# Assessment, Credit and Moderation (HE) Policy

## Section 1 - Purpose

(1) The purpose of this Policy is to outline the assessment framework for Higher Education courses ensuring quality student assessment and consistency with [Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021](#).

## Section 2 - Scope

(2) This Policy applies to all Melbourne Polytechnic Higher Education award courses and includes:

    a. All delivery locations (onshore and offshore).
    b. Courses offered through partners.
    c. Academic teaching and administrative staff.
    d. All student cohorts (domestic and international).

## Section 3 - Policy

### Policy Statement

(3) Melbourne Polytechnic Higher Education staff are committed to engaging students through methods of assessment that are designed to demonstrate students' knowledge, skills and abilities of specified course and subject learning outcomes. It is informed by evidence-based practice and benchmarking incorporated into continuous review of quality and standards. Assessment supports successful student outcomes and therefore is standard and criterion-based, where students receive timely and informative feedback that positively influences their learning experience and preparedness for employment, industry, and further study.

### Policy Principles

(4) This Policy is guided by the following principles, standards, acts & legislation:

    a. Compliance with [Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021](#).
    b. [Melbourne Polytechnic Education Plan/Strategy](#), [Strategic Vision & Values](#).
    c. Assessment is fair, equitable and inclusive for all students across diverse settings and learning environments.
    d. Providing students with detailed, timely feedback that supports improvement, promotes successful student outcomes and student engagement.
    e. Assessment is authentic and fit for purpose.
    f. Use of a similarity detecting tool (e.g. Turnitin) is required except where inappropriate (e.g. presentations, on-line quizzes, spreadsheet and practical based activities).
    g. Grading and results are demonstrated as reliable through assessment moderation processes that incorporate unbiased, valid, and effective result assurance.
    h. Assessment practices are subject to quality assurance processes to facilitate continuous improvement.

     i.  Assessment design and methodology reflects best practice pedagogy in the discipline.

## Policy Topics

## Assessment Design

(5) Assessment must be aligned to subject learning outcomes and be proportionate in their weighting to mitigate the risk of learning outcomes not being achieved or inappropriately assessed.

(6) Assessment methodology is supported by a documented and evidence-based rationale and enables demonstration of learning outcome achievement.

(7) The selection of assessment methodology is based on validity, reliability and feasibility, and employs a feedback framework that supports learner improvement and demonstrates impact on learning.

(8) Assessment design aligns to varying learning environments, modes of delivery, disciplines and student needs.

(9) Assessment tasks reflect authentic, real-world situations, relevant to the discipline.

(10) Assessments are designed in such a way that, where possible, a student's gender, age or cultural background or other aspects of their identity do not impact their ability to fully participate in assessment.

(11) Appropriate student assessment workload supports student success and includes a balance between the number of credit points for a subject, contact and non-contact study hours and complexity of the assessment task. [Note: Student Assessment Workload Guidelines to be developed].

(12) Assessment methods must satisfy prescribed professional accreditation requirements and support substantive discipline requirements where required.

(13) There will be 2-4 assessment tasks for each subject regardless of credit point value. Subjects determined to sit outside these parameters will require exceptions to be approved through relevant governance processes.

(14) Each assessment task (excluding hurdle tasks) has a specific weighting of total subject marks with the minimum weighting for an any task being 10% and the maximum weighting being 50%. The maximum weighting for an end of semester examination is 40%. Exceptions to maximum weightings may be sought where professional accreditation requirements need to be met, with all exceptions subject to approval by the Higher Education Courses Committee.

(15) The first weighted assessment that contributes to a summative grade must occur so students receive meaningful assessment feedback prior to the census date.

(16) Changes to assessment tasks following the commencement of the semester must be approved by the Head of Program and requires consultation with impacted students. Student Subject Outline must be updated on Learning Management System (Moodle) to reflect changes made

(17) Student subject outlines, as described in part 18 (below) must be prepared not less than one week before the start of semester on approved template

## Students and Assessment

(18) Students are provided with a Student Subject Outline in the first week of semester. The Student Subject Outline clearly shows the weekly lectures, workshops and tutorials as well as topics covered and any other curriculum planned activities.  A detailed description of each assessment task, the % weightings of the assessment, mark allocations, due dates, a marking rubric, submission instructions (e.g. use of text matching software and submission through Moodle) and any hurdle requirements.

