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<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager, Education (Executive Officer)</strong></td>
<td>Ms Fiona Birt</td>
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<table>
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<th>Schools</th>
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</tr>
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<td>Associate Professor Steven Schilizzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anatomy, Physiology &amp; Human Biology</td>
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<td>Animal Biology</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Dr Martha Ludwig</td>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>Dr Patrick Finnegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Dr Troy Visser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Science, Exercise &amp; Health</td>
<td>Mr Martin Anderson</td>
</tr>
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## Representative of the Science Student Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative of the Science Student Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Adviser, Student Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acting Senior Adviser (Undergraduate)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Student Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 representatives of undergraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 2 representatives of postgraduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## By Invitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Invitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre of Excellence – Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next meeting of the Teaching & Learning Committee will be held on **Thursday, 24th September** commencing at 3.00 pm in the Science Boardroom.

Members are reminded that only those apologies received before or at the meeting will be recorded as such.

**Fiona Birt**
Manager (Education) and Executive Officer
AGENDA

1. WELCOME

2. APOLOGIES
   Apologies have been received from:
   • Dr Patrick Finnegan (Michael Renton will be attending on Patrick’s behalf)

3. DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST - REF: F45712
   Members are asked to indicate any potential or perceived conflicts of interest.

4. MINUTES (AUGUST 2015) – REF: F45712
   The Minutes of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting held on 27 August 2015 are presented at Attachment A. Members are asked to confirm that these minutes are a true and correct record of that meeting.

   The Noting of Teaching and Learning Committee decisions by circular on 10th September 2015 are presented at Attachment B. Members are asked to confirm that these are a true and correct record of decisions.

   Agenda and minutes are also available from the Faculty’s intranet at: http://www.science.uwa.edu.au/staff/committee/faculty-of-science-committees/science-teaching-and-learning-committee

5. ACTIONS IN PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility / Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inbound Study Abroad Short Term Research Training</td>
<td>SAO Curriculum</td>
<td>On hold due to organisational change in the Global Learning Office. Any suggestions / ideas on ways to promote research to study abroad students should be sent to the Senior Administrative Officer, Curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipping Science Forum – An ‘exchange of information’ session will be organised in the Common Room for all Science teaching staff to exchange teaching methods and provide feedback</td>
<td>Dr Megan Ellyard</td>
<td>The first forum took place on the 1st September in the Science Common Room. Feedback has been positive. A second forum has been scheduled for Tuesday, 6th October from 1:00-2:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Exchange Partner Universities – development of a unit database for credit</td>
<td>Fiona Birt</td>
<td>Schools have been asked to provide details of a minimum of five exchange partner universities with expertise in their discipline so that these can be recommended to UWA students. The Science Student Office has agreed to work with the Global Learning Office to provide advice to unit coordinators on which universities students most want to attend to assist with the process. In progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART I: ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION TO BE DEALT WITH EN BLOC

6. INFORMATION FLOW BETWEEN TEACHING & LEARNING/CURRICULUM/EDUCATION COMMITTEES

This new standing item has been introduced to improve the information flow and awareness in the Teaching & Learning/Education space for members of the committee.

- University Education Committee: minutes of meeting of 24 August 2015
- University Curriculum Committee: minutes of meeting of 9 September 2015
- University Education Futures Strategy Group: minutes of meeting of 7 September 2015
- Faculty of Science Committees

7. 2016 TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Members are asked to note the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting dates for 2016. To accommodate the newly formed Curriculum Committee, from 2016 all Teaching and Learning Committee meetings will now be held on the third Thursday of the month scheduled, at 3:00pm in the Science Boardroom (G108), Ground Floor, Agriculture Central Building. Attachment C refers.

- Thursday 18th February 2016
- Thursday 21st April 2016
- Thursday 16th June 2016
- Thursday 21st July 2016
- Thursday 15th September 2016
- Thursday 17th November 2016

8. REVIEW OF COURSES

A Review of Courses is currently being undertaken by the University. A questionnaire (Attachment D) was recently sent to undergraduate major coordinators seeking their feedback on a number of key aspects of the New Courses Framework in the context of the major(s) they are coordinating, to inform the Audit Team’s submission to the Review Panel. The Dean of Coursework Studies identified Major coordinators as key stakeholders in the implementation of New Courses and considered it important to incorporate their views into the degrees’ self-assessment reports which will form part of the submission to the Review Panel. The views of students have also been canvassed via an online anonymous survey as an additional information input to the Review Panel.

9. BLACKBOARD SUPPORT OFFERED TO UWA STAFF BY THE CENTRE FOR EDUCATION FUTURES (CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY)

Members are asked to note the following Blackboard support Master Class being offered by the Centre for Education Futures. This information is also provided in a single document at Attachment E so that Schools can easily circulate.

