

1. Purpose

- 1.1 The Assessment, Grades, Results, and Moderation Policy and Procedure at Central Australian Institute of Technology Higher Education (CAIT Hi-Ed) is designed to ensure consistency, transparency, and fairness in the assessment and reporting of student performance. By establishing clear guidelines for conducting assessments, assigning grades, recording results, and communicating them to stakeholders, this policy promotes uniformity, prevents bias, and upholds the integrity of the academic process.
- 1.2 Additionally, it ensures compliance with educational standards while supporting quality assurance through valid and reliable assessment practices. Transparency is a key benefit, as the policy clearly outlines expectations, procedures, and the alignment of assessments with learning outcomes to enhance student learning and development. Furthermore, it provides a structured framework for addressing disputes, appeals, or corrections related to grades, fostering trust and confidence in the evaluation system while promoting continuous improvement in academic practices.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This Policy and Procedure applies to all staff and enrolled students involved in formative and summative assessments across all courses at CAIT Hi-Ed. It applies to students undertaking assessments, teaching staff responsible for conducting and grading assessments, and administrative staff managing academic records. By ensuring that all parties adhere to consistent standards and procedures for assessment, grading, reporting, and issue resolution, this policy maintains fairness, transparency, and integrity in the academic process.

3. Policy

- 3.1 This Policy and Procedure ensures a fair, transparent, and consistent approach to evaluating, recording, and communicating student performance across all programs. This policy establishes clear principles and practices for the development, implementation, and review of assessments, aligning them with educational outcomes, institutional standards, and regulatory requirements.
- 3.2 It also defines the responsibilities of students, teaching staff, and administrative personnel in maintaining academic integrity, promoting equity, and supporting student learning and development. By adhering to this framework, CAIT Hi-Ed upholds the credibility of its assessment and grading processes while fostering trust in the academic system.

4. Principles

- 4.1 Assessments and grading are impartial, free from bias or discrimination, and provide all students with equal opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge and skills while accommodating diverse learning needs.
- 4.2 Assessments are designed to accurately measure intended learning outcomes, reflect required knowledge and skills, and maintain standardised, stable grading procedures that ensure consistent results over time.
- 4.3 Students receive clear guidelines on assessment criteria, grading methods, and expectations, fostering confidence in the evaluation process and ensuring access to results, clarifications, and appeals.
- 4.4 Assessment processes align with Academic Integrity policies to prevent misconduct, define responsibilities for teaching and administrative staff, and comply with institutional, accreditation, and regulatory standards.
- 4.5 Students receive timely, meaningful feedback to support learning and development, while assessment and grading practices undergo regular review to enhance quality, effectiveness, and relevance.

4.6 Student records and academic results are protected to maintain confidentiality and ensure secure handling of academic data.

5. Assessment Procedure

5.1 Assessment Design

5.1.1 Assessments at CAIT Hi-Ed will be closely aligned with both subject and course learning outcomes. Each assessment will have a clear, evidence-based rationale that supports its role in enabling students to demonstrate their understanding and skills. Additionally, assessments will be relevant to real-world situations within the discipline, providing students with practical and authentic learning experiences that bridge the gap between theory and practice.

5.1.2 Assessment tasks will be designed to be inclusive, ensuring that all students, regardless of gender, age, cultural background, or other identity factors, are able to fully participate. The resources required for completing assessments will be accessible to all students. Furthermore, tasks will be clearly worded, unambiguous, and accompanied by a transparent marking scheme or rubric. Reasonable adjustments will be made for students with documented disabilities or impairments, aligning with the CAIT Hi-Ed Reasonable Adjustment Policy, to ensure that assessments are fair and equitable.

5.1.3 The weighting of tasks will be proportionate to their importance in achieving learning outcomes. Subjects will typically include between two and four assessment tasks, with each task weighted between 10% and 50% of the total subject marks. The maximum allowable weighting for an end-of-semester examination will be 40%, though exceptions may be made for professional accreditation requirements. Additionally, the overall assessment workload will be balanced to support student success, taking into account the number of credit points, contact and non-contact study hours, and the complexity of tasks. This balance will be essential in managing both student and staff workloads effectively.

