Assessment Policy

Policy Area: Academic Governance

Approval: Chairperson, Academic Council

Signature: Date:

1. PURPOSE

In line with the purpose of Sheridan Institute of Higher Education as a higher education institution to advance learning, knowledge and the professions, the Assessment Policy contributes to the maintenance of appropriately high academic standards throughout Sheridan, and to the recognition of course outcomes by employment and professional organisations, government authorities and the general community.

The Institute is committed to creating and sustaining an effective environment for learning. As part of this commitment Sheridan aims to ensure that the design of assessment tasks and strategies is informed by research into effective higher education practice and accepted standards for each discipline. Acting through the Academic Council, the Board of Directors also requires curriculum design to align assessment methods with graduate attributes, and with program and unit learning outcomes.

The Institute also recognises the value of efficient and effective assessment procedures in enabling it to record the progress of students and certify the standards they achieve. Further, consistent and reliable assessment processes provide data whereby the achievement of course objectives can be assessed and teaching methods reviewed.

2. RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Initial approval of policy:	Board of Directors
Amendment of procedures consistent with the policy:	Academic Principal
Distribution of policy:	Academic Principal
Implementation of policy:	Academic Principal, Faculty, Director of Student Services, Moderators
Monitoring and compliance of policy:	Academic Council, Academic Principal, Faculty, Director of Student Services
Evaluation and recommendations for amendments:	Academic Council, Academic Principal, Faculty, Director of Student Services, Moderators
Subsequent approvals to policy amendments:	Chairperson, Academic Council

3. AIMS

Assessment is an essential part of the teaching and learning process. Appropriate assessment tasks influence approaches to study and help students to allocate their time. Constructive and timely feedback on assessment helps students to gain a sense of achievement and progress, and an appreciation of the performance and standards expected in a particular discipline or professional area. Good assessment practice should promote learning and improve student performance.

Under this Policy, the Sheridan assessment practices will:

a. promote active student engagement in learning, and reinforce and reward that learning;
b. recognise and value student diversity;
c. demonstrate a scholarly approach by both staff and students;
d. exemplify ethical practice that is transparent and consistent across Sheridan;
e. require timely feedback that has value for improving student learning;
f. produce grades and reports that are valid, reliable and accurate;
g. meet the expectations and satisfy the standards of stakeholders and accrediting authorities;
h. be subject to external moderation and peer review;
i. be the focus of quality assurance and continuous improvement.

4. DETAILED BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSIBILITIES

Academic Council
The Academic Council will ensure that assessment practices are:

1. clearly communicated, fair, transparent, inclusive and consistent across Sheridan.
2. well managed and moderated in the Faculties.
3. underpinned by a shared understanding of academic integrity and consistent application of the Academic Integrity Policy.
4. supported by consistent application of the Student Grievance Policy.

Director of Student Services
The Director of Student Services will ensure:

1. the accuracy of results presented to the Academic Council for review.
2. the correct application of moderations applied by the Academic Council.
3. the accuracy and security of student academic records.

Academic Principal
The Academic Principal, in partnership with Course Coordinators, is responsible to ensure that:

1. lecturers and students are informed about the rules for progression in the courses.
2. assessment procedures are adhered to.
3. assessment information, resources and procedures are available to students and staff.
4. there is a shared understanding of standards and expectations in regard to assessment.
5. assessment standards are regularly benchmarked against those of peer providers and professional organisations.
6. assessment tasks are aligned with course and unit learning outcomes.
7. a diverse range of assessment tasks are included in each course.
8. assessment packages are monitored for workload, effectiveness and consistency.
9. students receive constructive and timely feedback about their assessment tasks.
10. examinations are well managed, and examination documents and records securely kept.
11. grading criteria and standards are applied accurately, fairly and consistently.
12. a consistent approach is adopted to instructing students about academic integrity and managing instances of academic misconduct.

