



Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy

1. Purpose

KOI has a standards-based approach to teaching and learning and aims to provide quality teaching and learning opportunities at all times. Course and Subject Learning Outcomes are criterion-referenced and relate to what students, who complete the course or subject successfully, can do as a result of their learning experiences. Learning Outcomes are clearly stated, demonstrable, achievable and measurable, and based on relevant specifications in the *Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)*. *Course Learning Outcomes cover both discipline specific outcomes and generic outcomes (including the KOI Graduate Attributes)*. Assessment tasks allow students to demonstrate their achievement of the Learning Outcomes.

KOI adheres to the three core principles of effective assessment for higher education as articulated by The Centre for the Study of Higher Education (University of Melbourne):

- assessment should guide and encourage effective approaches to learning;
- assessment should validly and reliably measure expected Learning Outcomes, in particular the higher-order learning that characterises higher education;
- assessment and grading should define and protect academic standards.

Assessment has an important and central role at KOI in driving and shaping student learning. Assessment provides feedback to students on their learning and is the basis by which their academic achievements are judged and certified. Academic standards and the rigour of courses are central to KOI's assessment schemes and processes.

Student assessment is a complex activity with many stakeholders, including students, academic staff, KOI, the professions, industry, governments and the community. Assessment results inform stakeholders about the nature and depth of student learning that underpin the skills and attributes of students.

KOI acknowledges the critical role of academics' professional judgement and expertise in all aspects of the assessment process, and particularly in making judgements about students' work. KOI is committed to supporting and fostering this expertise. External referencing through moderation, peer review and benchmarking ensures that all stakeholders can be confident that assessment decisions and judgements are compatible with disciplinary and professional standards and comparable to those of good higher education practice nationally and internationally.

The KOI Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy has been developed to comply with the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021* and the *Australian Qualifications Framework Second Edition 2013*, and to be in line with other comparable higher education providers.

Additional details and guidance on assessment are contained in the Assessment Guidelines (see Appendix 1).

2. Definitions

<i>Weighting</i>	Assessment 'weighting' refers to the contribution of an individual assessment task to the overall subject score.
<i>Subject moderation</i>	Subject moderation refers to the review of a subject's Learning Outcomes and assessment tasks.
<i>Moderation of marks</i>	Moderation of marks refers to the adjustment of marks of an entire class or a



subset of that class or of individual marks for individual assessment tasks or the total subject marks to achieve consistency in the application of subject objectives, performance standards and marking criteria.

Special consideration Standard policies and procedures relating to assessments and exams may be varied due to circumstances which prevent the student performing to their ability, and are outside the normal expectations of student life, unanticipated or beyond the student's control and supported by evidence and written documentation. (See Section 7 *Extensions, Supplementary and Deferred Assessments / Exams.*)

3. Objectives

The objectives of this policy are to:

- articulate an integrated set of values, processes and procedures for student assessment at KOI;
- provide guidance in the design and implementation of assessment tasks, marking and moderation of student work, and the review of assessment;
- identify roles and responsibilities in the implementation of this policy.

4. Assessment principles

It is essential that assessment and feedback practices:

- are demonstrably valid, reliable, equitable and fair;
- promote higher order learning skills of analysis, synthesis, evaluation, critical thinking and ethical practice;
- provide timely feedback to students on their progress designed to foster continuing development;
- align with relevant learning outcomes for the subject and ensure incremental achievement of the graduate attributes;
- are moderated to ensure appropriateness of tasks, consistency in marking, and the maintenance of standards;
- are reviewed regularly for effectiveness in meeting desired Learning Outcomes, under KOI quality assurance mechanisms;
- are supported by a culture of academic integrity that is actively fostered at all levels of KOI;
- are supported by resources that enable appropriate time to be invested in high quality assessment processes;
- are supported by professional development for academic staff to increase assessment literacy and capability across KOI.

4.1. Student roles and responsibilities

At KOI students are expected to accept the following responsibilities.

- Be familiar with the Subject Outline and learning resources on Moodle for all their currently enrolled subjects, paying particular attention to the assessment details provided.
- If unsure about any assessment element, seek advice and act on feedback from the Lecturer / Tutor at an appropriate time as early in the trimester as possible. Tutorials and the lecturer / tutor's consultation hours provide opportunities to ask questions. If questions arise outside class time, they can be asked via Moodle or email. Students needing additional help may contact the Head of Program for assistance.
- Complete their work to the best of their ability and adopt good Academic Integrity practices in completing their assessments. (See KOI's *Student Handbook*, *Student Academic Misconduct Policy*, the *Academic Integrity Module* in Moodle and the *Student Code of Conduct*).
- Keep a copy of all submitted assessments and returned assessments with feedback for their personal records and use the feedback to improve their work.



- Check returned assessments and final grades as soon as possible after return of assessments or Release of Results in order to meet the timeframes should they wish to appeal their results or grades (see Section 8 *Assessment Appeals*).