(19) If students have any issues or concerns relating to subject assessments, they are encouraged to speak with their lecturer/teacher or subject co-ordinator within the first three (3) weeks of the semester to clarify and resolve such matters.

(20) Students are provided with timely, formative assessment feedback to support ongoing learning and improvement, within fifteen days of the agreed submission date.

(21) Note: if an assessment is held up being returned to students, meaningful feedback without an assessment grade should be provided within the fifteen day turn around period.

(22) Students must submit assessments via the Learning Management System (e.g. Moodle) unless an alternative submission mechanism is detailed in the Student Subject Outline.

(23) It is critical for students to retain a copy of all submitted assessment tasks until the final subject result is published.

(24) Students will be informed of the subject assessment naming convention of all submitted assessments through the Student Subject Outline.

## Academic Integrity

(25) Academic staff, students and all members of the academic community are expected to display and apply the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and research.

(26) Students have a responsibility to adhere to academic integrity in the preparation and submission of assessment by ensuring authenticity and originality of work submitted and the submitted work conforms to an appropriate referencing style.

(27) Students are required to use similarity detection software (e.g. Turnitin – as appropriate for the assessment) as part of assessment submission.

(28) Assessments and examinations may require invigilation (face-to-face or by using digital tools/procedures) to ensure the integrity of student work.

(29) Academic integrity risk within assessment design and delivery is monitored. Routine reviews are undertaken to incorporate improvements and sector recommendations to lower academic integrity risk.

(30) Activities inconsistent with academic integrity, such as plagiarism, collusion, and cheating (including contracted cheating), are addressed in accordance with the [Academic Integrity Procedure](#) and the [Student Discipline Policy](#).

(31) Melbourne Polytechnic will respond to suspected academic integrity breaches in a fair, consistent, transparent and timely manner in accordance with the relevant policies.

## Continuous Improvement

(32) A continuous cycle of quality improvements are implemented in order to regularly monitor assessment practices and processes.

(33) Subject assessment validation and assessment grade moderation are undertaken as part of Melbourne Polytechnic's quality assurance and continuous improvement activities. Refer to the [Moderation and Validation (HE) Procedure](#).

*This policy document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of staff printing this document to always refer to the Policy and Procedure Register for the latest version.*

Page 3 of 12

## Credit Transfer and Recognition of Prior Learning

(34) Students may apply for and be granted credit towards Melbourne Polytechnic awards where warranted.

(35) Students may be granted Credit Transfer (CRT) if previous studies are deemed equivalent, in the form of block, specified or unspecified credit.

(36) Students may be granted Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) if previous formal, informal and non-formal learning is deemed equivalent.

(37) Studies less than ten (10) years prior to the year of application can be considered for Credit Transfer. Studies completed more than ten (10) years prior to the year of application may be considered where it is determined that currency exists or where the qualification is recognised by external registration bodies.

(38) Unspecified and block Credit Transfer may be granted for formal qualifications completed more than ten (10) years previous to the year of application and may include whole sections of a course and/or electives.

(39) Where specific articulation agreements with Melbourne Polytechnic courses are in place, credit is granted up to the maximum amount stated in the agreement.

(40) Credit Transfer and Recognition of Prior Learning decisions are evidence-based and applied consistently, fairly, and in a timely manner.

(41) Any credit granted for prior learning cannot disadvantage a student from completing the expected course learning outcomes (CLOs).

(42) The integrity of the course must be maintained when assessing credit.

(43) Credit Transfer may not be granted for a subject that has been granted a Conceded Pass grade. Exceptions to this rule can be made to embedded MP qualifications (e.g. Associate degree) or with approval by the Director Higher Education under exceptional circumstances.

(44) A student who has concerns regarding the outcome of their Credit Transfer and/or Recognition of Prior Learning application may request a decision review by contacting the Head of Program.

(45) A student may lodge a decision review application under any of the following grounds:

   a.  The student met all requirements to be granted Credit Transfer and/or Recognition of Prior Learning.
   b.  The process was not compliant with this Policy and Credit (HE) Procedure.
   c.  The credit application was submitted on time with all the relevant information.
   d.  A significant change to industry accreditation requirements or practices has occurred.