Lecturers
Lecturers are responsible to:

1. be familiar with the Faculty requirements for good practice in assessment.
2. ensure that assessment practices are aligned with unit learning outcomes.

3. communicate assessment expectations clearly in the first class session, and be available to discuss students' concerns about assessment.
4. ensure students have access to resources needed to complete assessment tasks.
5. ensure students are familiar with the requirements for academic integrity in the discipline.
6. set the first submission deadline early in learning period (trimester or intensive block), to gain information about possible learning challenges for some students.
7. give timely and constructive feedback on work submitted.
8. keep assessment tasks under review and discuss improvements with Academic Principal.
9. keep confidential records of student achievement and any intervention strategies during the learning period (trimester or intensive block).,
10. evaluate their own performance as Lecturers and seek peer feedback.
11. cooperate with the Academic Principal in the investigation of any grievance raised by students.

Students

Students have a responsibility to:

1. be aware that the major object of assessment is to aid learning rather than merely the achievement of grades.
2. be informed about the rules for progression in their course.
3. abide by Sheridan's assessment policy and procedure.
4. behave ethically and responsibly in their conduct of assessment tasks.
5. submit work on time, ensuring it is their own work except when shared ownership is part of the task.
6. notify the lecturer as soon as possible if difficulties arise with timing, resources, or understanding studies or tasks.
7. use assessment to engage in self-evaluation in terms of course progression and achieving learning goals.
8. be aware of the Student Grievance policy and procedure.

4. GRADING SCALE

Student performance is graded and notified according to the following scale. Letter grades only are published, not numerical marks.

Mark Range	Level
80 - 100	High Distinction
70-79	Distinction
60-69	Credit
50-59	Pass
0-49	Fail

5. GRADUATION OF GRADE DESCRIPTORS

Grade	Level 5 Diploma	Level 6 Associate Degree
Pass	The student - makes basic attempts to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a basic understanding and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - shows an awareness of relevant scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates a limited ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - has begun to grasp and apply the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences engagement with a range of scholarly viewpoints.
Credit	The student - demonstrates a limited ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - has begun to grasp and apply the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences engagement with a range of scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates sound ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a sound grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences sound ability to critically evaluate a range of scholarly viewpoints.
Distinction	The student - demonstrates sound ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a sound grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences sound ability to critically evaluate a range of scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates a pronounced ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a pronounced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences a pronounced ability to critically evaluate a range of scholarly viewpoints.
High Distinction	The student - demonstrates a pronounced ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a pronounced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences a pronounced ability to critically evaluate a range of scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates an advanced ability in the analysis of primary sources including case studies, - evidences an advanced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - exhibits an advanced ability to critically evaluate a range of scholarly viewpoints.

Grade	Level 7 Bachelor Degree	Level 8 Graduate Certificate Graduate Diploma
Pass	The student - demonstrates sound ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a sound grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences sound ability to critically evaluate a range of scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates a pronounced ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a pronounced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences a pronounced ability to critically evaluate a wide range of scholarly viewpoints.
Credit	The student - demonstrates a pronounced ability to engage with primary sources including case studies, - evidences a pronounced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - evidences a pronounced ability to critically evaluate a wide range of scholarly viewpoints	The student - demonstrates an advanced ability in the analysis of primary sources including case studies, - evidences an advanced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - exhibits an advanced ability to critically evaluate a wide range of scholarly viewpoints.
Distinction	The student - demonstrates an advanced ability in the analysis of primary sources including case studies, - evidences an advanced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - exhibits an advanced ability to critically evaluate a wide range of scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates an advanced ability in the analysis of primary sources including case studies, - evidences an advanced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - exhibits an advanced ability to critically evaluate a wide range of scholarly viewpoints such that genuinely independent scholarly judgments begin to emerge.
High Distinction	The student - demonstrates an advanced ability in the analysis of primary sources including case studies, - evidences an advanced grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - exhibits an advanced ability to critically evaluate a wide range of scholarly viewpoints such that genuinely independent scholarly judgments begin to emerge.	The student - demonstrates a superior ability in the analysis of primary sources including case studies, - evidences a superior grasp and application of the foundational features of the discipline as that intersects with the topic, and - exhibits an advanced ability to critically evaluate and empathically assess a wide range of scholarly viewpoints such genuinely independent scholarly judgments begin to be developed.