5.1.4 Assessment design will incorporate a feedback framework that supports student learning and improvement. To maximize the formative function of assessments, at least one graded task will be administered early in the study period, ideally before the census date, to provide timely and meaningful feedback. Subsequent assessments will be spaced throughout the study period to avoid clustering and ensure manageable workloads. Continuous review and renewal of assessment tasks will be necessary to maintain academic integrity and relevance.

5.1.5 When group tasks are used in assessments, they will be aligned with the learning outcomes, ensuring that each student can demonstrate their achievement. To maintain individual accountability, at least 70% of the total available marks in a unit will be attributable to individual performance, even when group tasks are included. Group tasks will be carefully structured to allow all members to contribute meaningfully and to ensure fairness in the assessment process.

5.1.6 Hurdle assessments, which require students to meet a minimum standard to pass a unit, will be clearly specified in the Unit Guide and used only for critical purposes such as assurance of learning, accreditation, or academic integrity. Students who fail a hurdle assessment after making a serious first attempt will be given one additional opportunity to meet the requirement. Supplementary assessments will only be offered under specific conditions, such as when a hurdle requirement is not met or when special consideration has been granted, and will closely resemble the original task to ensure consistency in assessing learning outcomes.

5.1.7 Moderation will play a critical role in ensuring that assessments are reliable and consistently measure student learning. This process will occur at all stages of the assessment lifecycle, from design to grading, to ensure that assessment criteria and standards are aligned with the intended learning outcomes and are understood by both students and staff. Assessment tasks will be standards-based, with explicit criteria detailed in a marking rubric provided to students before the unit begins. Marks and grades will be awarded based solely on merit and achievement, avoiding the use of normative distributions.

5.2 Assessment Communication

5.2.1 Assessments will be communicated to students through a structured and multi-faceted approach to ensure clarity, consistency, and transparency throughout the course.

5.2.2 All details related to assessments will be made available on Learning Management System (LMS) used at CAIT Hi-Ed, the primary online learning platform. This will include descriptions of the assessment tasks, relevant learning resources, rubrics, marking criteria, performance standards, and due dates.

5.2.3 Unit Assessors will be responsible for publishing this information at least seven days before the start of the relevant Study Period. This early availability will allow students to understand the expectations and plan their workload accordingly.

5.2.4 The assessment details on LMS will be consistent with those listed on the CAIT Hi-Ed's unit web page. This will ensure that students receive the same information across all official channels, reducing confusion and discrepancies.

5.2.5 If there are any changes to the type, timing, or weighting of assessment tasks after the Study Period has begun, these changes will only be made under exceptional circumstances.

5.2.6 Such changes will require approval from the Academic Dean and will be promptly communicated to students through multiple channels:

- An additional notice will be posted on the unit's LMS site.
- An email will be sent to the unit's student email list to ensure all students are aware of the changes.

5.2.7 In cases where delays are unavoidable due to Compassionate and Compelling Circumstances, students will be notified as soon as possible, and appropriate allowances will be made.

5.3 Assessment Submission

5.3.1 Students will be required to submit all text-based assessment tasks electronically via the CAIT Hi-Ed's LMS and through Turnitin or any other plagiarism checker, unless explicitly waived due to the nature of the assessment task.

5.3.2 Students must include the final Similarity Report from Turnitin or an approved plagiarism checker in their submission. Submission in unapproved formats will result in a zero (0) mark and a Fail grade.

5.3.3 The submission deadline for assessments will be set at 11:55 pm on the due date, unless otherwise specified by the unit coordinator. This deadline will follow Australian Eastern Daylight Time (AEDT) during daylight saving months.

5.3.4 All assessment tasks worth 20% or more will need to be archived for benchmarking, calibration, or grade review for six months unless otherwise approved.

5.3.5 If an assessment item is submitted after the due date without an approved extension or mitigating circumstances, a penalty of 10% of the total mark for the assessment item will be applied for each business day it is late, up to ten days.

5.3.6 After ten days, the assessment will receive a mark of zero (0).

5.3.7 Penalties will be applied consistently and equitably. Students will need to apply for Special Consideration if serious and unavoidable circumstances affect their ability to submit on time.