4.2 Academic staff roles and responsibilities

- Academic staff should set, moderate, mark, record marks and return assessments with appropriate feedback within the parameters set in this policy and the *KOI Assessment Guidelines* (see Appendix 1) which are reflected in the approved Subject Outline. Constructive, timely and relevant feedback on assessment tasks is vital for meaningful student learning and is an important part of any academic's teaching role. Feedback on assessment tasks enables students to monitor their progress, diagnose and rectify problems, make decisions about where to focus their efforts and generally to be active participants in their learning. Insufficient, unhelpful or untimely feedback is the most commonly reported cause for dissatisfaction by students.
- The Subject Coordinator is responsible for ensuring their subject is delivered in accordance with the Subject Outline approved by the Academic Board. The Subject Coordinator should confirm that students have access to the approved Subject Outline via Moodle and check that students understand the aims of the subject, the learning activities and the assessment requirements.
- As part of managing consistency across all subjects and courses in preparation for the next trimester, the assessment approach for each subject will be reviewed by the Heads of Program to ensure:
 - alignment of subject learning outcomes with course learning outcomes
 - alignment of tasks with subject learning outcomes and graduate attributes;
 - appropriate AQF level of skill and knowledge;
 - addressing professional standards (where relevant);
 - alignment with levels in Bloom's Taxonomy;
 - appropriateness of overall assessment load;
 - criteria and standards that are clear and appropriate;
 - instructions to students that are clear, complete, unambiguous and expressed in plain English;
 - guidance, mentoring and supervision of inexperienced staff.
- The Head of Program will submit changes to assessment tasks resulting from the review to the Vice-President (Academic). Minor changes can be approved by the Vice-President (Academic); major changes require approval by the Academic Board and must be proposed in good time to allow proper consideration. The Academic Board relies on the Course Advisory Committee to make an independent review of the alignment and relevance of the learning outcomes and assessment. (Refer to the Subject Outline Policy for the detailed procedure.)
- Any changes to the approved subject outline (including the assessment) must be approved by the Vice-President (Academic) and reported to the Academic Board. No changes to assessment tasks, weightings or timings will normally be permitted after the commencement of the trimester. Any changes must be communicated to all students enrolled in the subject via Moodle and in class.
- Academic staff, led by the Subject Coordinator, are responsible for providing timely and meaningful feedback to students. Normally feedback for assessments submitted on time during the trimester must be provided within 10 working days of the assessment due date.
- The KOI Board of Examiners is the final arbiter for the awarding of grades. Grades for subjects will normally be released to students within two weeks after the last final exam is completed (with the exception of marks subject to reviews of grade and/or applications for deferred exams). Specific dates for Release of Results are published on the KOI website www.koi.edu.au and in the *Student Handbook*. Students will be advised of their trimester grades via Gradebook.
- The Vice-President (Academic) will lead an ongoing, continuous improvement review process of assessment strategies across all courses and subjects offered by KOI.



4.3 Assessment design

This section articulates KOI's approach to assessment in undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses. The section complements other key plans and academic policies. Supplementary details of assessment content, formats, etc. can be found in the KOI *Assessment Guidelines* (see Appendix 1).

- The number and design of assessments must be directly related to the Learning Outcomes and level of the subject and the larger context of the course of which it is part. Although Subject Coordinators are given considerable latitude in exercising judgement about what should be assessed, assessment design is essentially collaborative and should not occur in isolation from other subjects in the course. A whole-of-course approach will facilitate the employment of a diverse range of assessment methods to encourage the development of KOI's graduate attributes in an appropriate developmental sequence from first year to final year. Assessment mapping is used to show the planned sequence approach to the achievement of the graduate attributes, course learning outcomes and subject learning outcomes, and to ensure that there are equitable student workloads, as well as appropriate timing and weighting of assessment tasks.
- Assessments must be designed to encourage effective student learning and enable students to develop and demonstrate the skills and knowledge identified in the relevant AQF Qualification Specifications and Knowledge Levels (i.e., different knowledge levels for first year, second year and third year assignments (e.g., from introductory level to intermediate level to advance level). Assessments also have to be designed in line with constructive alignment between course learning outcomes and subject learning outcomes. Assessments must be designed in a way that will allow objective measurement of achievement. Standards of performance (or 'grade' descriptors), through the use of detailed marking guides or marking rubrics, must delineate the various levels of student performance, as well as the corresponding grade that will be awarded (HD, D, C, P, F). Standards must be sufficiently detailed so that students can see how to improve the quality of their performance.
- Wherever possible, assessment tasks should be authentic, that is, based on real world tasks, problems and scenarios. Students should also be offered the opportunity, at appropriate stages within their course, to exercise some choice in assessment tasks, to relate concepts to their chosen careers and develop their self-management and lifelong learning abilities.
- All assessment tasks and standards of performance will be developed by applying professional judgements about expected student performance at the level at which a subject is taught. Standards will be benchmarked against acceptable levels of performance within KOI, against other providers of similar courses, and the expectations of relevant professions.
- Subject assessment design should ensure that students are provided with sufficient opportunity for formative feedback on their progress towards the Learning Outcomes during the teaching period. KOI adopts a model of continuous assessment where formative and summative assessments are integrated in tasks completed over the trimester. Assessment tasks that occur during the first half of the trimester are usually designed to maximise the formative developmental function of assessment. There should be sufficient spacing between assessment tasks to ensure that students gain sufficient feedback from one task before attempting the next.
- All assessment details will be provided in the Subject Outline. In some circumstances, relevant learning resources and exemplars may also be added to the subject page in Moodle.
- KOI recognises that students enrolled in first year subjects should be carefully supported, and that assessment in the first year of study should be as formative and developmental as possible to build students' academic skills and confidence. An assignment contributing a small component of the total mark is strongly encouraged in all subjects and must be included in the first four weeks of core first year subjects. Assessment drives learning and assessment such as quizzes has a positive impact on student engagement which, in turn, is linked to student retention and success. Heads of Program and Subject Coordinators should ensure that formative academic skills assessment tasks are included in the curriculum of first year subjects in each course. These assessment tasks should be placed in the early part of the trimester and preferably prior to the census date for that teaching period. The aim of these



tasks is to build confidence, provide early feedback to students on their progress and assist in the identification of students at academic risk. Heads of Program and Subject Coordinators should monitor the performance on these assessment tasks as a means of ensuring early intervention in cases where academic progress is not consistent with course expectations.

