and equipment.
- 3.4 The grading system is specified in [Appendix 1](#) of the [Assessment Policy](#).
- 3.5 All aspects of assessment including design, delivery and outcomes must be routinely monitored and reviewed (refer [Section 10](#) of this Procedure)
- 3.6 In order to pass a unit, students must attain a total mark of 50% in the unit overall and are expected to receive a passing grade in each assessment task. For units that are not graded with a percentile students must participate within and complete all tasks and activities satisfactorily.
- 3.7 Students may apply for a re-mark following the process set out in [Section 8](#) of this Procedure.
- 3.8 Students may appeal a mark or grade only on the grounds set out in [Section 9](#) of this Procedure.

4. Key Requirements

Design and Delivery of Assessment

- 4.1 Assessment must provide systematic opportunities for students to demonstrate progress towards or achievement of program level learning outcomes, including development of graduate attributes.
- 4.2 Assessment must be mapped against program level outcomes and monitored as part of the Annual Review process (refer [Program Design and Review Procedure, Section 6](#)).
- 4.3 Assessment is designed to maintain high standards and generate valid evidence of learning through the following:
- 4.3.1 The use of criterion-referenced assessment which makes explicit the relationships among assessment tasks, learning objectives, the criteria used as the basis of assessment judgements, and the grades associated with different levels or standards of performance.
- 4.3.2 A focus on the quality of learning outcomes, including the quality of tutorial participation or contribution to a group outcome.

- 4.3.3 Authentic assessment tasks that reflect and support the program design.
- 4.3.4 The use of a combination of two or more assessment tasks (or a multi-component staged task such as a project) which reflect the range and complexity of the learning objectives. No single assessment task, excluding a multi-component or capstone project, may compulsorily contribute more than 60% of the final grade.
- 4.3.5 The demands of the combined assessment tasks in a unit must be commensurate with its nominal value and the relative weighting of tasks within a unit must be commensurate with the relative importance of the associated learning objectives.
- 4.3.6 Assessment that provides students with the opportunity to demonstrate a range of competencies in learning from minimum learning standards to learning of the highest standard.
- 4.4 Assessment is also designed in accordance with the availability and appropriate allocation of resources for the course.
- 4.5 Criteria and standards must sufficiently distinguish students' performance over a range of levels.

Group Work

- 4.6 The ability to work in teams is an essential skill so group work will be one of the assessment types. Where group work is summative, assessment must be criterion-referenced, linked to the learning objectives of the unit and be transparent, fair and equitable.
- 4.7 To enable compliance:
 - 4.7.1 The need for group work must be necessary to achieve the unit objectives and hence be specified as a learning objective in the course profile.
 - 4.7.2 A student's ability to work effectively in a team will be reviewed during the Higher Education Enabling Program (HEEP) and students will be provided with opportunities to improve their skills if deemed necessary.
 - 4.7.3 Students are expected to take responsibility for contributing equitably to group work, however, staff will also monitor that this occurs. To facilitate management of cases in which groups are not functioning effectively, students will be directed to resources and additional support.

Assessment Integrity

- 4.8 In designing and conducting assessment, staff must give due regard to assessment integrity and security, and minimise the possibility of impersonation and cheating (refer also to [Academic Integrity Procedure](#)).
- 4.9 Electronic submission of written assessment (the AIPM uses Turnitin for this purpose) is required to provide authoritative proof of the date and time of submission and to allow for text matching including the use of plagiarism detection software. It is also recognised that this is a valuable learning tool for students.
- 4.10 Any student who enrolls in a unit must not be given exemption or partial credit from a previous attempt for any individual piece of assessment. Likewise, no credit shall be given on the basis of prior studies for an individual piece of assessment. Instead, the student must

complete all of the learning activities and assessment items within the study period of enrolment (refer [Section 5, Admissions, Enrolment and Credit Procedure](#)).