5.3.8 Late submissions will not be accepted once the marked assessments have been returned to students who submitted on time.

5.3.9 Supplementary assessments may be offered in cases of failed units under specific conditions.

5.3.10 Extensions due to mitigating circumstances will be granted at the discretion of the Academic Dean, and applications will need to include all work done up to that point. Requests made within three days of the due date will be unlikely to be granted.

5.3.11 Extensions must be applied for before the assignment is due, and the new due date will be subject to late penalties if missed.

5.3.12 Students whose ability to submit or attend an assessment is affected by sickness, misadventure, or other circumstances beyond their control will be able to apply for Special Consideration.

5.3.13 Applications will need to be submitted within two days of the assessment due date. Late applications may be accepted under exceptional circumstances.

5.3.14 Outcomes may include additional or supplementary assessments, discontinuation without failure, or other decisions as determined by the Academic Dean.

5.4 Assessment Marking and Feedback

5.4.1 Academic staff will assess each piece of student work against established marking criteria and rubrics, remaining vigilant against implicit and explicit biases.

5.4.2 Grading will be consistent across the Institute, using rubrics developed during the design of the assessment to ensure alignment with the grading descriptors and stated assessment criteria.

5.4.3 Mechanisms like de-identification of students' work will be employed wherever possible to reduce or eliminate bias in marking and providing feedback.

5.4.4 Feedback will be an integral part of the assessment process, and it will be communicated to students in a timely manner. Marked assessments, except for examination scripts, will be returned to students within 14 days of submission, ensuring that students receive feedback before the next assessment is due.

5.4.5 For final assessments (excluding capstone subjects), marks and feedback will typically be provided to students within 7 calendar days of the last day of the term in which the subject was taught.

5.4.6 In the case of capstone subjects assessed through substantial written projects (15,000 words or more), marks and feedback will usually be given within 28 calendar days of the last day of the term.

5.4.7 Graded assessment tasks and marks will be returned to students via the LMS.

5.4.8 Students will generally receive a mark and grade level for each assessment item, along with an overall grade reflecting the sum of marks for all assessment items in the unit.

5.4.9 Grades and/or marks for all individual assessment tasks will be released to students. If a grade is provided without a mark, feedback will be given to help students understand their performance within the grade range.

5.4.10 Grades and/or marks for tasks conducted within a session will be released before tasks undertaken during the examination period, where possible.

5.4.11 Grades and/or marks for tasks conducted during the final examination period will be released to students before the finalization of unit marks for ratification, wherever possible.

5.4.12 After all assessments are completed, reviewed, and approved by the Board of Examiners, the overall mark and subject grade will be published and notified to students.

5.5 Supplementary Assessment

5.5.1 Supplementary assessments will be granted at the discretion of the Board of Examiners to students who have scored between 45% and 49% in a unit of study, provided they have made all reasonable efforts to submit all required assessments and have completed all examinations for that unit. The specifics of the supplementary assessment, including its format, length, and due date, will be decided by the Board of Examiners.

- 5.5.2 If a student passes the supplementary assessment, their final mark for the unit will be adjusted to a 50% (Pass), with a PS notation for the grade as per the Award of Grades Policy. Should the student fail the supplementary assessment, the original fail mark for the unit will be maintained.
- 5.5.3 A student may receive supplementary assessments for up to two failed units in a two-year course or three failed units in a three-year course. Supplementary assessments will, where feasible, be designed by the original assessor or unit coordinator to evaluate the same skills and knowledge as the original assessment.
- 5.5.4 If the supplementary assessment is in the form of an exam, the Academic Registrar will notify the student of the date, time, and location at least five working days in advance via their institute email account.

6. Grades and Results

6.1 Grades

- 6.1.1 Grades at CAIT Hi-Ed will represent the assessment of a student's performance in individual academic tasks, such as assignments, exams, or projects. They will provide a quantitative or qualitative measure of how well students have met the learning outcomes set for a specific course or assessment. Grades will be expressed using a scale, such as letter grades (e.g., High Distinction, Distinction, Credit, Pass, Fail) or numerical scores (refer to Appendix 1). These grades will reflect the level of achievement, with higher grades indicating a better understanding of the material and stronger performance. Grading criteria will be communicated clearly to students before assessments, ensuring transparency and consistency in how work is evaluated.

