



Assessment Practice Procedures

1 Governing Policy

1.1 MNU Assessment Policy

2 Purpose

2.1 To ensure that assessment practices throughout the University align with the principles outlined in the University Assessment Policy.

3 Setting assessment activities

3.1 Course design

3.1.1 Responsibility: Course Leader

- a. Ensure that each course incorporates a comprehensive, clearly articulated whole-of-course assessment strategy that:
 - i. provides a clear and justified rationale for the assessment approach employed across the course;
 - ii. identifies the role of assessment activities in facilitating the achievement and demonstration of course learning outcomes, as well as addressing professional registration requirements where applicable;
 - iii. serves as a key reference point for evaluating and considering proposed changes to assessment practices as part of course and subject review processes; and
 - iv. ensures all assessment design aligns with the principles of constructive alignment, thereby directly linking learning activities, assessment tasks, and intended learning outcomes.

3.2 Subject assessment design (during subject delivery)

3.2.1 Responsibility: Subject Coordinator

- a. Ensure that each specific assessment activity is supported by a clear rationale for how the activity provides the opportunity for students to demonstrate learning related to subject and course learning outcomes.

- b. Ensure assessment activities include controlled/unaided assessments that make up at least 50% of the assessment total.
- c. Ensure that the subject assessment guidelines specify that a minimum of 50% of the designated marks for controlled/unaided assessments must be achieved to meet the assessment requirements and to pass the subject.
- d. If participation is to be a requirement for completion of a subject, ensure that there is an explicit description of:
 - i. the link between participation and learning outcomes, and
 - ii. the criteria for acceptable participation.
- e. Ensure, as far as possible, that the combination of assessment activities:
 - i. replicates/represents authentic practice in the disciplines/professions to which the subject relates, and
 - ii. should show a balanced mix of evidence (variety) of what students have learned, and
 - iii. they must be fair, equitable, and transparent.
- f. Ensure that the number of assessment activities is proportionate to the credit point allocated to the subject.
- g. Ensure that any larger assessment activity that makes up a major percentage of the final subject grade has been clearly scaffolded with staged opportunities for the student to review learning progress. For example, a final subject grade may be determined based on a single/final assessment artefact that demonstrates the achievement of all learning outcomes e.g., placement report, thesis, creative work, performance.
- h. Where learning outcomes can be demonstrated through multiple and alternative assessment activities, students should, where possible, be provided with options regarding the types of assessments they undertake, provided this aligns with safety considerations and professional registration or accreditation requirements.
 - i. Ensure that the criteria and standards required for the successful completion of each assessment activity are clearly communicated to, discussed with, and clarified for students during the first week of the term, via the assessment brief uploaded to the LMS.
 - j. Ensure that all assessments are to be submitted through the University's LMS. Alternative submission methods may only be used if explicitly approved by the FCC before commencement of the term and communicated in advance.
- k. Ensure that any 'mandatory requirements,' defined as assessment activities or components that must be completed in order to pass the subject, are clearly communicated to the student, and are justified by a clear rationale based on:
 - i. safe practice or professional competencies, or

- ii. registration/accreditation requirements, or
- iii. the need to authenticate a completed assessment activity for quality assurance and academic integrity purposes.

Note: where a learning outcome can only be demonstrated by one assessment activity, that assessment activity is considered a mandatory requirement. This should be the case only by exception and, wherever possible, learning outcomes should be able to be demonstrated by more than one assessment activity.

3.3 Work Integrated Learning – Clinical Placement, Teaching practicum, Internship

- 3.3.1 Course-related work experience is a specific type of learning offered in accordance with the requirements of subject/discipline. The assessment of this learning is aligned with discipline and professional standards but must still adhere to the principles outlined in the Assessment Policy, ensuring transparency, equity, and appropriate workload considerations.

4 Moderation

4.1 Course assessment moderation

4.1.1 Responsibility: Course Leader

- a. Where subject-prerequisite is a component of a course, ensure that:
 - i. the relationship between assessment results and progression decisions is explicit and documented, and
 - ii. progression decision processes are robust, consistent, and considered, and informed by sufficient data.

4.1.2 Responsibility: Dean/Head

- a. Formally review (ARC) the grade distribution and approve the release of final results/grades of subjects in accordance with the assessment policy.

4.2 Subject assessment moderation

- 4.2.1 Moderation occurs at three phases in the assessment cycle: at the time of subject assessment design, during teaching delivery and when submitting final grades for subjects.

4.2.2 Responsibility: Subject Coordinator

- a. Moderation Phase 1: Design (Pre-Assessment)
 - i. Review – before an assessment is administered, faculty should review the assessment task(s) to ensure they
 - a. align with the stated learning outcomes of the course/module.
 - b. are clear, unambiguous, and appropriately worded.
 - c. are at the appropriate level of difficulty for the student cohort.
 - d. provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the required skills and knowledge.