Reasonable Adjustment to Assessment

- 4.11 A reasonable adjustment or change to assessment may be made in specified circumstances to ensure that all students are able to participate equitably in program.
- 4.12 Adjustments are only made when the student has indicated at the time of enrolment that they will require special arrangements and requirements have been approved by the Director of Academic Programs.

5. Submission of Assessment and Extensions

- 5.1 Students are responsible for evidencing submission by the due date of all assessments in the required form, e.g. retain evidence, screenshot, email, photo and copy of submitted work.
- 5.2 Students are expected to make use of Turnitin Draft Coach™ as part of their learning feedback process.
- 5.3 As discussed in [Academic Progression Procedure 4.3](#), if a student is unable to meet an assessment due date because of unforeseen circumstances, they may apply via email to the Program Manager for an extension. Grounds for approval are generally similar to those listed under clause 5.6 of this Procedure for a longer extension, such as medical, compassionate or work related reasons.
- 5.4 If a further extension is requested by the student this must be in writing and they must be able to provide evidence of extenuating circumstances. The request is referred to the Director of Academic Programs for consideration. The Director may grant an extension to a timescale that is commensurate with the extenuating circumstances and that is not unfair to other students in the unit, or determine that the student is ineligible and reject the request. The student is notified of the outcome as soon as possible in a manner that gives the student time to consider the implications of the outcome.
- 5.5 Grounds for an extension may include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - 5.5.1 Medical reasons
 - A medical certificate that complies with the following parameters must be provided:
 - (i) a medical certificate or statement obtained on or before the assessment item due date or the two week extension due date, signed by a registered health practitioner (including an allied health or mental health practitioner);
or
 - (ii) a medical certificate obtained after the submission or extension due date but resulting from extenuating circumstances, such as a period of hospitalisation.
 - A further extension granted to a student will usually not exceed the number of days suffered from a medical condition as stated on the medical certificate.

- 5.5.2 Compassionate or extenuating circumstances for which the student should provide a statement of reasons and any corroborative evidence. Examples include, but are not limited to:
- Unavoidable work commitments such as a promotion, transfer or secondment to higher duties.
 - Participation in or management of an unforeseen event such as a natural disaster.
 - Sudden serious illness or recent death of a family member.
 - Serious personal or emotional trauma.

Penalties for Late Submission

- 5.6 The AIPM recognises the importance of student's adherence to assessment deadlines as being part of a student's academic development and the development of key graduate skills, as well as being fair and equitable to other students who have met the timeline. The following penalties apply to late submission of an assessment item:
- 5.6.1 A penalty of 10% of the maximum possible mark allocated for the assessment item will be deducted per day for up to 5 calendar days, at which point any submission will not receive any marks unless an extension has been approved. Each 24-hour block is recorded from the time the submission is due.
- 5.6.2 An alternative penalty in certain limited and exceptional circumstances may apply as approved by the Director of Academic Programs.

Oral Assessments

- 5.7 When a student is required to complete a live oral or similar assessment item worth 20% or more, more than one assessor will be responsible for marking the performance and notes will be taken to support the feedback or if required, review process. When feasible, a recording may be made. See also clause 6.3 below.

Assessment resubmissions

- 5.8 Students who fail a written or oral presentation assessment activity will be permitted once only, to resubmit a revised assessment piece. In fairness to other students, the maximum percentage they can be awarded in this instance will be 50%.
- 5.9 The maximum number of times a student will be permitted to submit a written or oral presentation assessment piece is twice: formal submission by the due date, and as indicated in clause 5.8, resubmission if they fail their assessment piece with a limitation on the percentage that may be obtained.

Provision of Feedback

- 5.10 In addition to the mark awarded, feedback must be provided promptly on all assessment tasks, including examinations, to enable students to apply the feedback to further tasks within the unit or program. The form of feedback provided must be appropriate to the task weighting, timing and context, with reference to criteria and standards.

- 5.11 Students will take responsibility for incorporating feedback into their learning in accordance with the Student Charter.
- 5.12 [Academic Progression Procedure, Section 4, Monitoring of Academic Progression](#), and [Section 5, Unsatisfactory Academic Performance](#) are also relevant.