- On the other hand, a low pass rate or a high withdrawal rate is a signal that the subject design and the assessment strategy should be reviewed. Heads of Program should identify such subjects as part of the ongoing program of course review. (Refer to the Course Development and Review Policy for further details).
- Assessment should take into consideration the impact of emerging trends and technological advancements (e.g., the concerns and opportunities associated with developments and advancements of Generative Artificial Intelligence tools in recent years).
- Teamwork and collaboration among students should be encouraged and taken into consideration when designing assessment.
- This policy does not limit the form of assessment to any particular type, but this policy and the associated *Assessment Guidelines* (see Appendix 1) must be followed by Subject Coordinators when designing assessment tasks.

5. Marking and grading

KOI has adopted a standards-based assessment approach. This means that assessment of student achievement is measured against verified criteria and standards. Such criteria and standards should be referenced, wherever possible, to industry or professional standards, as well as accepted academic standards evident in comparable courses of study nationally and internationally. Marking criteria and standards of performance must be explicitly articulated and made available to all students at the commencement of the study period for each assessment task. Criteria and standards should also be discussed with students, so that students can understand the standards of academic performance expected of them.

Standards-based assessment is incompatible with norm-referenced assessment schemes. Therefore, no pre-determined or ideal distribution of grades can be applied across a student cohort. Subject Coordinators should not adjust students' grades to comply with pre-determined distributions.

Marks and grades awarded to students are to be based solely on merit in relation to prescribed academic standards and against specified marking criteria.

- Marks for assessments submitted on time will normally be returned to students within 10 working days of the assessment due date.
- Assessment of group work will usually be based on a group report, on which all group members will be awarded the same mark, a group presentation on which marks may include a component based on each member's individual performance, and an individual reflection and/or peer evaluation showing each student's contribution to the project. Where one or more group members raise issues with the respective contributions of another group member or members, the group mark may be adjusted up or down for some or all group members following a thorough investigation by the Subject Coordinator. An explanation for such a variation of marks must be included in the report recommending the final grades for the subject.
- Final exam scripts will not normally be returned to students. Students can obtain feedback on their exam performance at the Review of Grade session (details are included in the Subject Outline).
- On completion of subject(s), students will be provided with grades for the subject(s). Specific dates for release of grades are published in the KOI website www.koi.edu.au, in the *Student Handbook* and posted on notice boards.
- KOI grades are based on standards used across the Australian higher education sector. Assessment and subject results are expressed as a grade which falls within a specific range of marks.

Grades used by KOI are explained in the following table:



Final Result Grade	Notation	Marks Range (%)	Descriptor
High Distinction	HD	85-100	Consistent evidence of comprehensive understanding of the subject content at a very high level; demonstration of an extremely high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; substantial originality and insight in identifying, creating and developing arguments, perspectives and critical evaluation of problems; and a high level of communication and application appropriate to the discipline.
Distinction	D	75 – 84	Consistent evidence of a high level of understanding of subject content; development of relevant skills to a high level; evidence of creative insight and ability to apply relevant skills and theories as well as interpretive and analytical ability; and demonstration of appropriate and effective communication.
Credit	C	65-74	Evidence of a good level of understanding, knowledge and skill development in relation to subject content; demonstration of a high level of interpretive and analytical ability; and demonstration of effective communication.
Pass	P	50-64	Evidence of satisfactory understanding of basic subject content; development of relevant skills to a competent level; adequate interpretive and analytical ability; and adequate communication of information and concepts in terms of disciplinary requirements or conventions.
Fail	F	0-49	Little or no attainment of Learning Outcomes, with limited understanding of course content or skill development.

Marks in the range 46 – 49% should be reviewed and may be moderated (see Section 6). Moderation of marks may be dependent on factors such as the student's engagement and participation during the trimester.

Threshold levels of performance for a pass in a subject may be set for assessment tasks with the approval of the Academic Board. (For example, this may include a requirement that all assessment tasks are submitted, or that a passing mark is obtained in the final examination.)

KOI only uses a grade point average (GPA) in making awards for academic excellence for graduates.. Each final grade is assigned a numerical value:

HD = 5; D = 4; C = 3; P = 2; F = 0

The GPA is the sum of all the numerical values for the grade in a subject multiplied by the credit points for that subject, divided by the total credit points for all subjects attempted. Subjects with advanced standing or withdrawal without penalty are not counted in the calculation of the GPA. Where a student has repeated a subject, both grades will be counted in the GPA and both results will appear on the academic transcript.