Master Class Format:
- 45 minutes (e.g. 1:00pm-1:45pm)
- A Faculty may request that the CEF provide a master class subject to the following conditions:
  (a) There are six or more Faculty staff registrations, and
  (b) The Faculty allow at least two working weeks between the request and the date of the master class, and
  (c) (i) A suitable computer lab can be provided to run the session, or
       (ii) Staff bring their own device or laptop if using a Centre for Education Futures venue.
### Blackboard Master Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting Started and Administrative Processes</td>
<td>Participants will walk through the process of planning, creating, and organizing the course menu, the home page, and determining tool availability. Participants will also find out about archiving their unit.</td>
<td>Face-to-face or using Blackboard Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>This workshop covers creating and managing groups, and enabling collaboration tools to fit requirements.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Centre</td>
<td>Participants will learn how to navigate the Grade Centre, and customize it to suit their needs.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests, Assignments and Turnitin</td>
<td>This workshop provides an introduction to the test and marking tools in Blackboard Learn, with a focus on creating and deploying tests. Participants will learn to create, review, and grade assignments. Several options for presenting assignments to students are offered.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Tools</td>
<td>This workshop introduces participants to the communication tools used for self-reflection, collaboration, and communication with the instructor and classmates: discussion board, journals, blogs, and wikis.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART II: ITEMS FOR DECISION TO BE DEALT WITH EN BLOC

There are no items for decision to be dealt with en bloc.

### PART III: ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISION

#### 10. UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ASSESSMENT

The University Policy on Assessment has been further refined following comments made through the consultation process with members of the Teaching & Learning/Education Committees of the Faculties, via the information sessions to which members had been invited. Here we have a near final opportunity to comment on the revised draft of the University Policy on Assessment. For Members’ reference, the Review of Assessment Working Group Report is attached (Attachment F), along with the most recent draft of the new Policy (Attachment G).

For discussion.

#### 11. SURF AND TEACHING & LEARNING INDICATORS

The Deputy Dean and Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) attended a meeting with the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) and the Dean of Coursework Studies to discuss (a) the completed templates from the Faculty relating to the units identified by the DVCE’s office as “unsatisfactory” in SURF; and (b) the Faculty response to the Teaching and Learning Indicators that form part of the Australian Graduate Survey. The ADTL will present to the Committee a summary of the information discussed.

The outcomes from the meeting were:

i. The Faculty, in consultation with members of the Faculty Teaching & Learning Committee, to suggest improvements and modifications to the SURF response template.

ii. The Faculty to explore with unit coordinators how to improve the organisation of units.

iii. The ADTL to meet with staff from the DVCE’s office to explore how to better present SURF data.

For discussion.
12. INFORMATION FLOW BETWEEN SCHOOL & FACULTY TEACHING & LEARNING COMMITTEES

This will become a standing item in the Faculty Teaching & Learning Committee agenda to encourage and improve the communication flow between Schools and Faculty Teaching & Learning Committees. Faculty T&L committee members will be asked to provide an update from their schools prior to each Faculty T&L meeting for inclusion in Part I of the agenda.

For discussion.

13. POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK ADMISSIONS PROCESS – UPDATE

One of the strategic priorities for the Education portfolio identified through the Faculty’s 2015 Integrated Planning Exercise, is to improve the way the Faculty assesses applications for admission to Cycle 2 courses and to significantly reduce the turnaround time from receipt of application to outcome. A project was commenced by the Science Student Office to work with course coordinators to clarify assessment criteria in order to facilitate the delegation of offer authority to central admissions. In July 2015, the International Centre agreed to take on delegated offer authority for 12 masters’ degrees for 96 point admission. A further 7 courses were identified as needing further refinement prior to handing over and the remaining courses are considered to sit outside of the process for a variety of reasons such as professional accreditation requirements, a ranking process for courses with quotas, or complex background requirements.

The rollout of delegated authority has not been as smooth as was hoped, and this has been compounded by the organisational change process and its impact on staffing in both international and domestic admissions centres. Whilst central assessment has been underway for the last couple of months, a significant number of applications continue to be referred to the Faculty due to uncertainty and assessment inexperience of central staff. It has been noted that additional work will be required with course coordinators to better articulate to administrative staff with minimal or no science background, the kinds of keywords and subject areas they need to look out for on the academic transcript.

Phase two of the project will soon be commenced with the appointment of a Project Officer in the SSO who will work to further refine and clarify admission requirements, particularly in relation to the assessment of cognate background for admission to the 72 point degrees.

For discussion.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

15. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of this Committee is scheduled for Thursday 22nd October, 2015 at 3.00 pm in the Science Boardroom (G108), Ground Floor, Agriculture Central Building.
FACULTY OF SCIENCE
SCIENCE TEACHING & LEARNING COMMITTEE – [REF #F45712]

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 27 AUGUST 2015

1. PRESENT

A/Professor Peter Hammond; Professor Brendan Waddell; Ms Fiona Birt; Dr Anthony Bakker; A/Professor Steven Schilizzi; Dr Anthony Bakker; Dr Nicola Mitchell; Dr Martha Ludwig; Dr Julian Clifton; A/Professor Paul Abbott; Dr Patrick Finnegan; Dr Troy Visser; Mr Martin Anderson; Dr Megan Ellyard; Ms Lyssa Collins; Mr Alex Tsaknis; Ms Genevieve Simpson; Ms Michelle Bailey; Ms Gina Sjepcevich, Mr Thomas Wimmler (representing Ms Molly Ireland).

Invited Guest: Mr Andrew Hu

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from:
- Merrilee Albatis (represented by Ms Gina Sjepcevich)

3. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed members to the meeting and introduced Dr Andrew Hu and Ms Lyssa Collins, Acting Senior Adviser (Undergraduate).

4. DECLARATIONS OF POTENTIAL OR PERCEIVED CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts of interests were declared.

5. NOTING OF DECISIONS - JULY 2015

It was

RESOLVED 98/2015
to confirm the Noting of Decisions by Circulation of the Teaching and Learning Committee taken 23rd July 2015 as a true and correct record.