6.2 Results

- 6.2.1 Results at CAIT Hi-Ed will refer to the overall academic outcomes of a student, typically at the conclusion of a course or program. Unlike individual grades, which measure performance in specific assessments, results will provide a summary of the student's overall academic progress and achievements. This can include the final grade for a course, program completion status, or pass/fail outcomes. Results will be communicated to students at the end of a term or academic program and will be used to determine academic progression, eligibility for awards, or the completion of qualification requirements. Results will be essential for students to understand their academic standing and plan their next steps in their education or career.

7. Grading Components

7.1 Assessment Types

- **Assignments:** Evaluated based on criteria such as content accuracy, research depth, and presentation quality.
- **Examinations:** Typically account for a significant percentage of the final grade, focusing on theoretical knowledge or practical skills.
- **Projects:** May include group or individual work with grading based on innovation, execution, and relevance.
- **Practical Assessments:** Especially in technical or hands-on courses, practical tasks are graded on efficiency, accuracy, and adherence to guidelines.
- **Participation and Engagement:** Class participation, discussions, or online engagement might also contribute.

7.2 Weighting

- Each component of the course will contribute a specific percentage toward the final grade (e.g., Assignments 30%, Final Exam 50%, Participation 20%).

8 Grade Point Average (GPA) Calculation

- 8.1 At CAIT Hi-Ed, the Grade Point Average (GPA) will serve as a key measure of academic performance, providing students and educators with a standardized metric to evaluate progress. The GPA will be calculated by assigning numerical values (See Appendix 1) to letter grades, such as High Distinction (HD), Distinction (D), Credit (C), and Pass (P), then weighting these values by the credit points of each course. This ensures that subjects with higher workloads or importance within the curriculum will have a greater impact on the overall GPA.
- 8.2 CAIT Hi-Ed will implement a scale, ranging from 0.0 to 4.0 against the grades (GPs) and a unit will be allocated 6 credit points (CPs). The system will allow students to monitor their academic standing, ensuring they meet the thresholds required for successful program completion. The GPA will be recalculated at the end of each term, reflecting the most recent academic achievements. Student's GPA will be recorded on their final official academic transcript.
- 8.3 The GPA at CAIT Hi-Ed will play an integral role in academic and career progression. By offering a transparent and reliable assessment of performance, it will help students identify areas for improvement while enabling educators to provide targeted support. Additionally, it will be a critical factor in admissions for advanced study programs and may influence employment opportunities for graduates, positioning CAIT Hi-Ed students for future success.
- 8.4 A student's GPA is calculated as a weighted average of grades earned in completed course. The GPA calculation formula is as follows:

$$GPA = \frac{\sum(GPs \times CPs)}{\sum(CPs)}$$

8.5 Example:

Units	Grade	Grade Points	Credit Points	GPs x CPs
ECE70101	HD	4	6	24
ECE70102	D	3	6	18
ECE70103	C	2	6	12
SUM		18		54

$$GPA = \frac{54}{18} = 3$$

, Therefore, the GPA is 3.

9 Grades and Results Procedure

9.1 Assessment and Evaluation

- 9.1.1 Students will complete various assessments, such as assignments, exams, projects, or practical work, within the stipulated deadlines.
- 9.1.2 Lecturers or Tutors will evaluate these submissions using detailed rubrics or marking schemes to maintain consistency.

9.1.3 For quality assurance, grades may undergo a moderation process where multiple educators review the marking to ensure fairness and accuracy.

9.1.4 This document must be read in conjunction with the CAIT Hi-Ed Student Assessment Policy and Procedure to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the assessment processes, grading criteria, and student responsibilities.

9.2 Grade Compilation and Approval

9.2.1 Individual assessment scores will be combined, using predetermined weightings, to calculate the final grade for each subject.

9.2.2 Academic staff and department heads will review the compiled grades to identify discrepancies or inconsistencies.

9.2.3 Final results will be approved by an academic board or faculty committee before publication. This step ensures compliance with institutional policies and standards.