6. Moderation of marks

Moderation of marks refers to the adjustment of the marks of an entire class or a subset of that class or of individual marks to achieve consistency in the application of subject objectives, performance standards and marking criteria. While this is not normal practice at KOI, marks may be moderated in certain circumstances at the discretion of the Board of Examiners. Such moderation is generally



restricted to students whose overall result is close to a grade boundary, who have submitted all but one of the major pieces of assessment and who have a satisfactory attendance record.

Moderation may also be applied to marks just below a grade boundary where a student has a mark on a major piece of assessment which compares favourably with marks in the grade above.

Subject Coordinators are asked to identify such cases for review by the Board of Examiners.

Moderation of marking is designed to confirm that marking is fair and consistent. That is, marks awarded by different markers agree within a small tolerance and marks are consistent with the learning outcomes, the desired performance standards and the marking criteria. Consensus moderation processes are used to develop a common understanding of the subject standards to ensure consistency of marking. (Refer to the Moderation of Assessment Policy for further details.)

The Board of Examiners reviews final marks in all subjects and reports from Heads of Program and Subject Coordinators to assure overall consistency of grading. The Board of Examiners may moderate marks to address inconsistencies in performance standards.

7. Extensions, supplementary and deferred assessments / exams

KOI understands that students may not be able to complete assessments or sit mid-trimester or final exams due to circumstances beyond their control, and outside normal circumstances. Where this occurs, students may apply for an assessment extension or a deferred exam as appropriate. In addition, the Board of Examiners may approve a supplementary assessment or exam for students whose overall performance shows satisfactory application and is close to demonstrating the required learning outcomes. Note that an assessment extension or a deferred examination is made in response to an application by the student, whereas a supplementary assessment or examination is decided by the Board of Examiners on the basis of the student's performance in a subject.

A deferred exam is only available when a student is unable to attend the exam due to compassionate and compelling circumstances. A student should only attend an exam if they are fit to undertake it.

Where a deferred exam is granted, the final grade for the subject will be dependent on the mark gained in the deferred exam and marks of other assessments in the subject. Where a supplementary exam or assessment is granted, students who pass the supplementary assessment or exam will receive a 50% pass grade for the subject (regardless of the actual mark gained in the supplementary assessment or exam).

In assessing a request for an assessment extension or a deferred exam, KOI will take into account the information provided, the severity of the event or circumstance, the student's performance on other items of assessment in the subject, class attendance and the student's history of previous applications for special consideration. Supplementary assessment will not usually be offered unless the student has achieved 40% in the final exam or the major assessment task and 40% of total marks of the subject. Attendance for the tutorial classes will also be taken into consideration.

The application must show that there are exceptional circumstances that prevent the student from submitting the assignment or attending the exam on the due date. Examples of the types of circumstances which may be considered include:

- Serious illness or psychological condition, for example, hospital admission, serious injury, severe asthma, severe anxiety or depression;
- Serious family issues (for example injury, illness or bereavement);
- Hardship/trauma, for example victim of crime or severe disruption to domestic arrangements or financial hardship arising from a substantial change in circumstances outside the student's control;
- Technological problems which could not be anticipated or avoided;
- Sporting or cultural commitments where a student has been selected through a formal process to participate in a major event.

The supporting evidence must confirm the serious nature of the circumstances and explain why it was not possible to submit the assignment or attend the exam as scheduled.

If students miss a mid-trimester or final exam there is **NO GUARANTEE** they will be offered a deferred exam. Students will **NOT** normally be granted a deferred exam on the grounds that they



mistook the time, date or place of an examination, or that they made arrangements to be elsewhere at that time; for example, had booked plane tickets.

Routine work, sport, social and travel commitments **DO NOT** usually constitute acceptable reasons for assessment extensions, or the granting of supplementary or deferred assessments or exams.

Difficulties adjusting to the demands of study, anxiety associated with exams, misreading the timetable or assignment instructions and difficulties that could reasonably have been anticipated **DO NOT** usually constitute acceptable reasons for assignment extensions or granting supplementary or deferred assessments or exams.

Illnesses must be sufficiently serious to affect a student's capacity to study, sit an exam, or complete an assessment task as judged by a medical practitioner or health practitioner – minor temporary ailments such as colds and headaches **DO NOT** usually constitute acceptable reasons for assessment extensions, or the granting of supplementary or deferred assessments or exams.

Applications for an assessment extension or a deferred examination must be made by completing the Assignment Extension / Exam Deferment Form available on the KOI website or via Student Portal as soon as possible but no later than three days after the assignment due date or the exam date. The application must be accompanied by detailed supporting evidence and documentation as outlined in the form, within the timeframes specified by KOI. Supporting evidence may include, but is not limited to:

- a correctly detailed medical certificate – this needs to be signed and stamped by the medical practitioner;
- a police report;
- a technician's report on problems with computer or communications technology;
- a statutory declaration correctly signed and witnessed;
- a note regarding public transport issues signed and dated by a relevant officer from a public transport organisation.

The outcome of such applications will be dependent on the circumstances and the evidence provided. **There is no guarantee of extensions, or supplementary or deferred exams.** A student who is not satisfied with a decision may seek a review under the *Complaints and Appeals Policy*.

7.1 Review of grade

Students may request a review of an assessment mark or subject grade if they believe the outcome is not a fair result in terms of the assessment criteria, or they believe there has been an error in the marking. The outcome of a successful review of grade appeal may be either a change of grade or an opportunity for supplementary assessment.