Grade	Level 9 Masters (Coursework)	Level 9 Masters (Research)
Pass	The student - demonstrates a pronounced grasp of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, and - exhibits a pronounced ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints.	The student - demonstrates a pronounced grasp of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, - exhibits a pronounced ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints, and - demonstrates a sound grasp of research principles and methods applicable to the discipline and its professional practice.
Credit	The student - demonstrates an advanced grasp of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, and - exhibits an advanced ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints such that genuinely independent scholarly judgments begin to emerge.	The student - demonstrates an advanced grasp of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, - exhibits an advanced ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints such that genuinely independent scholarly judgments begin to emerge, and - demonstrates a pronounced grasp of research principles and methods applicable to a field of work and/or learning.
Distinction	The student - demonstrates a superior ability in the analysis and critique of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, - exhibits a superior ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints, and - evidences a pronounced ability to begin to develop genuinely independent scholarly judgments in a select area of study.	The student - demonstrates a superior ability in the analysis and critique of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, - exhibits a superior ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints, - evidences a pronounced ability to begin to develop genuinely independent scholarly judgments in a select area of study, and - demonstrates an advanced grasp of research principles and methods applicable to a field of work and/or learning.
High Distinction	The student - demonstrates a highly superior ability in the analysis and critique of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, - exhibits a highly superior ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints, and - evidences a superior ability to develop genuinely independent scholarly judgments in a select area of study.	The student - demonstrates a highly superior ability in the analysis and critique of a complex body of knowledge in one or more disciplines and/or area of professional practice, - exhibits a highly superior ability to apply established theories and critically analyse, reflect on and synthesise complex information drawn from a wide range of scholarly viewpoints, - evidences a superior ability to develop genuinely independent scholarly judgments in a select area of study, and

		- demonstrates a superior grasp of research principles and methods applicable to a field of work and/or learning.

6. ASSESSMENT DESIGN

Unit outlines provided to students at the commencement of each learning period (trimester or intensive block) include a detailed description of each assessment task, its relative weighting, the criteria by which it will be evaluated, submission modes and due dates, relevant resources and related advice.

Unit assessment packages are approved in the course accreditation process as representing generally agreed workloads and standards for each unit. Students must submit (complete) all assessment tasks to qualify for a passing grade in the unit. The nature of assessment tasks varies widely across the different disciplines, and can feature a variety of media. Lecturers are encouraged to use a range of approaches to assessment. The key criterion for choice of assessment task and method is curriculum alignment, in which assessment tasks relate in mode and substance to unit learning outcomes.

Assessment design should be developmental, and promote increased complexity, challenge, and independence in learning. The following types of tasks may be considered for assessing Sheridan courses.

- Essays
- Examinations/tests/quizzes
- Critiques/evaluations/peer and self-assessments
- Reviews/responses/observations/journals/summaries
- Reports/research
- Maps/diagrams/concept drawings/technical structures
- Proposals
- Literature surveys/annotated bibliographies
- Interviews/survey instruments
- Portfolios
- Teaching programs/lesson plans/curriculum units
- Teaching resource packages
- Workshops
- Briefs (industry-related)
- Projects (research/creative)
- Technical assessments
- Role plays/simulations
- Seminars/presentations
- Teaching practice

Lecturers are expected to give students constructive feedback on assessment tasks in a timely manner in order to assist students to identify their strengths, address misconceptions and gaps in their understanding, and identify strategies for improvement.