9.3 Publication of Results

9.3.1 Results will be published on the CAIT Hi-Ed's student portal or through official communication channels. Students will receive notifications once their results are available.

9.3.2 The report will typically include a breakdown of grades for each unit, overall GPA, and academic standing.

9.3.3 Students will log into a secure online system to view their results.

9.3.4 In some cases, official transcripts or hard copies may be provided upon request or for specific purposes, such as job applications.

9.4 Feedback and Consultation

9.4.1 Students will have access to feedback on their assessments to understand their performance and identify areas for improvement.

9.4.2 Students can consult with Lecturer and Tutors, if they have questions about their grades or need guidance on future study strategies.

9.5 Academic Progress and Certification

9.5.1 The results will determine if students meet the prerequisites to progress to the next stage of their program.

9.5.2 For final-year students, results will be used to confirm eligibility for graduation or certification.

9.5.3 Results will also affect a student's academic standing, such as maintaining good standing or addressing probation requirements.

9.6 Appeals and Disputes

9.6.1 After grading, final grades will be compiled and approved by the Board of Examiners. Results, including feedback and marks for individual assessments, will be published through the CAIT Hi-Ed's LMS or student portal, with students receiving formal notification via email or the portal. All final grades and assessment outcomes will be recorded in the CAIT Hi-Ed's Student Management System for administrative purposes and future reference.

9.6.2 Students will first need to approach their lecturer to discuss any concerns about their assessment decision. This initial discussion aims to clarify and potentially resolve issues directly with the lecturer.

9.6.3 If the issue remains unresolved after discussing with the lecturer, students will be able to request a formal review. This request must be made in writing using the appropriate form and will be

assessed by the Head of School within five working days from the notification of the assessment result.

- 9.6.4** Appeals against marks or grades for an assessment item or examination must be submitted within two days of receiving the results.
- 9.6.5** Appeals submitted after this deadline may still be considered if students can demonstrate they were unable to submit on time due to circumstances beyond their control. The decision to accept a late appeal will be made by the Academic Dean.
- 9.6.6** Students may appeal if learning outcomes or assessment tasks were not clearly defined in the unit material.
- 9.6.7** Appeals can also be based on failure to follow the outlined assessment procedures, issues with marking such as unmarked work, or inappropriate application of marking criteria.
- 9.6.8** Students may also appeal if they received wrongful advice from teaching staff regarding assessments or extensions.
- 9.6.9** Appeals against final grades will be considered on specific grounds, including administrative errors in grade calculation, incorrect application of Special Consideration outcomes, or unequal assessment conditions compared to the cohort.
- 9.6.10** If the informal resolution does not resolve the issue, students will need to submit a formal appeal using the Student Appeal Form within ten working days following the informal resolution meeting.
- 9.6.11** The Academic Dean will review the formal appeal and communicate the outcome within ten working days.
- 9.6.12** Students will have fifteen working days from the date of final grade publication to submit an appeal against their final grade.
- 9.6.13** Acceptable grounds for final grade appeals include clerical errors, improper application of Special Consideration, or inequitable assessment conditions.
- 9.6.14** Appeals related to final grades cannot be made if the final grade resulted from a finding under the Academic Integrity Policy.
- 9.6.15** The outcome of an appeal may result in no change, an increase, or a reduction in the awarded grade.
- 9.6.16** All documentation related to the appeal will be recorded and maintained in the Student Grievances Register.
- 9.6.17** If the appeal is not resolved internally, students will have the option to escalate the matter to the Appeals Committee or an external mediator for further review.

9.6.18 Students may refer to CAIT Hi-Ed Student Grievance and Appeals Policy and Procedure.

10 Validation and Moderation Procedure

10.1 Internal Validation Process

10.1.1 Initial Course Development

- The curriculum design will reflect current industry standards, including emerging pedagogical trends and regulatory frameworks.
- The course and program content will be aligned with national qualifications frameworks (Australian Qualifications Framework) and standards.

10.1.2 Pre-Delivery Validation

- Subject outlines will be reviewed by an internal team consisting of experienced educators, course coordinators, and, when possible, external advisors.
- Assessment tasks and teaching materials will be aligned with the program's learning outcomes and the needs.