6. ACTIONS IN PROGRESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Responsibility / Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inbound Study Abroad Short Term Research Training</td>
<td>SAO Curriculum</td>
<td>On hold due to reorganisation in the Study Abroad Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any suggestions / ideas on ways to promote research to study abroad students should be sent to the Senior Administrative Officer, Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipping Science Forum – An ‘exchange of information’ session had been organised in the Common Room for Science teaching staff to exchange teaching methods and provide peer feedback.</td>
<td>Dr Megan Ellyard</td>
<td>The first forum was scheduled to take place on the 1st September in the Science Common Room. Two presentations were scheduled with time for discussion. Notes would be circulated after the forum. A second forum would be scheduled in due course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. BLACKBOARD

Mr Andrew Hu, Manager (eLearning Systems) was invited to the meeting to provide an overview of Blackboard and Turnitin. The following points were raised:

- Turnitin was structured to integrate with Blackboard, however with large cohorts of ~1000 students the systems were failing to communicate. This had been exacerbated by merged enrolments. Project Black Swan was working hard with Turnitin and Blackboard to fix this issue.
- Records and grades would need to be manually fixed in the meantime.
- An update for Turnitin was currently being tested and should be functional in the immediate future.
- Another issue which had arisen was the disappearance of marks from the system; however it was noted that the data was still stored in Turnitin and a manual pull-down could be organised if necessary.
- Blackboard and Turnitin supported inline marking. However, it was noted that academics often preferred to download work to mark but then had trouble uploading as a bulk file. It was explained that documents could be bulk uploaded to a content management area within the unit and could be manually linked from there.
- A member noted that the system ‘choked’ when trying to view assignments for classes of >70 students. Delegated marking was identified as a better way to manage what had previously been achieved using ‘groups’ in Moodle.
- Project Black Swan was working hard with Psychology to resolve the various issues they had encountered due to large cohorts and hoped to have everything functional by the coming Monday.
- Originality reports would still be accessible should Turnitin be replaced.
- Three years of historic data was available in Turnitin.
- One Member had submitted a formal request to use Turnitin outside of Blackboard which had been approved with some reluctance; the Executive did not want to set precedence on this.

Mr Hu urged the Committee to continue using Blackboard under the assumption that things worked, but to be prepared for some issues over the coming week. Members were encouraged to report any problems they encountered to the Project Black Swan team via the email help-desk so that they could be fixed as soon as possible.

The Chair thanked Mr Hu for addressing the Committee.

8. BOARD OF EXAMINERS REPORT

Members noted the Board of Examiners Report for Semester One, 2015 which was attached to the agenda.

9. LABSTER PRESENTATION

Prof Martha Ludwig gave a Labster (a virtual lab simulator) presentation to the Committee.

Labster (https://www.labster.com/) is a company that produces online teaching tools through collaboration with academics at leading institutions worldwide. They specialise in life science lab simulations and use gamification to engage students. An introduction to the company and its products was presented by Dr Martha Ludwig. The simulations could be used to complement existing hands-on practical experiences and in conversion units for Cycle 2 programs.
The following points were noted:

- The simulator was interleaved with quiz questions to engage students, with questions adjusting in difficulty according to a student’s level;
- It could be used on any platform or web browser;
- Theory was integrated with virtual practical experience and modelled after real world scenarios;
- Students were able to work at their own pace and progress could be tracked online;
- Students were able to get immediate feedback on progress and quiz responses;
- The system wasn’t intended to replace hands-on labs but to be used in conjunction with them;
- There would be approximately 30 lab practicals available by the end of 2015;
- At UWA they could be used in revision for Honours courses and within conversion units to supplement Masters’ courses;
- There was a cost involved in using Labster, but if UWA was to develop a module this would allow access to the full Labster suite at a significantly reduced rate.

The Chair thanked Dr Ludwig for her presentation. Members were encouraged to try the software and then report back to the next meeting.

10. ASSOCIATE DEAN (TEACHING & LEARNING)’S REPORT

A/Prof Peter Hammond, Associate Dean (Teaching & Learning) reported on the following:

- Data collection for new timetable system: A lot of information was being requested from Schools at this time; a large data collection for Syllabus Plus was currently underway and some schools were finding this to be an arduous task. Members were encouraged to contact Mr Matt Huitson if they required assistance.

- Project Black Swan: Units for Semester One, 2016 and trimester units needed to be migrated across to Blackboard. A spreadsheet presenting data which needed updating had been simplified through negotiation with PBS, however this was still placing an additional workload demand on Schools. 1038 units had been sent out for updating and this task was currently in progress.

- SURF Responses: Schools were being asked to respond to SURF units whose scores were classified as unsatisfactory (those units which over the last 6 semesters had consistently achieved SURF scores lower than 2.8). Units with excellent SURF scores were also identified; namely, those units with SURF scores consistently above 3.4. Schools were being asked to review units classified as unsatisfactory and compare them with the ‘excellent’ units within their discipline and consider what factors resulted in the higher scoring. The aim was to improve units and make them as good as possible for students to enhance the student experience.

  It was noted that there was one question in particular (Q4 relating to unit organisation) that had been identified as being a key indicator of SURF success; if a unit was considered to be well organised it was significantly more likely to achieve a better overall SURF rating than units which were perceived as poorly organised. This was therefore one area that should be focussed on where improvements would potentially result in a substantial increase in scores. A concern was raised, however, that due to the problems that had been encountered with the introduction of Blackboard, Semester Two, 2015 SURF scores could be negatively impacted.