7. EXAMINATIONS

Examinations must normally be scheduled during exam week in accordance with the Sheridan timetable.

Examination Conditions

Punctuality and correct completion of examination forms are the responsibility of students. The following are to be strictly observed:

1. Students are allowed ten minutes to read the examination paper before commencing the stated time of written work. To take advantage of this, students should be seated in their places ten minutes before the stated time of commencement. During this time students are allowed to make notes, but only on the examination question paper.
2. Answers to each question should begin on a new page.
3. A student may not leave the examination room within the first hour, or within the last 15 minutes of the examination session.
4. At the conclusion of the stated time for the examination, students will be instructed to stop writing and should at once place their papers in order.
5. Students sitting external examinations should complete the prescribed form and include that form in their online submission.
6. Answers should be arranged in numerical order, all pages numbered consecutively.

Refer to Invigilation Procedure for Examiners for full details.

Appeals
See *Student Grievance Policy*

If an appeal is made against a passing grade, an administrative fee may be charged.

Any appeal must be lodged in writing within two weeks of the posting of the results. In extenuating circumstances the time for the appeal may be extended with the authorisation of the Academic Principal.

Setting of Exam Papers

General
1. The main lecturer for a unit will normally be the examiner. Sheridan may request another person teaching in a relevant discipline to be the examiner.
2. The lecturer or other examiner is to refer to the Examinations Policy when setting an examination paper.
3. The lecturer or other examiner is to use the Examination Submission Form to seek approval of the examination paper draft from the relevant moderator by the date specified for each learning period.
4. Questions about rules and guidelines for setting papers should be directed to the Academic Principal.
5. External examiners (where appointed by Sheridan) and moderators may be paid fees for setting, assessing and marking papers according to the scale set by Sheridan each year.

The Structure of Exam Papers
1. Examination papers are to be structured in such a way as to enable students to understand readily what is required. Significant changes from previous patterns are to be avoided (unless the Sheridan regulation has changed).
2. Examination papers should be constructed using the Exam Paper Template and contain questions of sufficient numbers and type to cover adequately each examinable section of the relevant syllabus.
3. The ratio of questions set to questions required to be answered is to be approximately 5:2 for all courses at all levels.
4. With the approval of the Academic Principal, examiners may distribute the questions of exams in advance to a class of students. When questions are distributed in advance, the ratio of questions required to questions set should be greater than that in unseen papers.
5. Papers should be sufficiently brief so as to be read twice through by students during reading time.

6. In all Sheridan examinable units, examiners must examine the syllabus as distinct from the lecture course.

The Structure of Examination Questions

1. Questions should be broad enough to give students opportunity to show what they have learnt, yet sufficiently precise to be testing.
2. Questions should not be of unreasonable length, nor contain technical terms beyond the scope or level of the relevant syllabus.
3. No untranslated (non-English) words are to be used except in language exams.

Supplementary assessment

A supplementary assessment is offered to a student for whom providing them with a second chance to pass the unit is warranted. Formal approval must be given by the Board of Examiners who make the decision on a case by case basis by taking into account a student's academic record and circumstances. Generally, supplementary assessment should only be considered for a student who has obtained an overall mark of at least 45 in the unit however, approval for supplementary assessment should not be granted simply on the basis of a 'near pass' i.e. a mark close to 50%. A maximum of two supplementary assessments may be granted to the same student in a study period. Where the supplementary assessment is an examination, the Academic Principal will oversee the organisation and communication regrading this for student/s and staff concerned.

8. ETHICS

Sheridan has adopted the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.[1] Only 'low-risk' research[2] should normally be undertaken at AQF Levels 5-7. All lecturers are to take this into account in design of unit assignments.

Any student conducting research towards a thesis or major project who proposes to conduct human subject research must complete Sheridan's Ethics Protocol (or Application for Ethics Approval), and receive clearance from their supervisor. Applications must be submitted to the supervisor at least six months before the proposed commencement of the research.