7.2 Supplementary and deferred exams

These exams are held in the Supplementary Exam period (following end-of-trimester exams) for students who meet the following criteria:

- students who have a Deferred Exam approved as a result of an Application for Deferred Exam – Medical or Non-Medical;
- students who fail a subject, were close to passing, and have received and accepted an offer of a Supplementary Exam (solely at the discretion of the Board of Examiners as explained earlier in this section).

Supplementary exams may also be offered in the period following mid-trimester exams.

Students who are offered a Supplementary or Deferred Exam are contacted by the Academic Services team by email to their **KOI email address** with the details of the date, time and location of the exam.

There will be **ONLY ONE** Supplementary or Deferred Exam offered each trimester for each subject. **Students who do not sit the Supplementary or Deferred Exam as offered will not be offered a further supplementary exam, regardless of the reason.**

7.3 Supplementary assessment



A supplementary assessment is occasionally offered to students to provide a final opportunity to demonstrate successful achievement of the major learning outcomes of a subject. **Supplementary assessments are only offered at the discretion of the Board of Examiners.** The offer is determined based on a student's academic and attendance history.

Students are advised of an offer of a supplementary assessment by email to their **KOI student email address** with the details of the time and due date for the supplementary assessment.

7.4 Marking of supplementary and deferred assessments / exams

Setting and marking supplementary and deferred assessment / exams is the responsibility of the Subject Coordinator. Marks and recommendations for change of grade, where appropriate, are submitted to the Vice-President (Academic) for review and recommendation to the Board of Examiners.

- Deferred Assessments and Exams – the final grade for the subject will be dependent on the mark gained in the assessment or exam which replaces the mark on the original assessment or exam;
- Supplementary Assessments and Exams
 - Students who pass the Supplementary Assessment or Exam will receive a 50% pass grade for the subject regardless of the actual mark gained in the Supplementary Assessment or Exam;
 - Students who fail the Supplementary Assessment or Exam will fail the subject.

8. Assessment appeals policy

Students of KOI may request a review of an assessment mark or subject grade if they believe the outcome is not a fair result in terms of the assessment criteria, or they believe there has been an error in the marking.

8.1 Grounds for appeal

Students may lodge an appeal for an assessment mark or subject grade if they have reason to believe that:

- a. the Subject Coordinator did not provide a Subject Outline as required;
- b. the assessment requirements as specified in the Subject Outline were varied in an unreasonable way;
- c. assessment requirements specified in the Subject Outline were unreasonably or prejudicially applied to the student;
- d. a student is of the view that a clerical error has occurred in the computation of the grade;
- e. due regard has not been paid to the evidence of illness or misadventure (that was previously provided to KOI), as part of an *Application for Assignment Extension or Deferred Exam – Medical Reasons* or an *Application for Assignment Extension or Deferred Exam - Non-Medical Reasons*.
- f. *the outcomes of the Review of Grade are not satisfactory.*

The following appeals will not be considered:

- a. verbal appeals;
- b. group appeals or appeals in the form of petitions (with the exception of a group relating to a group assessment);
- c. an appeal by a student who is not properly enrolled, for example, because of non-payment of fees;
- d. an appeal about a grade which is the result of disciplinary action taken under any relevant KOI Policy.

The following are not sufficient grounds on their own for appeals:

- a. a comparison with the result for another student;
- b. belief by a student that the mark is not commensurate with his or her effort;
- c. visa or residence status of a student;
- d. financial difficulties or employment prospects.



8.2 Assessment appeals process

Appeals under this policy are handled in 3 stages: informal process, formal process and external review procedures. Stages 1 and 2 are free of charge. External Review may attract some charges on the part of the External Reviewer as determined by the external agency.

Stage 1 - Informal process

For appeals against assessments in a subject, including the outcomes of final exams, the student should first approach the subject coordinator informally

- for assessments - within 5 working days of the return of the assessment,
- for subject final grades and final exams - at the KOI organised *Final Exam Review Day* (date(s) will be published in Moodle and on notice boards or sent via email).

to discuss the assessment results. At that stage it can be established that arithmetical marks have been calculated correctly and that any other academic issue has been discussed.

It is anticipated that the majority of student concerns will be satisfied at this stage. Where a change of grade is warranted, the lecturer/subject coordinator will make a recommendation for approval by the Vice-President (Academic).

Stage 2 - Formal process

If the outcome of the informal stage does not satisfy the student, the student may lodge a formal appeal. Appeal for assessment results and grade will not be considered unless the student has first contacted the subject coordinator to discuss the result under the informal process.

To lodge formal appeal, the student must complete the Complaints and Appeals form available on KOI website, providing any documentary evidence available, and clearly stating the grounds for appeal (see 8.1 Grounds for Appeal above). The form is to be submitted to KOI Reception by hand or emailed to academic@koi.edu.au. The appeal must be made within 10 working days of the return of an assessment, or within 5 working days of the Final Exam Review Day.

The Vice-President (Academic) will review all relevant documentation and may discuss the matter with the academic(s) involved and the student. The Vice-President (Academic) will make a decision on the appeal, based on the evidence. The outcome of the review will be communicated to the student in writing, and a copy added to the student's file.

If the student is not satisfied with the appeal outcomes, he/she can escalate the matter to CEO and President for further consideration.

Stage 3 – External review

If the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome after going through internal form process, he/she may pursue the matter under the external review provisions in the *Complaints and Appeals Policy*, which contains details relating to external appeals.