  It was noted that there were not many Level 1 or 2 units on the list of unsatisfactory units; they were primarily at Levels 3, 4 and 5.

11. PROSPECT AND POSTGRADUATE ORIENTATION

Dr Megan Ellyard provided an overview of the Science PROSPECT and Postgraduate Orientation sessions held for new commencing students in Semester Two, 2015.

a) Prospect: The second iteration of Science-PROSPECT orientation program was held Wednesday 22nd to Thursday 23rd July. This second iteration had disappointing student attendance, although the response from those students who did attend was positive.
70 students (70/175 newly enrolled = 40%) attended PROSPECT on Wednesday July 22nd. Only 18 students (18/175 = 10%) attended on Thursday July 23rd. A survey was distributed to commencing science students to investigate why they did not attend PROSPECT. Of the students who did not attend (n = 59), 76% claimed “I have never heard of PROSPECT; I didn’t know about it”. A further 7% claimed “It didn’t seem important.” This highlighted the need to investigate more effective methods to advertise PROSPECT to commencing students.

Coincidentally, the Enrolment and Orientation Working Group (EOWG) were investigating communication strategies between the University and commencing students regarding on-boarding events. Ms Kelly Elliott (EOWG representative) was the Faculty’s contact in this regard. Ms Elliott had recently been coordinating with Administrative Officers to investigate communications between schools and commencing students.

b) Postgraduate orientation: The Faculty of Science had piloted a more extensive Postgraduate orientation program this semester. The half-day program on Friday July 24th involved a ‘Networking’ workshop followed by a morning tea where students interacted with PG course coordinators. This was followed by ‘Survival Skills’ and ‘Science Library Resources’ workshops. 19 students attended the FoS-PG orientation (19/75 = 25%). The program was very well received by students; one suggestion for improvement was to include ‘Science Precinct’ or ‘School-specific’ tours in the future.

Prior to developing the FoS-PG program, schools were contacted to identify routine school-specific PG orientation/induction events. This informal audit suggested that school-specific events were essential due to specific laboratory/facility safety induction requirements and to ensure student familiarity with the school and their peers, but that these rarely occurred during O-week. Unfortunately this semester some school-specific events were planned at times that clashed with the FoS PG orientation program. Although these were easily rectified, this highlighted the need to optimise communication between Faculty and Schools to coordinate orientation events in the future. Ms Kelly Elliott (PEOC representative) was the Faculty’s contact in regard to on-boarding activities.

The Faculty of Science would like to invite Honours students to the PG orientation in the future; increased interaction between Honours and Masters students may promote Honours to Postgraduate transition, and re-introduce students to Faculty and central support teams and programs.

The following points were noted:
- Better communication was needed to reiterate the importance of Prospect in future.
- Suggested follow-up events to occur whereby Course-work students were targeted.
- There was a need to work closely with Schools to reinforce the importance of Prospect.
- Science Library Resources should be promoted; of all the workshops delivered, the Science Library session had received the highest satisfaction scores.

12. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT

Prof Brendan Waddell, Deputy Dean, provided an update on the University’s Review of Assessment.

Prof Waddell noted that the Working Party was currently in the consultation stage of the draft recommendations which would guide the new University-wide Assessment Policy. The policy would prescribe general guiding principles on assessment, but each Faculty would be expected to develop its own recursive policy and procedures. Given the size of the Faculty of Science and its diversity, this would most likely be delegated to Schools. T&L Members were encouraged to attend one of the three open forums being held on the 1st & 4th of September, which would provide an opportunity to engage with the Working Party to discuss the recommendations and provide feedback.

The Committee raised concerns about the limitations of the current student system in terms of providing ready access to the data needed to manage the new policy requirements, such as distribution of grades; Prof Waddell noted that the new policy would necessitate the improvement of systems so that the required reports could be generated for consideration by Schools and Boards of Examiners. This would be an important message to get across to support its successful implementation.

Discussion arose around the distribution of grades using criterion based assessment. It was clarified that the
grade distribution guidelines were not binding, but if the prescribed distribution was not generally adhered to
there would need to be some accountability by School Boards of Examiners to support this decision. It was
noted that some cohorts were demonstrably stronger than other cohorts and this was a justifiable reason for
distribution variance; the Bachelor of Philosophy cohort was used as an example where there was a reasonable
expectation that a higher number of students would achieve in the Distinction / High Distinction range.

13. REVIEW OF COURSES

Prof Brendan Waddell, Deputy Dean advised that no update was available at this time as the Review of
Courses has been put on hold due to a number of other University wide priorities.

14. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of this Committee is scheduled for 24th September at 3:00 pm in the Science Boardroom
(G108), Ground Floor, Agriculture Central Building.