Guidelines for ethics in coursework units are available as a separate document from the Sheridan office.

9. MARKING

Sheridan does not use norm referencing where an ideal distribution of grades across a class is predetermined. Rather, a criterion-referenced approach is used to reflect the way in which students vary in their ability to meet the established learning performance standards. Final grades are an expression of how closely students' work reflects the intended learning outcomes.

The Marking of Assessments

Students are not tested on their particular worldview or standpoint, but on their ability to present relevant material in an objective and orderly manner at the level of the relevant course.

---

[1] Developed jointly by National Health and Medical Research Council, Australian Research Council and Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, © Australian Government 2007 (http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72.pdf).

[2] In §2/1/6 'low-risk' is defined as 'where the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort. Where the risk, even if unlikely, is more serious than discomfort, the research is not low risk.'

Students must demonstrate a sound level of spelling and grammar in order to pass each assessment. No special allowance is to be made in these areas unless the paper is annotated with the permission of the Academic Principal.

1. Scripts are to be marked at a level appropriate to the relevant course. Sheridan requires all markers to assess student work based on the grade descriptors in Section 5 of this Policy.

2. The examiner is to calculate the actual mark to be awarded for the paper, together with any averages required.

3. In all units, marks are sent on the Marks Submission Form to the external moderator, showing marks for each assessment item. Moderators should receive a minimum of four moderation scripts in a designated moderation instrument, commonly the end-of-unit exam, totalling at least 40% of the total grade. Where no single moderation instrument is worth 40%, two or more pieces should be submitted to make up the 40%. Where possible moderators should receive a sample of at least one script from each grade awarded in the instrument, namely, F, P, C, D and HD. Where unit classes consist of five students or less, all pieces of the designated assessment are to be sent to the moderator. The moderator will assess the spread of marks, read the sample scripts, and compare these with other associated institutions. Any recommendations for change by the moderator are submitted for consideration by the Academic Principal.

4. Copies of assessed papers, essays and reports are to be securely retained on campus by the Course Coordinator until any moderation has been completed. A minimum of six months is expected.

5. The following scale has been used for converting letter grades to percentages and grade points for all units:

Mark Range	Level	Grade Point
80-100	High Distinction	4.0
70-79	Distinction	3.0
60-69	Credit	2.0
50-59	Pass	1.0
0-49	Fail	0

6. The transcript of students' examination results will convert the score or grade awarded to a grade point, culminating in a grade point average (GPA) upon graduation. A student's GPA is calculated by multiplying the grade point for each unit by the number of credit points for that unit. The sum of these is then divided by the total number of credit points accumulated for the award.

Passing Grades

In all coursework units 50% overall is needed to record a passing grade for a unit. There is no minimum requirement for individual assessment items.

The Adjustment of Marks

The Academic Council undertakes a review of marks at the conclusion of each learning period.

The Academic Council has the right to modify marks as awarded, accepting or adjusting the recommendations of examiners and moderators, and to recommend to Sheridan that it modify its assessment procedures and grades.

Adjustments may be made in the following circumstances:

1. Where recommendations have been received from examiners/moderators.
2. Where there is more than 10% variation between the essay/assignment grades and exam marks.
3. In special circumstances not covered by the above.

Deferred Assessment

1. Deferred assessments may only be granted:
   a. in cases of illness subject to the submission of a satisfactory medical certificate;
   b. on compassionate grounds subject to endorsement by Sheridan;
   c. at the discretion of the Academic Principal.

2. All applications must be in writing and should be received by the relevant lecturer no later than Friday, 5pm of Week 5 of each trimester, or Friday, 5pm of Week 3 of each intensive block.