9. Detection and reporting of academic integrity breaches

Plagiarism and other forms of academic integrity breaches are not tolerated by KOI. The Student Academic Integrity Policy and Student Academic Integrity Procedure provide definitions, roles, responsibilities, and procedure for handling academic integrity breaches. It is important that all academic staff are familiar with this policy & the procedure and understand the steps to take when plagiarism or other forms of academic integrity breaches are suspected. Academic staff and exam invigilators must report where they believe a case of academic integrity breach has occurred.

It is also vital that students are alerted to their responsibilities under the KOI *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and the *Student Code of Conduct*, especially in their first year of study. All students are required to take and gain 100% competence on the *Academic Integrity Module* via Moodle during the first four weeks of their first trimester.

Students will be inducted in academic conventions and KOI values regarding academic integrity at their compulsory Orientation Session. Students are provided with advice and guidance on academic



integrity conventions and techniques in Moodle. Subject Coordinators should be alert to opportunities in the design of assessment tasks to discourage academic integrity breaches and make such breaches more difficult.

10. Inclusive and equitable assessment

Some assessment modes or designs may unfairly privilege or disadvantage some students. All reasonable efforts should be made by Subject Coordinators to ensure that assessment tasks are designed to be contextually relevant and culturally inclusive, and to avoid bias or other unintended negative outcomes resulting from poor assessment design. Particular account should be taken of student diversity, including international student cohorts from non-English speaking backgrounds.

Students with identified disabilities or special needs can request assessment tasks to be modified to ensure equal access and opportunity. KOI will endeavour to satisfy any such reasonable requests.

11. KOI Board of Examiners

The KOI Board of Examiners will meet to consider the grades recommended by the Subject Coordinators for each student within two weeks of the final exam each trimester. Prior to accepting, amending or rejecting grades, the Board of Examiners will ensure quality in assessment practices in accordance with this policy. The Board may also investigate the handling of issues such as students at academic risk, students with language difficulties, unforeseen assessment events, moderation activities, benchmarking of standards and progression, completion and attrition rates.

Procedures for meetings of the Board of Examiners require Heads of Program and Subject Coordinators to:

- ensure that all available grades are submitted in the required format through electronic means by the notified date;
- attend the relevant Board of Examiners meeting if requested and be prepared to respond to any queries of the Board along with any proposed amendments to final grades.

12. Confidentiality and security

All reasonable effort will be made by staff of KOI to ensure that the principles of privacy, confidentiality and security are maintained throughout the administration of student assessment. Particular care should be employed in relation to:

- the security of examination papers and student scripts;
- the confidentiality of assessment results;
- the prior permission of the student for any reproduction or use of assessment material beyond normal marking, feedback and review processes;
- access to grades and authority to disclose grades to students or any third party.

In matters of privacy and confidentiality in assessment, staff should be guided by KOI's *Privacy Policy* and the *Privacy Act 1988*, the *Privacy Amendment (Enhancing Privacy Protection) Act 2012* and the *Australian Privacy Principles (APPs)*.



Document Control

Policy title	Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy
Policy owner	Vice-President (Academic)
Policy approver	Academic Board
Version date	13 February 2025
Version Approved	Academic Board 6 August 2021; Academic Board 11 August 2023; Academic Board 7 February 2025
Date of next review	13 February 2027
Changes in this version	Section 4.3: added more perspectives of assessment design (including the impact of emerging trends and technological advancements); Section 7: provided better explanation of deferred exam and supplement exam process; Section 9: Replaced Academic Misconduct with Academic Integrity Breach and included latest policy and procedure for Academic Integrity, and Updated information in Appendixes and provided latest reference from TEQSA.

***** END OF POLICY *****



Appendix 1

Assessment Guidelines

These guidelines are to be read in conjunction with the Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy. The guidelines are intended to support the key principles of that policy:

- Assessment should guide and encourage effective approaches to learning.
- Assessment tasks of a subject should provide students with opportunities to have appropriate, authentic engagement with Artificial Intelligence tools and learn the skills of using Artificial intelligence properly and ethically.
- Assessment tasks of a subject should involve both individual tasks and team/group work.
- Assessment should validly and reliably measure expected the course and subject learning outcomes, in particular the higher-order learning (applying analyzing, evaluating and creating)¹ that characterises higher education.
- The choice of assessment tasks should allow all students to demonstrate their achievement of the course and subject learning outcomes, with a variety of assessment types across the course to cater to different learning styles.
- Assessment provides feedback to students on their learning and is the basis by which their academic achievements are judged and certified. Academic standards and the rigour of courses are central to KOI's assessment schemes and processes.
- Constructive, timely and relevant feedback will be provided for all assessments except the final exams, normally within 10 working days of the assessment due date. Feedback should allow students to understand where and why they have or have not satisfied the marking criteria and provide guidance for improvement.

All assessment tasks should be fully documented in the subject outline and should not rely on supplementary details and marking guides on Moodle. All subject outlines must provide the following information for each item of assessment:

- Purpose of the assessment, subject learning outcomes designed to test and contribute to the course learning outcomes and KOI graduate attributes appropriate to the level of the subject
- Topic and type of assessment (essay, project, examination, oral presentation, etc.)
- Length or duration of the item (in terms of words, pages, time, etc.)
- Due date (that is, the day, date and time) for the submission of the assessment
- Percentage weighting of the assessment item
- Marking criteria (e.g., rubric, model answers).