There was no other business.
FACULTY OF SCIENCE
SCIENCE TEACHING & LEARNING COMMITTEE – [REF #F45712]

NOTING OF DECISIONS TAKEN 14TH SEPTEMBER 2015 ON ITEMS CONSIDERED
BY THE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE BY WAY OF A CIRCULAR

1. FACULTY OF SCIENCE 2015 TEACHING AND LEARNING STRATEGIC FUND

The Faculty of Science 2015 Teaching and Learning Strategic Fund was set up to support initiatives related
to pedagogy and the student experience. A call for applications went out to all staff in the Faculty on the
28th July 2015, with a closing date of 21st August 2015. The following criteria applied:

- Supported initiatives must comply with relevant strategies detailed in School and Faculty IPEs;
- Matching funds would normally be required from the relevant School/s;
- While funds would be available for School-specific projects, preference would be given to those
  with a clear, cross-Faculty benefit;
- Preference would also be given to proposals that leverage funds from outside the Faculty / School;
- Funding must be committed for expenditure during 2015;
- The Deputy Dean has the discretion to approve requests for strategic funding up to $5,000;
- The Science Executive Committee would consider requests for strategic funding between $5,000
  and $30,000 upon recommendation from the Science Teaching & Learning Committee.

A total of 14 applications were received by the closing date, however four of these were deemed ineligible
as they were not considered to satisfy one or more of the criteria. One application was not considered as
it was deemed incomplete. The remaining nine applications were circulated for Members’ consideration.

The Committee

RESOLVED 99/2015

to approve and recommend the following proposals for Faculty of Science 2015 Teaching and Learning
Strategic Funding to the Science Executive Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT SOUGHT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>Martha Ludwig</td>
<td>Cycle 2 conversion units</td>
<td>$3,873.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEE</td>
<td>Matthew Tonts</td>
<td>Support program for international students</td>
<td>$15,696.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHB</td>
<td>Wyrwoll/Hill/O'Shea/Meyer</td>
<td>Development of new interactive resource</td>
<td>$10,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSEH</td>
<td>Jacqueline Alderson</td>
<td>Development of online unit</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCB</td>
<td>Arthur/Attwood/Ludwig</td>
<td>Pilot modular laboratory course</td>
<td>$10,571.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Biology</td>
<td>Yopak/Roger/Fitzgerald/Collin</td>
<td>Brain project</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant, Animal, SEE</td>
<td>Hovey/Prince/Hansen</td>
<td>Underwater equipment</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHB</td>
<td>Hayes/O'Shea/Hill</td>
<td>Multi-Q Resource Review and Upgrade</td>
<td>$12,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHB</td>
<td>O'Shea/Hayes/Hill</td>
<td>Migration of Digital ANHB1101 to Mobile devices</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $78,840.35
## 2015-16 Meeting Dates for Faculty of Science Curriculum Committee and Teaching and Learning Committee

### 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRICULUM COMMITTEE</th>
<th>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING COMMITTEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Thursday 24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Thursday 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2015</td>
<td>Thursday 22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Tuesday 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2015</td>
<td>Thursday 26&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRICULUM COMMITTEE&lt;sup&gt;Ⅰ&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>TEACHING &amp; LEARNING COMMITTEE&lt;sup&gt;Ⅱ&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Thursday 18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; February 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Thursday 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; March 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 21&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Thursday 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; April 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Thursday 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; May 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Thursday 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Thursday 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; August 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Thursday 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Thursday 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; August 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Thursday 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; August 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Thursday 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Thursday 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Thursday 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
<td>Thursday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>Ⅰ</sup> Curriculum Committee meets on the first Thursday of the month at 3:00pm

<sup>Ⅱ</sup> Teaching and Learning Committee meets on the third Thursday of the month at 3:00pm (revised from 2015)
# Questionnaire for Majors’ Coordinators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major(s) you coordinate:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since when have you been coordinating the major(s)?</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree in which major(s) sit:</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your feedback is invited on the following:

1. What do you think are the strengths and successes of the [New Courses Framework](#)?

   Click here to enter text.

2. What do you think are the weaknesses of the New Courses Framework?

   Click here to enter text.

3. Do you have any comments on the developmental progression (from Level 1 to Level 3 units) of the major(s)?

   Click here to enter text.

4. New Courses “require every undergraduate major to include a demonstrable emphasis on inquiry-based learning and research skill development through direct engagement with the research culture of the relevant discipline” (recommendation 13). How effectively does the major meet this requirement?

   Click here to enter text.
5. New Courses “require every undergraduate major to either include at least one unit with an explicit focus on oral and written communication skills or embed these skills within the major” (recommendation 12). How effectively does the major meet this requirement?

5.1 As referenced in the Educational Principles, cultural competence is defined as “a set of skills that allow individuals to increase their understanding of cultural differences within, among and between diverse cultural groups, marked by respect for such diversity”. How well is the major contributing to students’ acquiring cultural competence?

6. How satisfied are you with the overall quality of the major(s)?

7. Do you have a key improvement suggestion regarding the New Courses Framework?

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey.

Kathrin Stroud
Executive Officer, Review of Courses
BLACKBOARD SUPPORT OFFERED TO UWA STAFF BY CENTRE FOR EDUCATION FUTURES (CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY)