3. The examinations will be completed by the end of week 15 of each trimester, and week 5 of each intensive block.

4. For units taught in a period other than the learning periods identified above, appropriate dates will be set.

Student Errors

1. In the event of a student answering more question(s) in a particular section of the examination paper than prescribed by the rubric, the policy shall be that the mark of the question that achieved the lower mark should be halved as long as the student has attempted the number of questions prescribed in the exam as a whole. For example, the rubric may ask a student to answer five questions, two from Section A and three from Section B. The student may answer five questions, but does three from Section A and only two from Section B. The lowest mark received in Section A will be halved.

2. Where a student answers more than the total number of questions prescribed in the examination, the superfluous question/s shall not be marked.

3. In such cases, special consideration should be given to a student in a borderline pass/fail situation.

4. In the event of a student misreading an exam timetable, no special consideration will be given and the student will be ineligible to sit that exam. No deferred exam will be offered. Such students will receive a fail for that unit. They will be required to re-enrol, undertaking all assessments again, though they will not be required to repeat lectures. The normal tuition fee will apply.

In line with higher education institutions throughout Australia, Sheridan regards academic misconduct as a serious matter and rigorously pursues the highest possible standards of academic honesty and integrity.

10. ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

The Academic Principal, in partnership with Course Coordinators, manages the assessment process for each Faculty. The Academic Principal will ensure, in the induction of any new Lecturers, that the issue of academic integrity is covered in some detail.

Lecturers are referred to the Academic Integrity Policy for guidelines about strategies and resources to minimise plagiarism, and to the Academic Progress and Intervention Policy and Procedure for guidelines about identifying students who may need assistance to achieve their learning goals.

Before the year commences the Course Coordinator provides the unit outlines to Lecturers, and then meets with staff to organise and approve assessment schedules and tasks as appropriate to ensure the best learning experience for students in that learning period. Lecturers give their students an expanded unit outline in the first class session, discussing the assessment requirements in detail, and ensuring that the set tasks require students to apply the unit content, that they measure students' achievement of the unit learning outcomes, and that they can be completed in the time allocated.

During the learning period, the Academic Principal has to approve any variation made to assessment packages, after ensuring that students have been consulted and have agreed to the change. The Academic Principal also consults with Lecturers during the learning period for feedback on effectiveness of assessment and the progress of individual students. When students are identified as being 'at risk' the Academic Principal will generally become involved in the intervention strategies. In the last class students are asked to complete an evaluation of the unit and their learning experience.

At the end of each learning period (trimester or intensive block), the Academic Principal will:

- meet with the Lecturers to consider grades and assessment outcomes, moderation, and other feedback including from a specialist External Moderator. The achievements of individual students are discussed and intervention strategies agreed where appropriate.
- meet with the Faculty Dean or other representative to discuss the grades and outcomes of the assessment processes. The meeting focuses on the quality and reliability of assessment as well as student achievements and concerns. Normally possible improvements are identified in this dialogue.
- submit a Moderation Report to the Academic Council together with the learning period's results for approval.

After the learning period (trimester or intensive block), is completed the Academic Principal receives the student feedback for each unit from the Director of Student Services, together with a summary of student responses. The Academic Principal reviews this feedback with each Lecturer, and determines action to be taken where appropriate. The student feedback summaries and responses from the Lecturers are presented to the Academic Council during the next Council meeting. The feedback loop is then closed as the decisions made at the Council meeting in response to students' concerns are made available to those students. Student feedback also forms part of the backdrop to the annual Staff Review.

Assessment of major assessable research outputs for higher degrees by research, such as theses, dissertations, exegeses, creative works or other major works arising from a candidate's research must incorporate assessment by at least two assessors with international standing in the field of research, who are independent of the conduct of the research, competent to undertake the assessment and do

not have a conflict of interest. Further, for doctoral degrees, assessors must be external to Sheridan, and for masters degrees by research, at least one assessor must be external to Sheridan.

11. MODERATION

Rationale for Moderation

The purpose of the Sheridan moderation process is to ensure that academic quality is maintained, the objectives for each unit are addressed in the way students are assessed, stated Sheridan learning outcomes (or grade descriptors) for each unit are uniformly and consistently applied, and graduate attributes are likely to be attained.