## Examination and Invigilation

(46) Examinations and invigilation are conducted in an organised, fair, equitable and transparent manner. Refer to the Assessment (HE) Procedure, Melbourne Polytechnic Higher Education Examinations Conduct and Invigilation (HE) Guidelines and the Digital Invigilation (HE) Procedure.

## Extension to Due Date of Assessment

(47) A student may apply for extension to an assessment task due date if an unexpected event occurs. This includes unexpected family or work matters, unexpected loss of accommodation, illness or other matters outside of a student's control which impacts their capacity to complete an assessment task by the due date.

## Subject Assessment Validation

(48) Review and validation of subject assessments will be conducted routinely as per a schedule developed by the Head of Program.  An appropriately qualified academic staff member not directly involved in the delivery of the subject will be determined by the Head of Program, to ensure course and subject quality, consistency and integrity are upheld. Subject assessment validation will review:

   a. Assessment design at the appropriate [Australian Qualifications Framework](#) level,
   b. Clarity of assessment documentation; assessment criteria, marking rubrics and guides,
   c. Assessment design accurately reflects the subject and course learning outcomes,
   d. Appropriate volume of learning and assessment workloads are manageable by students,
   e. Mechanisms to provide formative feedback which support student learning and improvements,
   f. Feedback, from students and other stakeholders, is considered in assessment design,
   g. Assessments time frames are reasonable.

## Assessment Mark Moderation

(49) Student assessment outputs are moderated to ensure marking and grading consistently adheres to agreed standards of student performance across subjects and courses.

(50) Mark moderation applies consistency of student performance standards regardless of the enrolment timing, delivery period and mode, method, or location.

(51) Where a range of staff participate in assessing student work, mark moderation ensures equity (grades are accurate, correct and fair) and comparability to ensure consistency in student performance judgements. Moderation either confirms student performance is consistent with agreed standards or alternately, supports grade adjustment.

(52) Mark moderation applies to subject assessment tasks as per the [Moderation and Validation (HE) Procedure](#). Mark moderation practices must occur post assessment submission and prior to the publication of final results as per the [Moderation and Validation (HE) Procedure](#).

## Scaling of Marks

(53) Scaling of marks can be recommended to the Results and Integrity Committee (RIC) by the Results Review Meeting (RRM)

(54) Scaling of marks can be applied by the Results and Integrity Committee after grade distribution has been reviewed.

(55) Scaling practices may include:

   a. Increasing or decreasing a fixed mark for each student,
   b. Proportionally increasing or decreasing the mark for each student,
   c. Other methods that change the distribution while preserving the original rank order within the relevant cohort.

## Student Performance Confirmation and Reporting

(56) The approved Higher Education result codes are used for grading subjects.

(57) The grade for the final assessment task is not released to the student until the final subject result has been ratified by the Results and Integrity Committee.

(58) Following the examination period, the Results and Integrity Committee approves the final grades which are then made accessible via the student portal on a set date.

## Supplementary Assessment

(59) Supplementary assessment will be offered to students under the following conditions:

a. In any subject for which a mark of 48 or 49% has been obtained.
b. In a subject for which a mark of 45 – 47% has been obtained, the Results and Integrity Committee will consider and may approve the student's eligibility to be granted a supplementary assessment in accordance with the following indicators:
    i. overall progress during the semester across the range of assessments
    ii. progress towards all learning outcomes
    iii. consistent application during the semester
    iv. health issues that may have impacted the final result
    v. recommendation from the Head of Program supporting the granting of a supplementary assessment.
c. In any subject where a student failed a hurdle requirement.
d. As a consequence of dispute resolution.
e. On the recommendation of an Academic Progress Panel held after the Results and Integrity Committee.
f. Where granting of the supplementary assessment does not exceed the maximum allowance of one (1) supplementary assessment per standard year (96 credit points) of the accredited course structure.
g. Where the Director Higher Education has identified a requirement.