Master Class Format:
- 45 minutes (e.g. 1:00pm-1:45pm)
- A Faculty may request that the CEF provide a master class subject to the following conditions:
  (a) There are six or more Faculty staff registrations, and
  (b) The Faculty allow at least two working weeks between the request and the date of the master class, and
  (c) (i) A suitable computer lab can be provided to run the session, or
       (ii) Staff bring their own device or laptop if using a Centre for Education Futures venue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blackboard Master Class Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting Started and Administrative Processes</td>
<td>Participants will walk through the process of planning, creating, and organizing the course menu, the home page, and determining tool availability. Participants will also find out about archiving their unit.</td>
<td>Face-to-face or using Blackboard Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>This workshop covers creating and managing groups, and enabling collaboration tools to fit requirements.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Centre</td>
<td>Participants will learn how to navigate the Grade Centre, and customize it to suit their needs.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests, Assignments and Turnitin</td>
<td>This workshop provides an introduction to the test and marking tools in Blackboard Learn, with a focus on creating and deploying tests. Participants will learn to create, review, and grade assignments. Several options for presenting assignments to students are offered.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Tools</td>
<td>This workshop introduces participants to the communication tools used for self-reflection, collaboration, and communication with the instructor and classmates: discussion board, journals, blogs, and wikis.</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT WORKING GROUP REPORT

TRIM FILE REFERENCE: F70940

DOCUMENT STATUS

☐ Draft  ☑ Ready for Review  ☐ Final

DOCUMENT MODIFICATION HISTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version Number</th>
<th>Primary Author(s) (name and position)</th>
<th>Description of Version</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Provided To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0.1            | Professor Grady Venville  
Dean of Coursework Studies  
and Convenor of the Review of Assessment Working Group | Draft report for consultation | 28th August 2015 | Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education)  
Deans of Faculties  
Chair, Academic Board  
Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees – Open Forum |
|                |                                      |                        |                | 7 September 2015 | Education Futures Strategy Group |
|                |                                      |                        |                | 9 September 2015 | Curriculum Committee |
|                |                                      |                        |                | 14 September 2015 | Education Committee |
|                |                                      |                        |                | 7 October 2015   | Academic Council |

DOCUMENT APPROVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved By (name/position of approver)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY................................................................................................................... 3

2 INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................................................. 4

3 BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY.......................................................................................... 4
3.1 Purpose and Terms of Reference ................................................................................................. 4
3.2 Members of the Assessment Working Group .............................................................................. 4
3.3 Meeting dates of Working Group ............................................................................................... 4
3.4 Procedure ..................................................................................................................................... 4
3.5 Benchmarking Outcomes ............................................................................................................ 5

4 ISSUES ........................................................................................................................................... 5
4.1 Consistency across the University ................................................................................................. 5
4.2 Academic integrity ........................................................................................................................ 6
4.3 Digital first .................................................................................................................................... 7
4.4 Criterion-referenced approach to assessment ............................................................................. 7
4.5 Distribution of grades at UWA ........................................................................................................ 8

5 IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE ...................................................................................................... 9

6 REFERENCE ................................................................................................................................... 10

7 APPENDICES ................................................................................................................................. 10
Assessment inevitably shapes the learning that takes place; that is, what students learn and how they learn. Assessment should closely reflect the purposes and aims of the course of study.

Recently, the Dean, Coursework Studies, within the Office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education), initiated a review of the University’s assessment policy, practices and related activities. This review, aims to ensure internationally benchmarked assessment practices are meeting the needs of domestic and international students. It is also an important component of the evaluation of the success of NC2012 and the roll-out of the Education Futures Vision, with a particular focus on transformative teaching.

To this end, the Review of Assessment Working Group recommends the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>That the University develop a comprehensive University policy to establish common academic and administrative procedures to be applied in all courses taught by all faculties and that any current policies subsequently be rescinded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>That the parameters around specific aspects of assessment as set out in Appendix C are included in the new University Policy on Assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>That the University move to a ‘digital first’ strategy for assessment submission, feedback, marking, grading and submission of marks through the Learning Management System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>That assessment at UWA is strongly oriented towards criterion-referenced approaches with explicit assessment criteria linked to learning outcomes that are used to determine marks and grades.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5   | That the Dean of Coursework Studies investigates the viability of:  
  a) calculating the UWA students’ undergraduate degree WAM from their 20 best unit marks rather than all unit marks; and,  
  b) using deciles to rank students within each unit to include on their academic transcript and make a recommendation to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education). |
| 6   | That assessment in all units employ a process of moderation, which may take several appropriate forms, to ensure consistent marking and alignment with the assessment criteria. Adjustment of marks may be employed as part of moderation. |
| 7   | That the new University Policy on Assessment include parameters on the proportions of grades that can be awarded within units. |
2 Introduction

Assessment of student learning is an important educational function of the University with teaching practices designed to engage, challenge and transform students throughout their courses. Assessment drives and focuses student learning and, as such, is a critical component of the way teaching activities are designed for a unit of work.

Changes at the sector level and within UWA over recent years, in particular the introduction of new courses in 2012 and the first graduating cohort in 2014, make it timely to conduct a comprehensive review of assessment policy and practices within UWA. Moreover, feedback from a number of sources including Student Unit Reflective Feedback (SURF), International Student Barometer (ISB) and the University Experience Survey (UES) indicate the importance of high quality, well communicated and managed assessment to the student experience.

3 Background and Methodology

3.1 Purpose and Terms of Reference

The University is committed to the systematic review and evaluation of its activities and a cyclical review of policy is an integral part of its strategic planning and quality assurance.

The purpose of the review of assessment is to ensure internationally benchmarked assessment practices meeting the needs of domestic and international students. This review is an important component of the evaluation of the success of the new courses introduced in 2012 and the roll-out of the Education Futures Vision, with a particular focus on transformative teaching.

The Terms of Reference for the Review of Assessment were approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Education on March 17th 2015 (Appendix A).