6. Assessment Judgements

The Basis of Judgements

- 6.1 Assessment judgements must:
 - 6.1.1 Be made with reference to criteria and standards and not to the achievement of other students.
 - 6.1.2 Reflect the quality of the student's performance (e.g. the quality of class contribution not class attendance).
 - 6.1.3 Be transparent (for example, negative marking in multiple choice examinations, that is, the practice of deducting marks for providing incorrect answers to correct for guessing, is not permitted).

Moderation and Avoidance of Bias

- 6.2 Moderation is an important part of quality assurance.
 - 6.2.1 The minimum requirement is that moderation is conducted with reference to criteria and standards to ensure consistency of judgements about the work of students within a group; in different groups within a unit; and students whose work has been peer-assessed or self-assessed within a unit.
 - 6.2.2 Moderation within a course between staff may involve discussion of the way the standards have been applied to assessed work and / or review of the application of standards prior to marking.
 - 6.2.3 Moderation between students taking the same unit in different cohorts or years is also an important part of quality assurance processes.
 - 6.2.4 Where a near relative or close associate is enrolled in a unit/program for which the staff member is involved in the assessment, the staff member is not to participate in the marking of assessment and must inform the Director of Academic Programs of the potential conflict at the earliest opportunity.
- 6.3 To ensure the integrity of assessment and to enhance feedback, clear records must be kept of the evaluation of assessment including when work does not generate evidence that can be referred to after the assessment. For example, for assessment in the form of a presentation or oral assessment at least two assessors may be used, or the presentation may be recorded, or clear records will be kept of performance against the criteria and standards.
- 6.4 Students are only provided with their individual marks and grades and not those of other students. Results must not be displayed in public places or student forums.

7. Finalisation of Grades

- 7.1 Grades in each unit will be awarded in accordance with [Appendix 1](#) in the [Assessment Policy](#).
- 7.2 A grade of PS (Pass) is the lowest passing grade.
- 7.3 Students who withdraw from a unit or the program, either
- formally by notification to the AIPM; or
 - informally by failing to participate in the learning tasks or submit assessment items and who do not respond to subsequent communications from the AIPM
- will have a grade of 'W' recorded for any unit for which they are currently enrolled. Refer also to the [Academic Progression Procedures](#).
- 7.4 The Director of Academic Programs in consultation with relevant staff must ensure that grading outcomes are reliable and are a genuine reflection of student performance against the assessed criteria.
- 7.5 Results for all summative assessments will be made available to individual students through the eLearning Management system on completion of marking. Staff must not disclose any information about the marks or grades of a particular student to unauthorised persons.
- 7.6 The Learning Management System is used to manage the calculation of final grades for each unit and following approval by the Director of Academic Programs, the grades are automatically posted to the student's profile on the eLearning Student Management System.
- 7.7 Subject to clause 8.18, before or up to six months after graduation, a grade may be altered by the Director of Academic Programs to correct a procedural error, or following a re-mark. Unless the Head of School authorises a change due to procedural error, after six months no further alteration of a final grade may occur.

8. Assessment Re-marks

- 8.1 The purpose of reconsidering assessment judgements (refer section 6 of this Procedure) is to ensure the marking criteria and standards have been applied appropriately.
- 8.2 If the request for a re-mark is approved the work will be re-assessed against the marking criteria and standards.
- 8.3 If the mark is found to be incorrect due to a mathematical error in the calculation of the final result (including if marks from a piece of assessment have been omitted), this is not considered a re-mark but a procedural error.
- 8.4 Reconsideration of a mark that involves review of the academic judgement will in all cases be treated as a re-mark request.
- 8.5 Where a student has completed an individual assessment item and the student believes the judgement of their work and the resulting mark they were awarded does not reflect their performance as measured against the published assessment criteria, then the student can apply for a re-mark. In the case of group assessment which includes a peer assessment for each individual student, or there are components of the assessment item that are marked individually, then these items are treated as an individual assessment item request.