At least the major assessment tasks should vary significantly from one offering of a subject to the next. The way in which this is achieved will depend on the type of assessment. For example:

- Essay questions should be on significantly different aspects of a topic
- Case studies should include significantly different questions
- Analysis of financial statements should include some significantly different questions as well as changes to the numbers.

There will be some exceptions to the general rule. For example:

- Capstone projects and research projects may follow the same general framework from one trimester to the next.

Assessment strategies, based on these guidelines, will be part of the induction briefing for new staff and assessment issues will be part of the regular discussion sessions for academic staff. Heads of Program have a particular responsibility to monitor assessment setting and outcomes.

Assessment Workload and Weighting

Subjects should usually have a minimum of three and a maximum of five pieces of assessment. This will consist of various assessment tasks during the trimester and, in most cases, a final exam. For this purpose, assessment tasks carrying a low weight, such as weekly tutorial participation or weekly homework exercises or a series on online quizzes are counted as one piece of assessment.

As a guide, the standard amount of assessment in a subject is as follows:



- undergraduate 4 credit point subjects have a total assessment of 4,000 words or equivalent
- postgraduate 4 credit point subjects have a total assessment of 5,000 words or equivalent

and pro rata for other credit point values. Variations of plus or minus 500 words are acceptable. Generally accepted equivalences (based on guidance from the University of Melbourne) are:

- 1 hour of examination = 1,000 words;
- 10 minutes of individual oral presentation = 1,000 words;
- 20 minutes of group presentation by a 3-person group = 1,000 words.

Group presentations and assignments are more difficult to quantify and the size of the group should be taken into account. However, it is generally accepted that the individuals working in a group would do more work in total than they would if completing the task alone.

The percentage weighting given to items of assessment reflects three things:

- the length;
- the amount of work expected to complete it satisfactorily;
- its importance in assessing mastery of the material in the subject.

Where the weighting of assessment items is not proportional to their length, a justification for the weighting must be provided when the subject outline is submitted for approval (see the Subject Outline Policy).

KOI adopts a model of continuous assessment where formative and summative assessments are integrated in tasks completed over the trimester. Subject assessment design should ensure that students are provided with sufficient opportunity for formative feedback on their progress towards the learning outcomes during the teaching period.

An assignment contributing a small component of the total mark is usually included in the first four weeks of core first year subjects.² The intention is that this assessment task will be submitted, marked and returned to the student within the first six weeks. The purpose is to provide students with an incentive to engage with the subject and early feedback in preparation for the later assessment tasks. Since many students receive advanced standing, this requirement applies to core subjects in the first three trimesters of the recommended sequence of subjects.

Given the importance of some form of assessment in the early part of the trimester, the assessment design and work expected should be explained in the weekly planner in the subject outline. Feedback to students so that they can judge their progress is critical. The weekly planner should indicate how this is done, for example, by discussion of homework in tutorials, or online quiz with immediate feedback.

All subjects must usually contain one significant assessment task (weighted at least 20% of the total marks) to be submitted in the second half of the trimester. In this assessment task, students will be expected to research, analyse information, solve problems and/or make recommendations based on a significant element of the subject content. Students should be required to present their responses in a professional manner and presentation should contribute to the marking criteria. This significant piece of assessment may be individual or group work and is in addition to any final exam. Where such an assessment task is not included, a justification for the assessment strategy must be provided when the subject outline is submitted for approval.

Quality assurance of exams and major assessment tasks

All exams and assessment material must be proofread for accuracy, clarity, validity, reliability and ease of reading. Exam papers must be verified by another subject expert. The exam cover sheet should be completed and signed by the exam setter and the exam checker (see Appendix 2 Examination Preparation Procedure).

Wording used in all assessments must be clear and unambiguous and not simply a test of the student's proficiency in English. Complex wording, jargon and colloquialisms should be avoided. Students are,

¹ See, for example, Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive skills.

² The purpose of such low weight assignments is to provide students with an indication of their performance at an early stage and give them an opportunity to improve their performance prior to receiving a final grade



however, expected to know the specific terminology of the subject.

Types of assessment

Tutorial participation and homework for presentation in tutorials: no more than 10% weighting.

These tasks are usually intended as formative assessment and should be constructive activities designed to reinforce subject content and allow students to practise their skills and apply their knowledge.

The allocation of marks must be clearly stated and relate to the learning activities and quality of work rather than a student's presence in class. Careful records of mark allocation must be kept, as these may be required in cases of review of grade requests. In addition, copies of some marked examples should be made for the purposes of moderation of assessment.

Attendance is important, but marks should not be awarded purely for attendance.

Assignments. All assignments should be fully documented in the subject outline and should not rely on supplementary details and marking guides on Moodle.

Online quizzes/class quizzes: no more than 15% weighting in total.

These tasks are also usually intended as practice. Randomised questions drawn from an extensive pool may be useful and a way of helping students to learn. 'True/false' and 'missing word' questions should be avoided. The validity of multiple-choice questions should be carefully tested by the examiner when they are used in summative assessment.

Mid-trimester tests: no more than 25% weighting.

These tests will be invigilated and the duration will be one hour or one and a half hours.

Final exams: weighting 40-50%

Exams will be invigilated and the duration will be two hours, two and a half hours or three hours (with 10 minutes additional reading time).