3.2 Review of Assessment Working Group: Membership

Professor Grady Venville (Convenor)        Professor Mark Israel
Ms Siri Barrett-Lennard               Professor Helene Jaccomard
Mt Tom Beyer                          Dr Nazim Khan
Professor Sandra Carr                Dr Kabilan Krishnasamy
Professor Marin Forsey              Professor Sid Nair
Professor Phil Hancock              Dr Dino Spagnoli
Dr Des Hill                            Professor Brendan Waddell

3.3 Review of Assessment Working Group: Meeting dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29th April 2015</td>
<td>9.00am – 10:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th May 2015</td>
<td>10.00am – 11:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd June 2015</td>
<td>3.00pm – 4:30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st July 2015</td>
<td>8.00am – 9.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th August 2015</td>
<td>11.00 – 1.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th August 2015</td>
<td>11.00 – 1.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th August 2015</td>
<td>8.00am -10.00 am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Procedure

The review of assessment involved a complex procedure involving the broad steps outlined in the table below. The review required considerable commitment from members of the Working Group to gather and analyse data, and conduct the benchmarking. The benchmarking required identifying aspects of assessment to be benchmarked and then making comparisons across the plethora of...
existing assessment policies from the different faculties and schools within the University and with other Universities. The benchmarking process included the Working Group broadly agreeing on several parameters that might be imposed on aspects of assessment at UWA. This was followed by the Working Group drafting University Standards for Assessment to guide the remainder of the policy. Finally, the full University Policy on: Assessment was drafted and circulated to Member of the Working Group for feedback and endorsement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Steps Taken for Review of Assessment</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Review of Assessment Working Group</td>
<td>27th March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SharePoint site established, data gathering, task allocation</td>
<td>1st April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking across UWA faculties and other universities</td>
<td>29th July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft new University Policy on: Assessment</td>
<td>28th August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report on Review of Assessment</td>
<td>28th August 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Benchmarking Outcomes

The benchmarking process was comprehensive and involved all members of the Working Group being allocated an area of interest based on the scope of the review. Working Party members were provided with a template and were asked to search the UWA website to compare faculty and school approaches to the area of interest as well as approaches taken by other universities. A tabular summary of the draft recommendations resulting from the benchmarking process is provided in Appendix B. The completed benchmarking templates with detailed information on each area of interest prepared by members of the Working Group are available by request from Academic Policy Services.

4 Issues

A number of important and issues were highlighted by the benchmarking process and were discussed in Working Group meetings. These issues have been incorporated in the following report from the Working Group and will be used to inform the development of the new University Policy on Assessment.

4.1 Consistency across the University

The Working Group found that the currently at UWA there are at least 11 individual policies including 32 pages of clauses related to assessment:

1. University Policy on: Assessment (UP07/23)
5. University Policy on: Alternative Examinations (UP12/7)
7. University Policy on: Grades and Marks for Undergraduate Units and Postgraduate Coursework Units (UP11/3)
8. University Policy on: Supplementary Assessment (UP11/2)
10. University Policy on: Amending Examination Results and other Academic Decisions Found to be in Error after Formal Notification to Students (UP07/120)
11. University Policy on: Provision of Unit Outlines (UP10/5)

Despite the length of these collective policies, the main University Policy on: Assessment (UP07/23) comprises a high-level document that delegates authority to faculties and schools to determine the detail of academic and administrative matters related to assessment. The Working Group found that some faculties and schools within UWA have assessment policies and procedures that provide clear
academic and administrative direction to staff and students. However, comparison between different faculties and schools highlighted different approaches to assessment, and different practices. This diversity within the University was considered by the Working Group to be unnecessarily confusing for students, especially undergraduate students, who now are required to take broadening units. The Working Group recommends developing a comprehensive University wide policy on assessment to establish common academic standards and administrative procedures to be applied in all faculties and schools and that any current policies subsequently be rescinded.

**Recommendation 1 – A comprehensive University policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>MID-TERM</th>
<th>LONGER-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the University develop a comprehensive University Policy to establish common academic and administrative procedures to be applied in all courses taught by all faculties and that any current policies subsequently be rescinded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmarking across other Australian universities and international universities also highlighted considerable differences in policies and procedures. A number of universities approach assessment in a similar way to UWA with a brief central assessment policy and authority delegated to faculties and schools for detailed information on academic matters and administrative procedures related to assessment. A number of universities, however, did provide what the Working Group considered to be exemplary academic policies and procedures.

The Working Group discussed at length a number of academic and administrative aspects of assessment where clear and consistent guidelines should be provided in the new University-wide policy. These aspects of assessment included: Minimum requirements for assessment within a unit; weighting of assessment items; marking; word limits and penalties; feedback; and, examinations. The Working Group provide a list of parameters around these aspects of assessment that were considered fair and achievable across all faculties to be included in the new University-wide policy. These proposed parameters are included in Appendix C.