(60) The following table details the maximum number of supplementary assessments permitted for each course type and duration.

| Course Type | Duration in credit points | Number of permitted supplementary assessments |
|---|---|---|
| Masters | 144 credit points | 1 supplementary assessment |
| Masters | 192 credit points | 2 supplementary assessments |
| Graduate Diploma | 96 credit points | 1 supplementary assessment |
| Graduate Certificate | 48 credit points | Not eligible for supplementary assessment |
| Bachelor | 288 credit points | 3 supplementary assessments |
| Bachelor | 384 credit points | 4 supplementary assessments |
| Associate Degree | 192 credit points | 2 supplementary assessments |
| Undergraduate Certificate | 48 credit points | Not eligible for supplementary assessment |

## Conceded Pass

(61) A Conceded Pass may be granted to undergraduate students under the following conditions:

a. The subject result is 45 – 49% and if passing this subject enables completion of the course.
b. The subject may be a first, second or third-year subject undertaken in the final semester of enrolment.
c. The subject may be one six (6) credit point subject or one twelve (12) credit point subject.
d. The student has submitted all marked assessment tasks including examination requirements for the subject.
e. The subject is not a capstone subject or required for Work Integrated Learning (WIL) work placement, Industry Based Learning, Professional or Industry accreditation requirements.

f. A maximum of one (1) Conceded Pass (CP) is permitted for students enrolled in an Associate Degree or Bachelor's Degree.

g. Students enrolled in an Associate Degree may only be permitted a maximum of one (1) Conceded Pass CP with the approval of the Director Higher Education. Any student subsequently enrolling in a pathway Melbourne Polytechnic degree will be ineligible for a further Conceded Pass.

h. Students need to investigate any possible implications associated with accepting a conceded pass, particularly where this may limit participation in possible future academic or professional opportunities (e.g. meeting the enrolment requirements of a research Masters course).

## Reasonable Adjustments to Assessment

(62) Reasonable adjustments to assessment are available for students with specific needs, including personal circumstances, disability or illness. Assessment tasks may be modified to ensure equal access and opportunity. Refer to the [Supporting Students with Disabilities Policy](#) and [Request for Support Form](#) (Students with a Disability or Chronic Medical Condition).

## Special Consideration

(63) Special consideration is available to students who have been affected by illness or other unexpected cause that has adversely affected their capacity to undertake, prepare for or complete any component of an assessment task.

(64) A student granted special consideration may be offered a deferred examination or an equivalent special assessment task.

(65) A student with concerns regarding the outcome of their special consideration application may request a review by contacting the Head of Program.

(66) A student may lodge a review on the following grounds:

a. The student has provided additional relevant information or evidence that was not available at the time of the original application, which may significantly impact on the initial special consideration outcome.

b. The decision was not compliant with the [Assessment, Credit and Moderation (HE) Policy](#) and [Assessment (HE) Procedure](#).

c. Failure to consider the depth and coverage of the evidence appropriately.

## Assessment Review

(67) A student who is dissatisfied with their assessment grade may request assessment review or final subject mark/grade review by contacting the Head of Program. Students are encouraged to discuss their concerns with their lecturer or Subject Co-ordinator in the first instance.

(68) A student may apply for a formal review of a result, known as Secondary Moderation, under any of the following grounds:

a. The original assessment failed to follow the published assessment rubric or marking guide for the assessment task.

b. An error has occurred in the calculation of the result.

c. The assessment did not comply with the [Assessment, Credit and Moderation (HE) Policy](#) or [Assessment (HE) Procedure](#) and this has impacted the result.

This policy document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of staff printing this document to always refer to the Policy and Procedure Register for the latest version.

Page 7 of 12

## Academic Penalty

(69) A student who withdraws from a subject between weeks 10 – 13 of the semester and fails to submit all assessments will receive a fail grade on their academic transcript.

(70) A student who withdraws after the academic penalty date (after the end of Week 9 of the semester), meets Unsatisfactory Progress criteria and wishes to continue in the program will be required to attend an Academic Progress Panel.

(71) A student may be eligible to have an academic penalty waived due to late withdrawal for a subject under special consideration provisions.

## Assessment Complaints and Appeals

(72) Review of an assessment decision may be sought from the Head of Program where this relates to one or more of the following matters.

   a. Assessment review
   b. Credit Transfer and/or Recognition of Prior Learning
   c. Special consideration
   d. Supplementary assessment

(73) Concerns regarding application processing (e.g. time delays) may be raised with the lecturer or Subject Coordinator. If the matter remains unresolved, a student may lodge a complaint using the [Student Complaints and Appeals Policy](#) and [Student Complaints and Appeals Procedure](#).