Moderation is a significant element in ensuring the quality of the Sheridan undergraduate diplomas and degrees, masters by coursework and graduate diploma courses. Moderators' work is based on:

1. reading samples of the major assessment (worth at least 40% of the final grade) for each unit in each mode taught at Sheridan,
2. comparing the grades and marks awarded by lecturers with Sheridan's published learning outcomes, and
3. markers' feedback to students on essays.

The reports of the moderators containing their recommendations for raising or lowering the marks of students in a given grade band and their observations about the quality of teaching and learning at Sheridan are submitted to the Academic Council at the conclusion of each learning period and before results are finalised.

The Academic Council oversees the moderating of Sheridan's assessment practices at the end of each learning period (trimester or intensive block). Moderation involves the Academic Principal, Lecturers, External Moderators and the Academic Council. The Student Services office gives students their final grades after moderation. These grades could, at times, vary from the marks issued by lecturers after the learning period.

The role of the Academic Principal

The Academic Principal monitors assessment issues across Sheridan, checking to ensure that assessment tasks are appropriate in terms of the number of tasks set, their rigour, spread, and appropriateness in terms of the learning outcomes. At the end of each learning period (trimester or intensive block), the Academic Principal discusses with the faculty the assessment experience, the standards expected and achieved, results submitted, and the progress of individual students. The Academic Principal may alter the marks lecturers have given, but will normally only do this in consultation with the lecturers and moderators.

The role of the External Moderator

An external person normally assists the faculty in each discipline for the purpose of reviewing the learning period-end assessment. Such moderators may be members of Course Advisory Committees, or other colleagues who manage similar programs at peer institutions.

In some disciplines the moderators attend students' public performances, or the final assessments of folios, artworks and exhibitions, and actually contribute to the final grades awarded. In others they may attend the faculty meeting at which academic grades are presented and discussed. The Academic Principal records the proceedings of the moderation sessions and presents a moderation report to the Academic Council together with the assessment reports. The marks assigned by the lecturers may at times be changed in the moderation meetings held within Faculties.

The role of the Academic Council

The Academic Council receives the assessments records and the moderation report from each Faculty, engaging in further enquiry and/or discussion as appropriate. The Council can vary the marks or call for a Faculty to re-assess student work before the assessments are approved.

The Academic Council will typically also discuss issues that have arisen in the moderation meetings, with the aim of ensuring that each Faculty's assessment practice is strengthened.

12. FURTHER REGULATIONS

Special Needs

Reasonable adjustment in teaching and assessment methods must be made to accommodate students with an officially recognised disability, impairment or medical condition.

Extensions

The due dates for assessment tasks are published in the unit outline. Late submissions will incur a penalty of a 5% deduction per day of the maximum mark possible. Students may receive a score of zero if work is submitted more than one week late.

A student with a serious reason for not meeting the submission deadline for a task may apply to the Lecturer for an extension before the due date on the Application for Extension.

Extensions may only be granted under the following conditions: for serious unforeseen reasons, that a revised due date be agreed, and that extensions be resolved as soon as reasonably possible, and without disturbing unit marking deadlines. A student who has been given an extension needs to submit the assignment, with the approved Application for Extension attached, to avoid receiving a failing grade.

Special Consideration

A student who is prevented through protracted illness or unavoidable disruption from completing assessment tasks before the end of the learning period (trimester or intensive block), should apply in writing to the Academic Principal for Special Consideration, enclosing relevant documentation. If approved, this will lead to an "E" grade for the unit. Again, however, early resolution of this interim grade is the goal. On application, the Sheridan Academic Principal will compassionately and reasonably assess requests for special consideration.

Resubmission

A student may be invited to resubmit an assessment task where the Lecturer deems it important to support the student's learning and progress, and where it does not disadvantage other students or interfere with unit marking deadlines. Resubmission is not allowed if the original assignment was submitted late. A resubmitted task can only be awarded a maximum of 50% Pass.