10.1.3 Ongoing Validation and Review

- A comprehensive review will take place annually where all internal stakeholders (teaching staff, academic coordinators, and department heads) will meet to review the course's effectiveness in achieving learning outcomes.
- Regular collection of student feedback will inform the validation process, and help identify areas for improvement.
- Feedback on assessments' relevance, fairness, and alignment with learning objectives will be gathered and analysed.

10.2 External Validation Process

10.2.1 Accreditation by Professional Bodies

- The programs will be accredited by professional bodies, ensuring they meet the regulatory and industry standards.
- Regular reviews of professional standards will be conducted, and the curriculum will be aligned to reflect any changes in national guidelines and teaching frameworks.

10.2.2 External Expert Review

- External experts will be engaged annually to provide feedback on the curriculum, assessment strategies, and teaching methods. These experts may include academics from other institutions, industry professionals, and researchers.
- External reviews will evaluate:
 - ✓ Program objectives and learning outcomes.
 - ✓ Alignment with professional practices.
 - ✓ Relevance of course content to current industry needs.

10.2.3 Stakeholder Consultation

- External stakeholders, including industry partners, educators in practice, and employers, will be consulted periodically to ensure the program meets workforce needs and prepares students effectively for their professional roles.

10.2.4 Regular Benchmarking

- The program will be benchmarked against other Australian and international institutions offering similar qualifications to ensure competitive and current content delivery.

10.3 Internal Moderation Process

10.3.1 Internal Moderation of Assessments

- Regular moderation of assessment tasks will be conducted to ensure consistency in marking and fair application of assessment criteria.

- For larger programs, moderation between departments will take place to maintain consistency in educational quality.

10.3.2 Moderation of Results

- For significant assessments, a panel will be formed that includes course leaders, subject experts, and external stakeholders where applicable. The panel will review sample assessments and verify the standards.

10.3.3 Feedback Loop

- After moderation, feedback will be provided to faculty on potential areas for development, including assessment design, teaching strategies, or learning materials.

10.4 External Moderation Process

10.4.1 Independent Review of Assessment

- A panel of external academic experts and industry professionals will review a random sample of assessments and student work to ensure consistency and fairness in grading.
- External moderators will assess:
 - ✓ The appropriateness of assessment methods.
 - ✓ The fairness and clarity of rubrics.
 - ✓ The consistency of academic standards.

10.4.2 Industry Consultation

- Industry partners will be consulted periodically to gain feedback on the professional relevance of the program. This can include input on evolving trends, challenges, and the skills needed in the relevant field.

10.5 Reporting and Actioning Feedback

10.5.1 External feedback will be compiled into a formal report detailing recommendations for program improvement and development.

10.5.2 All feedback will be discussed by the internal validation team, and a clear action plan will be developed to address any areas for improvement identified.

10.6 Ongoing Monitoring and Compliance

10.6.1 Regular external audits and checks will be conducted to ensure ongoing compliance with national quality standards (e.g., TEQSA requirements).

10.6.2 Any required updates to the program, based on external feedback, will be implemented in a timely manner, with periodic checks to verify compliance.

10.7 Continuous Improvement

10.7.1 Regularly review assessment methods and tools to ensure they align with learning outcomes and academic standards.

10.7.2 Gather feedback from students, markers, and academic staff on assessment effectiveness and clarity.

10.7.3 Analyse assessment results to identify patterns in student performance, highlighting areas where improvements are needed.

10.7.4 Develop strategies to refine assessment tasks, criteria, and rubrics based on review findings and feedback.

- 10.7.5 Implement changes on a small scale to evaluate their impact before broader application.
- 10.7.6 Continuously monitor the effectiveness of revised assessments to ensure they meet educational goals.
- 10.7.7 Make iterative adjustments to assessment processes based on ongoing monitoring and new feedback.