## Policy Transition Implementation

(74) Assessment tasks will be updated to meet the requirements of this Policy over a two-year period following policy promulgation.

   a. All assessment tasks will be reviewed and a schedule for updating the assessment tasks will be developed during the first year of policy implementation.
   b. The updates to assessment tasks will be completed as part of the course continuous improvement cycles (e.g. mid-cycle review, reaccreditation or end of semester course review).
   c. All assessment tasks will meet the requirements outlined in this Policy by the start of March 2025.

# Section 4 - Responsibility and Accountability

(75) The Director Higher Education is responsible for:

   a. Ensuring this Policy and associated procedures are applied across teaching areas.
   b. Supporting the Results Review Meeting and Results and Integrity Committee.
   c. Ensuring examination and invigilation activities are conducted appropriately.

(76) The Director International Academic Operations is responsible for:

   a. Ensuring all contracts with international partners adhere to this Policy and associated procedures.

(77) The Curriculum Unit is responsible for:

*This policy document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of staff printing this document to always refer to the Policy and Procedure Register for the latest version.*

Page 8 of 12

a. Setting a standard for assessment design and development in Higher Education courses that aligns with the Education Strategy and recognised best practice.

(78) Managers are responsible for:

a. Oversight of all validation and moderation activities to ensure the Policy and Procedure is followed.
b. Ensuring assessment activities occur as per the academic calendar.

(79) The Head of Program is responsible for:

a. Approving student subject outlines.
b. Approving changes to assessment tasks following the commencement of semester.
c. Approving special requirements and special consideration requests.
d. Identifying invigilation requirements.
e. Overseeing subject validation and grade moderation activities at course level, including any consultation with other courses where necessary.
f. Appointing peer reviewers.
g. Delegating tasks to staff as appropriate where academic judgement is required.
h. Responding to requests for reviews/appeals.
i. Leading continuous improvement review of assessment strategies and benchmarking.

(80) The Subject Co-ordinator is responsible for:

a. Preparing the student subject outline.
b. Developing assessment criteria and rubrics.
c. Approving applications for extensions to due date of assessment.
d. Ensuring reasonable adjustments to assessments are implemented.
e. Overseeing subject validation and grade moderation where a subject is taught by multiple academics.

(81) Academic teaching staff are responsible for:

a. Assessment delivery including reasonable adjustments.
b. Assessment marking and judgements.
c. Providing timely and quality feedback to students.
d. Participating in assessment grade moderation (within and across courses).
e. Discussing assessment concerns/issues with students.
f. Reviewing and validating subject assessments including examinations.

(82) The Directorate Administrator HE is responsible for:

a. Result collation.
b. Supporting governance and oversight of administrative procedures to ensure compliance with Policy and Procedure.
c. Examination and invigilation activities as per assessment procedures including digital invigilation with assistance from Course Administrators/Academic Services Officer (FMP).
d. Delegating tasks to Course Administrators, as appropriate, to support operational activities.

(83) The Results Review Meeting Committee (RRM) Chair is responsible for ensuring assessment results are reviewed

This policy document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of staff printing this document to always refer to the Policy and Procedure Register for the latest version.

Page 9 of 12

and finalised, or for providing an outstanding results completion plan prior to the Results and Integrity Committee meeting. In addition, the RRM Chair provides recommendations to the RIC on the following:

a. Minor moderation of grades.
b. Any proposals for scaling of marks.
c. Grade distributions for each subject.
d. Offers of supplementary assessment and special consideration outcomes.
e. Students eligible for a Conceded Pass
f. Students recommended to attend an Academic Progress Panel meeting.
g. Letters of commendation for high achieving students.

(84) The Standards and Registration Unit is responsible for:

a. Advising and contributing to continuous quality improvement processes.
b. Providing advice and guidance on processes related to assessment matters.
c. Undertaking regular reviews of credit applications.

(85) The Results and Integrity Committee (RIC) is responsible for ensuring academic integrity of student grades, including reviewing grade distributions, approving proposals for scaling of marks if appropriate, reviewing and approving as appropriate, recommendations in exception reports and ratifying final grades for publication to students.

(86) The Learning and Teaching Committee is responsible for:

a. Monitoring the review and validity of academic credit and/or Recognition of Prior Learning decisions.
b. Annual reporting and analysis of performance of student outcomes.

(87) Executive Director Educational Excellence is accountable for ensuring this Policy and associated procedures are fully implemented and adhered to by all relevant staff and stakeholders.