- 8.6 In the case of group assessment for which only one mark is awarded irrespective of individual contributions, provided at least 50% of group members agree that the resulting mark does not reflect the group's performance as measured against the published assessment criteria, then the group members can apply for a re-mark.
- 8.7 Applications for a re-mark will be considered only when the student, or one or more members of the student group, has sought and received feedback about their performance on the assessment from the relevant assessor (or has viewed the piece of assessment, and where available model answers/written comments or other feedback).
- 8.8 To request a re-mark, the student (or 50% of a group) must provide a sound written academic case to the Director of Academic Programs demonstrating that the mark awarded for an entire task (or a discrete component of a multi-component task) does not reflect their performance against the advertised criteria and standards for that work. Students should reference the published assessment criteria for the assessment item and clearly show where they believe there are grounds for reconsideration of the assessment judgement.
- 8.9 The request for a re-mark must be submitted no later than one week following the release of the mark for that piece of assessment.
- 8.10 If not all group members are a party to a group application, the Director of Academic Programs will send a notification to all group members for information purposes.
- 8.11 A re-mark may be approved by the Director of Academic Programs in consultation with relevant staff. If approved, the Director will arrange for the assessment item to be re-marked and the outcome will be communicated to the students with feedback within one week of the request being received or as soon as is practicable.
- 8.12 Where possible the re-mark will be conducted by an independent marker who will be provided with examples of different levels of performance against the criteria and standards.
- 8.13 Where a peer assessment re-mark is approved, then the peer assessment process and peer submissions should be reviewed by an independent marker. If appropriate the marker should interview all peer assessors to enable an academic judgement on the peer mark.
- 8.14 In all cases where a re-mark is approved, the assessment item submitted by an individual student or a group will be re-marked in its entirety.
- 8.15 In applying an amended grade on the basis of a re-mark, the Director of Academic Programs must take into account whether adjusting a condition for one student may have implications for other students in the unit. The result of re-marking should not unfairly disadvantage other students in the unit.
- 8.16 If the outcome results in a change of mark or grade the progression spreadsheet will be amended accordingly.
- 8.17 A re-mark will be conducted once only on the piece of assessment.
- 8.18 In all cases, a re-mark will replace the original mark for the piece of assessment in the calculation of the final grade which could result in a higher or lower grade. The only exception applies to a student who has graduated, where the result will be reviewed by the Head of School for a final decision.

9. Appeal of a Grade/Mark (not Re-mark)

- 9.1 Students may appeal a final mark or grade only on the following grounds:
 - 9.1.1 Disadvantage because due regard was not paid by the AIPM to evidence of illness/exceptional circumstances submitted at the time of the assessment event.
 - 9.1.2 Disadvantage because assessment requirements set out in the unit outline were varied unreasonably without consultation.
 - 9.1.3 Clerical error in the calculation of a grade for a unit.
- 9.2 The Appeal is submitted in writing to the Director of Academic Programs who will investigate the claim and provide a response as soon as is reasonably practical.
- 9.3 An appeal that is not made on the basis of one or more of the grounds cited in Clause 9.1 above will not be considered.
- 9.4 Notwithstanding 9.1, a student may appeal a final decision made by the Director of Academic Programs or Head of School under any provision of this Assessment Procedure to the AIPM Academic Appeals Committee (refer [Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Procedures, Section 6](#)). Note that specific grounds for appeal apply.

10. Quality Enhancement

- 10.1 Evidence of assessment outcomes and the effectiveness of assessment is collected and monitored to quality assure unit-level and program-level considerations.
- 10.2 Assessment must be consistent with best practice guidelines, for example tasks when viewed across a program, are selected, sequenced and weighted in ways that promote achievement of the program's desired learning outcomes and development of the graduate attributes; and there should be evidence of various forms of assessment with opportunity for the development of independent judgement.
- 10.3 Students are provided with the opportunity to evaluate the quality of teaching, units and programs, including assessment, and students are expected to provide fair and honest feedback on these parameters as per the Student Charter.
- 10.4 Staff respond to student performance on assessment, student evaluations of assessment and reviews of assessment and assessment outcomes (including student grades) in ways that enhance assessment practices and outcomes within the units.
- 10.5 Data on assessment outcomes and the effectiveness of assessment are collected from other sources (e.g. peer review, benchmarking, stakeholder input).
- 10.6 Assessment practices at the unit and program level are monitored systematically through the annual and five yearly program review processes and recommendations arising from these reviews are implemented so as to enhance assessment activities and outcomes for the program.