Most subjects will have a final exam which tests the majority of the subject learning outcomes and is based on the material covered throughout the subject. Subjects without a final exam are expected to have a major assessment task which tests the majority of the subject learning outcomes and is based on the material covered throughout the subject. Care must be taken to ensure that the assessment measures the work of the individual student and that there are safeguards to minimise the risk of cheating.

Questions must relate to material covered during the trimester of enrolment. Where appropriate, students will be permitted to bring reference books to exams, so that exams are not a test of memory but of understanding. For the same reason, required formulae will usually be included in the exam paper.

Sample exam papers or typical exam questions must be made available by week 10 of the trimester and discussed in class to help students in their preparation.

Mid-trimester tests and final exams should be designed to test knowledge, use problem solving or analytical skills and/or apply theory to practical situations, with a mix of multiple-choice questions, short answer questions, problem questions requiring calculations or analysis, and/or extended answer questions requiring the analysis of specific situations. Questions should generally range from basic standard knowledge questions to more challenging questions. 'True/false' and 'missing word' questions should be avoided. Multiple-choice questions, if used, should be carefully researched and must not constitute the whole test.

The allocation of marks must be shown on the test paper. A marking guide with suggested answers and allocation of marks must be prepared. Model answers may be useful if there is more than one marker.

The placement of questions in the exam paper needs to be carefully considered. There is some research³ to suggest that students, when presented with more difficult questions first, tend to do less well than if

³ Compare the comments from the Pew Research Centre on Questionnaire Design
<https://www.pewresearch.org/methods/u-s-survey-research/questionnaire-design/>



presented with the same paper, but with easier questions at the beginning, even though the same questions appear in both versions.

Group work. Group work should carry no more than 30% weighting, unless a specific exemption has been approved by the Academic Board. A higher weight is likely to be appropriate for a major project when this is the purpose of the subject (e.g., ACS recommendations for undergraduate and postgraduate IT project units).

The assessment requirements associated with a group task should include a component which measures the contribution of each individual in the group. For example, the individual contribution could be assessed through an individual reflective journal, an individual presentation, a log of contributions to group meetings or carefully moderated feedback from the group members.

The general expectation is to have 3-4 students per group.

The purpose of group work should be carefully considered to make the most of opportunities for peer learning and to develop team skills. The relevance of the task should be explained to students. Assessment protocols should ensure that grades properly reflect the level of performance of each student. See the report on "Assessing group work" in the list of references.

Minimising opportunities for academic integrity breaches

All subject outlines contain references to academic integrity and the dangers of academic integrity breaches. Lecturers should take some time at the beginning of the subject to teach students about authorship conventions and how to avoid academic integrity breaches and explain the value of Turnitin and Turnitin reports.

Academic integrity breaches can be minimised if expectations are made clear to students at the outset, assessments are carefully designed and plagiarism is visibly monitored and reported.

Variations from the guidelines

In circumstances where Subject Coordinators feel that their particular subject requires variation from these guidelines, they should contact the Vice-President (Academic) as early as possible, so that the assessment design can be considered and approved in sufficient time before the beginning of the trimester.

Major variations will require the approval of the Academic Board.

References and Further Readings

Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency

<https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/corporate-publications/assessment-reform-age-artificial-intelligence>

Assessment and feedback. Resources on assessment, Centre for the Study of Higher Education
<http://melbourne-cshe.unimelb.edu.au/resources/assessment>

"Assessing group work", UTS <https://www.uts.edu.au/research-and-teaching/learning-and-teaching/assessment/assessing-group-work>

"Preventing plagiarism", University of Technology Sydney
<https://www.uts.edu.au/sites/default/files/plagiarism.pdf>

"Multiple choice questions", University of Technology, Sydney <http://www.uts.edu.au/research-and-teaching/teaching-and-learning/assessment/types-assessment/multiple-choice-questions>



Appendix 2

Examination Preparation Procedure

Subject Name	
Subject Coordinator and signature	
Duration of exam	
Name of Academic Reviewer/Assessor and signature	

Prior to completing this form it is a requirement that the Academic Reviewer will have evaluated the assessment by thoroughly appraising the questions, solutions and assessment rubrics or marking guides. The Reviewer should be familiar with the content of the **subject outline** and any other relevant material

Criteria to be considered by the Academic Reviewer:

- ☐ The degree of difficulty and complexity is consistent with exercises on the topics set during the trimester
- ☐ The Examiner has adequately reflected the **Subject Learning Outcomes** in both the exam and the assessment rubric/marking guide
- ☐ Marks are shown for all questions and parts of questions.
- ☐ The questions are clearly stated in a plain English and understandable and free from ambiguity and error.
- ☐ Taking into account the reading time for the questions, the allotment of marks is consistent with estimated time to complete
- ☐ The aids (if any) are appropriate.

Having reviewed this paper I am satisfied that:

- ☐ The paper meets all of the above criteria
- ☐ The paper complies with KOI's Assessment Guidelines
- ☐ The assessment rubric or marking guide is sufficiently comprehensive to ensure consistency of marking
- ☐ The examination can be completed in the time allowed
- ☐ The electronic examination cover sheet and examination information sheet are correct and have all essential information
- ☐ Any special instructions are clear, correct and consistent with the requirements of the questions.

Signature of the Head of Program.....

Please note that exams will not be printed before this report is signed off by the Head of Program.