Privacy

Students' privacy must be protected in the assessment process. Written assignments are submitted online or into a locked box, and are held confidentially by Lecturers during assessment.

Marked work is returned directly to individual students. Materials related to an academic grievance are held in confidential storage for six months after the appeal is resolved.

13. APPENDIX: DOCUMENT HISTORY AND VERSION CONTROL RECORD

Document Title:	Assessment Policy
Source Documents:	*Adapted with permission from:* Wesley Institute, Assessment Policy Wesley Institute, Assessment Procedure
	Other sources include: Australian Universities Teaching Committee Assessing Learning in Australian Universities Macquarie University Assessment Policy http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/assessment/policy.html Macquarie University Policy: Assessment - Code of Practice http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/assessment/policy_code_of_practice.html Macquarie University Assessment Procedure http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/docs/assessment/procedure.html RMIT University Assessment Policy http://www.rmit.edu.au/browse;ID=det2rlnjeoay Australian College of Theology Assessment Policy
Associated Internal Documents:	Academic Progress and Intervention Policy Academic Integrity Policy Student Grievance Policy
Associated External Documents	
Authorised Officer:	Chairperson, Academic Council
Approved by:	Darren Smith
Date of Approval:	20 April 2017
Next Review Before:	Dec 2020

Version Number	Version Date	Authorised Officer	Amendment Details
0.01	30 May 2011	N/A	Draft prepared for Sheridan College and Vose College
0.02	16 May 2012	N/A	Revised by Vose College Academic Board
0.03	29 Jan 2013	N/A	Revised for Sheridan College Board of Directors
1.00	02 Mar 2013	Chairperson, Board of Directors	Submitted to TEQSA for Sheridan College HEP registration: Attachment 6.3.1e Assessment Policy
2.00	20 Mar 2015	Chairperson, Academic Council	Revised by Ray Dallin on behalf of the Academic Council. All references to "semester" replaced with "5-week teaching period" to reflect College's primary approach to course delivery. All references to "Head of Department" and "Principal" replaced with "Academic Principal" to reflect College organisational structure. All references to "College Council" replaced with "Academic Council" to reflect current title.

			All references to "Registrar" replaced with "Student Services" or "Director of Student Services" to reflect College organisational structure.
			Section 2: Responsibilities and Accountabilities: New responsibility and accountability row added to table, to reflect delegation of academic governance responsibilities from Board of Directors to Academic Council.
			Section 5: Learning Outcomes and Grade Descriptors: AQF Levels added to Grade Descriptors. Deleted table of Fail Grade Descriptors for Levels 300—600.
			Section 7: Examinations section revised and updated, including deleting references to digital examinations.
2.01	09 Oct 2015	Chairperson, Academic Council	Revised by the Academic Council.
			Teaching period references replaced with "trimester" and "5-week teaching period" to reflect College's new academic calendar.
2.02	24 February 2017		Revised by the Teaching and Learning Committee on behalf of the Academic Council. Major revision of Graduation of Grade Descriptors and minor modifications to include supplementary documents. Refer to Policy Review Template dated 24.2.17 for full details.
2.03	20 April 2017		Further revision following Academic Council meeting on 19/4/2017 to ensure compliance with Threshold Standards.
2.04	3 August 2018		Adjustments made to the scoring in the tables on pages 3 and 10 in line with the adoption of the revised assessment scale. (Refer to Academic Council minutes 24/5/18). Revision of wording of point 3 on page 10 to complement wording of 4.1 of the SC Examination Policy (External moderation).
2.05	12 April 2019	Academic Council	Updated wording to ensure consistency with current practice. Inclusion of provision for supplementary assessments.
2.06	27 Oct 2020	Executive Principal	References to "Sheridan College" changed to "Sheridan Institute".
			Update of logo to "Sheridan Institute of Higher Education" logo.