11 Roles and Responsibilities

11.1 Students

- 11.1.1 Students will be expected to submit assignments, exams, and other assessments by the specified deadlines.
- 11.1.2 Students will be responsible for familiarising themselves with the grading criteria, rubrics, and assessment guidelines for each unit or course.
- 11.1.3 After receiving their results, students will be encouraged to review feedback provided by Lecturers or Tutors to understand areas of strength and improvement.
- 11.1.4 If a student believes their grade is incorrect, they will first seek informal resolution with the Lecturer or Tutor. If unresolved, they will formally appeal in accordance with the appeal process.
- 11.1.5 Students will be expected to ensure that all work submitted is original, properly referenced, and complies with the CAIT Hi-Ed's academic integrity standards.
- 11.1.6 Students will participate in moderation processes where applicable, such as peer reviews or calibration exercises, to develop a better understanding of assessment criteria and standards.

11.2 Lecturers/Tutors

- 11.2.1 Lecturers/Tutors will be responsible for communicating clear grading rubrics, expectations, and deadlines to students at the start of the course.
- 11.2.2 Lecturers/Tutors will grade assessments impartially, consistently applying the grading rubrics and criteria to all students.
- 11.2.3 After grading, Lecturers/Tutors will offer constructive and timely feedback on students' work to help them improve.
- 11.2.4 Lecturers/Tutors will keep accurate and confidential records of student assessments, grades, and feedback.
- 11.2.5 If a student appeals a grade, Lecturers/Tutors will provide necessary information for the appeal process and assist in clarifying the rationale behind their grading decisions.
- 11.2.6 Lecturers/Tutors will participate in assessment moderation activities, including peer review of grading, standardisation meetings, and benchmarking exercises to ensure consistency and fairness in grading.

11.3 Course Coordinators

- 11.3.1 Course coordinators will ensure that assessments are aligned with course learning outcomes and institutional grading standards.
- 11.3.2 They will ensure that grading across different instructors is consistent and fair, especially in cases of multiple graders for the same course.
- 11.3.3 In the event of a formal appeal, course coordinators will review the case and provide support to instructors and students in resolving disputes.
- 11.3.4 Course coordinators will ensure that all assessments comply with institutional policies on academic integrity.

11.3.5 Course coordinators will oversee moderation processes, including pre- and post-assessment moderation, to ensure that assessment methods and grading practices are equitable and meet academic standards.

11.4 Assessment, Validation and Moderation Panel

11.4.1 The Assessment and Moderation Panel will consist of senior faculty members, external examiners (where applicable), and academic quality officers.

11.4.2 The panel will oversee the implementation of assessment moderation policies, ensuring that all assessment tasks are fair, valid, and reliable.

11.4.3 They will conduct regular audits of assessment practices to ensure compliance with institutional and accreditation requirements.

11.4.4 The panel will review selected samples of graded work across different courses to ensure consistency and standardisation in grading.

11.4.5 The panel will support professional development for faculty members on best practices in assessment design, grading, and moderation.

11.5 External Examiners (Where Applicable)

11.5.1 External examiners will provide independent review and validation of assessment methods, grading practices, and moderation procedures.

11.5.2 They will participate in the moderation of assessments, especially for capstone projects, dissertations, and high-stakes exams.

11.5.3 External examiners will provide feedback on the overall quality and fairness of assessment processes and suggest improvements where necessary.

11.6 Academic Quality Assurance Office

11.6.1 The Academic Quality Assurance Office will develop and maintain policies and procedures related to assessment and moderation.

11.6.2 They will conduct periodic reviews and audits of assessment and moderation processes to ensure continuous improvement.

11.6.3 The office will facilitate training and workshops for academic staff on assessment and moderation best practices.

11.6.4 They will work with faculty and external stakeholders to ensure compliance with institutional and accreditation standards for assessment and moderation.