- e. include clear marking criteria or rubrics.
- ii. Consultation - discuss the assessment task with colleagues, and seek feedback from colleagues, particularly those teaching the same subject or similar subjects, to ensure consistency in standards, and ensure:
 - a. Alignment in interpretation of the assessment specifications, rubrics and marking guides
 - b. Consistency in information provided to students and in grading practice, and
 - c. Consistency in feedback practices in the subject.
- iii. Documentation - Keep a record of the assessment task, marking criteria, and any changes made during the moderation process.

b. Moderation Phase 2: Marking Moderation (During Assessment)

- i. Sample Marking – During marking, ensure mechanisms are in place to validate assessment judgment of markers through second, double or collaborative marking. A sample of student work (e.g., 10% or a statistically relevant number) can be independently marked as required and relevant.
- ii. Discussion of Discrepancies - Markers should discuss any significant discrepancies in their marking and come to a consensus on the appropriate grade.
- iii. Calibration - Use the moderated sample to calibrate the marking standards of all markers involved in the assessment.
- iv. Addressing individual cases - If a marker identifies a particular issue with a student's work (e.g., suspected plagiarism, mitigating circumstances), this should be discussed with the subject coordinator or batch coordinator.

c. Moderation Phase 3: Post-marking Moderation

- i. Review of grade distribution - After marking is completed, review the overall grade distribution to identify any anomalies or unexpected patterns, and also provide reasons for incomplete and fail grades.
- ii. External Moderation (If Applicable) - In some cases, external examiners or reviewers may be involved in the moderation process to provide an independent perspective.
- iii. Feedback to Students: Provide students with clear and constructive feedback on their performance, referencing the marking criteria.
- iv. Documentation and Reporting - Document the moderation process and any outcomes, including changes to marking schemes or assessment tasks. Report findings to the relevant batch coordinator and/or Academic Review Committee.

5 Feedback to students

5.1 Responsibility: Subject Lecturer

- 5.1.1 Approve the grade for summative assessment activities, including where the assessment judgement is informed by other academic staff and/or external supervisors e.g. internship, placements etc.
 - a. Ensure that:
 - i. students are provided with meaningful and constructive feedback that supports their progression toward achieving the intended learning outcomes of the specific subject and associated course.
 - ii. the feedback is clear, explicit, and actionable, and designed to facilitate improvements in the students' learning.
 - iii. for assessment activities submitted and returned through the LMS, the corresponding feedback is also delivered through the LMS.
 - iv. as a minimum standard of feedback, completed rubric is provided upon the marking of assessment tasks.
- 5.1.2 Feedback on graded assessment tasks, where feasible, is expected to be provided to students within three weeks following either the submission due date or the actual date of submission, whichever occurs later. The timeframe for the return of feedback must be communicated to students in advance.

6 Due dates and times for submissions

6.1 Responsibility: Subject Coordinator

- 6.1.1 Ensure that each assessment activity has a specified due date and time, considering:
 - a. where possible, the due dates for other assessments in the subject and course, and
 - b. the expected effort to complete the assessment and other assessments in the subject
- 6.1.2 Due dates and times for submission of assessment are set at 23:59 on the due date, unless otherwise specified.
- 6.1.3 All assessment activities that are not examinations must have a due date no later than seven calendar days before the beginning of the relevant examination period, however, it is recommended that 21 days be allowed for all such assessments. Later due dates can be set with good reason that is approved by the Dean/Head of Centre.
- 6.1.4 Ensure that the due date and time of each assessment activity, and the consequences of late submission is communicated to students in the subject assessment information included in the subject outline and the assessment briefs.

6.2 Responsibility: Dean/Head of Centre

- 6.2.1 For each assessment activity, determine the consequences (including submission cut-off period) of late submission in accordance with assessment variation guideline.
- 6.2.2 Where there is a percentage deduction for late submission, the deduction must be set at 5% of the total marks possible for the assessment task/activity for every 24-hour period (or part thereof) after the submission due time (weekend and/or holidays included).

7 Review of grades

- 7.1 If students have concerns about assessable work, they should initially approach the subject lecturer to request an explanation or request remarking of their work. If the issue remains unresolved, the student is advised to escalate their grievance in the following sequence: first to the subject coordinator, then to the batch coordinator, and finally to the Dean. Each subsequent individual should only be approached if the student is dissatisfied with the resolution provided by the preceding staff member.
- 7.2 Students who believe that their aggregate mark or final grade does not accurately reflect their performance in the subject are entitled to seek an explanation or review. This process begins with the subject coordinator and may, if necessary, be escalated to the Dean for further clarification or review.
- 7.3 If the request for a review is substantiated, the reviewer may:
 - 7.3.1 arrange for an independent grading of the assessment task/activity
 - 7.3.2 offer an alternative or supplementary assessment, or
 - 7.3.3 take any other reasonable action appropriate to the circumstances
- 7.4 If a grade is amended as a result of a review, it will be the grade awarded for the assessment activity or subject, irrespective of whether it is higher or lower than the original grade.
- 7.5 If a student perceives that there has been a failure of due process in the reassessment procedure, they may submit a formal appeal to the Academic Review Committee. The appeal must include a detailed written statement outlining the grounds for the appeal, supported by any relevant documentary evidence. It is important to note that the role of the Committee is limited to ensuring that appropriate procedural steps were followed during the assessment process. The Committee does not reassess the academic quality or content of the student's work.

Approved Date: 21st December 2025

Effective from: 1st February 2026, Term 1

Note: This is a revision of the existing assessment policy, with procedures transferred to this new document.