11. Definitions

Academic integrity is the expectation that teachers, students, researchers and all members of the academic community act with honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

Academic progress is a student's progress towards successful completion of the academic requirements of their program of study.

Assessment is how students demonstrate both what they are learning and what they have learned. It requires the relevant staff member to make judgements about the ongoing and cumulative learning of each student against pre-specified criteria and standards.

Assessment requirement is the combination of assessment tasks, the timing of assessment tasks, the outputs to be submitted for assessment, and the conditions for assessment that must be undertaken to ensure that the learning objectives and requirements of a unit have been met.

Assessment task is a specific, discrete learning activity designed to obtain evidence about a student's achievement of the learning outcomes of a unit.

Authentic assessment focuses on students developing and applying knowledge and skills through meaningful, practice-oriented assessment tasks. Authentic assessment supports students to develop graduate attributes, apply theory to practice and engage with problems similar to those they will encounter in the workplace.

Criterion-referenced assessment refers to assessment tasks where a student's work is assessed against stated criteria, and marks or grades are awarded according to the level of achievement of these criteria without reference to the achievement of others. The AIPM only engages in criterion-referenced assessment.

Feedback is information about aspects of a student's learning used to guide or improve their understanding, performance or achievements. Feedback can be given informally or formally, from formative activities as well as summative assessment tasks. It can be gained in multiple ways, including but not limited to, group discussions in class or online, automated online responses, and self, peer or teacher reviews of work using rubrics, checklists or comments. It includes information from self, peers, teachers, other people, online and other sources.

Formative assessment guides ongoing learning and provides feedback that can be used by students to support and develop their learning techniques, and by teachers to understand student progress and improve teaching. Formative assessments usually contribute nothing towards the final grade.

Grade is the result achieved for a unit within the program, arrived at by aggregation of marks for assignment and/or assessment tasks.

Hurdle requirement is an assessment requirement identified in the unit profile that must be satisfied in order to receive a specific grade.

Mark refers to the mark attained for a specific assignment or assessment task.

Marking is the process of assigning an assessment score or grade to a piece of work produced, performed or submitted by a student according to information provided in the unit outline, using academic judgement.

Moderation is a process for developing consistency or comparability of assessment judgements.

Norm-referenced assessment is where grades are determined in relation to other students' performance and the grade distribution is managed in such a way that only a certain percentage of students are able to attain each grade. Assessment at the AIPM is never norm-referenced.

Reasonable adjustments are measures taken to enable a student with a disability to participate in a program on the same basis as other students and are provided in consultation with the student, within reasonable time after notification of the need to make any adjustments. A reasonable

adjustment, wherever possible, is to be made to meet the needs of the student without compromising academic standards of assessment.

Re-mark is reconsideration of a mark or grade awarded for an item of assessment against the marking criteria and standards.

Standard is a definite level of achievement aspired to or attained. Standards specify levels of quality (or achievement or performance) for each criterion.

Staff includes continuing, fixed-term, casual, affiliate and visiting staff associated with the learning, teaching and scholarly activities of the AIPM.

Summative assessment evaluates the student's performance against specified criteria. Summative assessments contribute towards the final grade.

| REVISION HISTORY | | | | |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|--|
| Version | Endorsed By | Approved By | Approval Date | Description of changes |
| 1.0 | Head of School | DAP | 4.8.23 | New document. |
| 1.1 | Head of School | DAP | 31.10.23 | Minor revisions reflecting AIPM practice including use of DraftCoach™ and removal of the option of a first draft review. |