12 Authority and Compliance

File Number	HEP14
Status	Current
Approval Authority	Academic Board.
Legislative Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act);• Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF);• Higher Education Standards Framework (2021);• Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011;• Disability Discrimination Act 1992 and Disability Standards for Education 2005;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Privacy Act 1988; • Equal Opportunity Act 2010; • National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (2018) • Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth)
Supporting Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAIT Hi-Ed Validation and Moderation Template • CAIT Hi-Ed Official Transcript Request Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Assessment Feedback Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Lecturer/Tutor Feedback Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Marking Rubric Template • CAIT Hi-Ed Special Consideration Application Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Extension Request Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Supplementary Assessment Approval Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Assessment Submission Cover Sheet • CAIT Hi-Ed Grade Appeal and Review Form • CAIT Hi-Ed Assessment Moderation Panel Report Template • CAIT Hi-Ed Validation Checklist • CAIT Hi-Ed Assessment Result Recording Template • CAIT Hi-Ed Assessment Return Log • CAIT Hi-Ed GPA Calculation Record Sheet • CAIT Hi-Ed Assessment Protocols
Related Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAIT Hi-Ed Academic Quality, Standards and Integrity Policy • CAIT Hi-Ed Student Grievance and Appeals Policy • CAIT Hi-Ed Privacy Policy • CAIT Hi-Ed Course Rules, Progression and Completion Policy and Procedure • CAIT Hi-Ed Student Support and Services Policy and Procedure • CAIT Hi-Ed Admissions and Enrolment Policy and Procedure • CAIT Hi-Ed Reasonable Adjust Policy and Procedure
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard 1.4; ss 1 – 4 • Standard 1.5; ss 1 - 2 • Standard 1.6, ss 1 • Standard 3.1; ss 3 & 5 • Standard 3.2; ss 3 - 4 • Standard 5.2, ss 1 - 3 • Standard 5.3; ss 1, 2 & 4 • Standard 6.2; ss 1 – 2 • Standard 7.2; ss 1 -2 • Standard 7.3; ss 1 - 2

Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS Act) and National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard 1; ss 3 - 4 • Standard 2; ss 1 - 2 • Standard 5; ss 2 • Standard 6; ss 3 & 5 • Standard 8; ss 1 – 2 • Standard 9; ss 1 – 3 • Standard 10; ss 2 - 4
Responsible Officer	Academic Dean.
Responsible Executive	CEO.
Enquiries Contact	Academic Dean.
Effective Date	
Expiry Date	Not applicable
Next Review	3 Years from the effective date

Appendix 1: Grades and Grade Points at CAIT Hi-Ed

The table below demonstrates how marks will be translated into letter grades, which represents the quality of a student's performance.

Grade	Grade Descriptor	Marks Range	Grade Points
HD	High Distinction: Exceptional performance; demonstrates comprehensive understanding and mastery of the subject matter.	Marks in the range 84.50% and above (85 – 100% when rounded to the nearest integer)	4
D	Distinction: Superior performance; demonstrates a high level of competence and understanding, with minor errors or gaps.	Marks in the range of 74.50 - 84.50% (75 – 84% when rounded to the nearest integer)	3
CR	Credit: Good performance; shows sound understanding of the subject with some areas for improvement.	Marks in the range of 64.50 - 74.50% (65 – 74% when rounded to the nearest integer)	2
P	Pass: Satisfactory performance; meets the minimum requirements to pass the subject.	Marks in the range of 49.50 - 64.50% (50 – 64% when rounded to the nearest integer)	1
PC	Pass Conceded: Awarded at discretion in borderline cases where the student is close to passing but does not fully meet the requirements.	Marks in the range of 45.0 - 49.50% (45 – 50% when rounded to the nearest integer)	0
PX	Pass (Ungraded): Pass achieved, but no numerical mark assigned.	Not Applicable	0
F	Fail: Unsatisfactory performance; does not meet the minimum academic requirements for passing the subject.	Marks below 49.50% (50% when rounded to the nearest integer)	0
AF	Absent Fail: Student did not complete mandatory assessments or exams, leading to failure.	Not Applicable	0
NX	Fail (Ungraded): Failure recorded, but no numerical mark assigned.	Not Applicable	0

NC	Not Complete: Student has not completed all required coursework.	Not Applicable	0
W	Withdrawn: Students withdraws from a unit after the census date for enrolments and their withdrawal without academic penalty is approved.	Not Applicable	0
WF	Withdrawn Fail: The student withdraws after the deadline for avoiding academic penalty, or fails to formally withdraw but does not complete the course requirements.	Not Applicable	0
IP	In Progress: Student is still completing coursework for the unit.	Not Applicable	0

8. Review Schedule

This policy will be reviewed by the Academic Board every three years.

Version History			
Version No	Approved by	Approval Date	Revision Notes
1.0	Academic Board	7/3/2025	