(88) Higher Education Academic Board is responsible to review the application of relevant policy and procedure in relation to progress, process, and outcomes of assessment.

# Section 5 - Definitions

(89) For the purpose of this policy the following definitions apply:

a. Assessment: A process to determine a student's achievement of identified learning outcomes and may include a range of written and oral methods and practice or demonstration.
b. Assessment design: Assessment strategies mapped to learning outcomes that demonstrate a student's learning and achievement. Assessment design may include formative and summative assessment tasks that provide clear expectations for students and allow for practice and feedback.
c. Assessment grade moderation: Quality assurance processes that ensure comparability of standards of student performance across different markers, locations, subjects, providers and/or courses.
d. Assessment task: A specific, discrete learning activity, exercise or a series of formative works that address a common knowledge and skill set designed to obtain evidence about a student's achievement of the subject and course learning outcomes (as per the Student Subject Guide). Tasks can be diagnostic, formative, or summative, including but not limited to, essays, presentations, performance, exhibition or final examinations.
e. Assessment validation: Validation of assessment is a quality assurance and improvement process that involves checking the assessment tool has produced valid, reliable, sufficient, current and authentic evidence to enable

reasonable judgements to be made as to whether the requirements of the relevant learning outcomes have been met. It includes reviewing and making recommendations for future improvements to the assessment tool, process and/or outcomes.

f. Assessor: Academic responsible for marking student assessment

g. Course: An accredited qualification made up of a defined set of subjects.

h. Credit: Credit is the course value granted in recognition of previous learning achievement which is equivalent in content and learning outcomes. Credit reduces the amount of learning required to achieve a qualification and may be through credit transfer, articulation, recognition of prior learning or advanced standing.

i. Credit transfer: is the recognition of previous study which provides advanced standing in a Melbourne Polytechnic course.  Credit transfer can occur where content from a previously studied subject can be mapped to the Melbourne Polytechnic subject.

j. Criterion referenced assessment: The process of judging and grading student performance by comparing the quality of the work submitted against a set of specified criteria and standards related to the desired learning outcomes of a course.

k. Double marking: A process where a minimum of two markers evaluate a piece of assessment and agree on a final mark.

l. Formative assessment: An assessment task that is used to provide students with feedback on their progress which can be incorporated in subsequent assessment tasks and learning activities as part of the learning experience.

m. Formative feedback: Is information communicated to the learner that is intended to modify his or her thinking or behaviour for the purpose of improving learning.

n. Hurdle task: Any condition, which a student must meet to pass the subject, but which has no mark attached.

o. Learning outcome: The expression of a set of knowledge, skills and the application of the knowledge and skills a person has acquired and is able to demonstrate as a result of learning.

p. Marking rubric: Sets out the criteria and standards for marking an assessment and is used to evaluate the quality of students' work.

q. Moderation: Moderation is the process of reviewing the assessment to ensure it meets certain standards or criteria.  This process is often carried out by a moderator or a group of moderators who are typically experts or experienced individuals in the specific field or subject matter.

r. Program: The nested set of courses leading to a qualification.

s. Recognition of Prior Learning: means you are able to receive credit towards a Melbourne Polytechnic course due to work experience in a relevant field or by evidencing attainment of the learning outcome.

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

u. Summative assessment: An assessment that is used to measure the final level of student success in achieving learning outcomes.

v. Subject: A discrete unit of study.

w. Subject assessment validation: Refers to the review of a subject's assessment task design and delivery to ensure consistency with learning outcomes and performance standards, and learner-centred educational strategies.

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

This policy document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of staff printing this document to always refer to the Policy and Procedure Register for the latest version.

Page 11 of 12

## Status and Details

| | |
|---|---|
| **Status** | Current |
| **Effective Date** | 5th August 2024 |
| **Review Date** | 1st November 2027 |
| **Approval Authority** | Executive Director Academic Operations |
| **Approval Date** | 8th November 2022 |
| **Expiry Date** | Not Applicable |
| **Policy Owner** | Marc Blanks<br>Executive Director Educational Excellence |
| **Policy Implementation Officer** | Nicola Cooley<br>Director Higher Education |
| **Author** | Nicola Cooley<br>Director Higher Education |
| **Enquiries Contact** | Nicola Cooley<br>Director Higher Education |