**Recommendation 2 – Assessment Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>MID-TERM</th>
<th>LONGER-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That the parameters around specific aspects of assessment as set out in Appendix C are included in the new University Policy on Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Academic integrity

The Working Group discussed concerns recently reported in the media about rising incidence of academic misconduct and plagiarism by students as well as misconduct by staff members with regard to assessment. While these issues do not currently seem to be a major problem at UWA, the Working Group considered it important to ensure that UWA's assessment policies and procedures kept pace with trends in the digital world and, as best as possible, supported academic integrity and guarded against potential misconduct by both students and staff.
4.3 Digital first

The Working Group found that many administrative processes and procedures related to assessment within UWA tended to be manual, labour intensive, paper based and different across faculties and schools. For example, some schools still require students to submit physical copies of assignments with a cover sheet, have the cover sheet date and time stamped by a staff member and submit the assignment in a physical drop box by the submission date and time. Some unit coordinators have a more contemporary approach utilising available digital tools to improve the student experience, reduce workload, increase the security of the assessment process and reduce the time taken for marking and feedback amongst other things. The Working Group considered it important that the University make a strong and consistent move to digital approaches to assessment including assessment submission, providing feedback, marking, grading and submission of marks. The newly implemented Blackboard Learning Management System (LMS) was considered by the Working Group to provide an opportunity for uniform procedures and a, to-date unavailable, secure repository and electronic data trail for all aspects of assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation 3 – ‘Digital first’ strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRIORITY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the University move to a ‘digital first’ strategy for assessment submission, feedback, marking, grading and submission of marks through the Learning Management System.

4.4 Criterion-referenced approach to assessment

The Working Group noted that different disciplines, schools and faculties within the University had different preferences for approaches to assessment resulting in both criterion-referenced and norm-referenced methods being used for marking and determining student grades. The Working Group considered important publications, for example, the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne’s publication on *Assessing Learning in Australian Universities* (James, McInnis, & Devlin, 2002) and website, as well as the *Final Proposed Higher Education Standards Framework section on Learning Outcomes and Assessment* p. 8). The Working Group concluded that “best practice in grading in higher education involves striking a balance between criterion-referencing and norm-referencing. This balance should be strongly oriented towards criterion referencing as the primary and dominant principle” (James, McInnis, & Devlin, 2002, p. 2). Benchmarking across GO8 universities found a consistent orientation towards criterion-referenced approaches to assessment.

The Working Group recommends a strong orientation towards a criterion-referenced approach to assessment at UWA. This approach is consistent with the current UWA curriculum development policy utilising learning outcomes and alignment of learning outcomes with assessment criteria. The Working Group was of the view that grades must be determined on the basis of explicit assessment criteria that clearly differentiate levels of achievement amongst students. The Working Group noticed and commended existing models of good practice in this regard in all faculties. The Working Group recognised that both qualitative and quantitative methods of marking and grading may be aligned with assessment criteria and that different disciplines have different preferences and conventions for either qualitative and/or qualitative approaches. The important point is that the grades derived should be defensible in reasonably objective terms.
Recommendation 4 – Criterion-referenced assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>MID-TERM</th>
<th>LONGER-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

That assessment at UWA is strongly oriented towards criterion-referenced approaches with explicit assessment criteria linked to learning outcomes that are used to determine marks and grades.

4.5 Distribution of grades at UWA

The working party was provided with a document from the UWA Institutional Research Unit (IRU) called Grades at UWA. This document shows differences in the ratios of grades awarded in different units offered by different schools and faculties. Some units were found to have large proportions of students being awarded distinctions and high distinctions and other units providing none or almost no students these grades. The introduction of new courses at UWA in 2012 resulted in some highly competitive professional courses being delivered at the postgraduate Masters level, in addition to Honours and other postgraduate coursework courses. The competitiveness for admission into some of these courses highlights potential problems with inconsistent ratios of marks and grades in different units at UWA. For example, it is apparent to the Working Group that some students have been seeking to enrol in majors and elective and broadening units that are perceived to be ‘easy’ and where students expect they are more likely to receive a high mark and/or grade. This practice is of concern to the Working Group and inconsistent with UWA’s new course structure that was designed to give students flexibility to study subjects of interest that are intellectually challenging. Concerns also were raised about the validity of the selection processes for admission to competitive Cycle 2 courses with inconsistent approaches to grade distribution. The Working Party also acknowledges that different units and majors and even degrees might attract students with different previously demonstrated scholastic achievement (for example their WACE ATAR scores) and that this adds another layer of complexity to creating policy around appropriate distribution of grades.

In considering the problems discussed above, the Working Group supported the idea of calculating a students’ weighted average mark (WAM) from their best 20 units (rather than their entire 24 units) across their undergraduate degree. This was thought to give student more flexibility to select units of interest and challenge without adversely impacting on their WAM. Moreover, there was support from the Working Group to consider using deciles to rank students within each unit and that this ranking would be included on the academic transcript. Because these practices would impact on students’ academic record, they are outside the scope of this review of assessment, but the Working Group recommends the Dean of Coursework Studies further investigate these proposals and makes a recommendation to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).

Recommendation 5 – Consideration of an alternative WAM calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>MID-TERM</th>
<th>LONGER-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

That the Dean of Coursework Studies investigates the viability of:

a) calculating the UWA students’ undergraduate degree WAM from their 20 best unit marks rather than all unit marks; and,

b) using deciles to rank students within each unit to include on their academic transcript and make a recommendation to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education).

As noted above, best practice in grading in high education involves striking a balance between criterion and norm-referenced approaches to assessment. While the Working Group recommends a
strong orientation towards a criterion-referenced approach to assessment at UWA, the Working Group also considered it worthwhile to monitor grade distributions and to use modest, norm-referencing to ensure some consistency of mark and grade distribution to prevent ‘grade creep’ and to create a sense of worth in high grades at UWA. Moderation was considered by the Working Party to be an essential aspect of assessment pedagogy to ensure consistent marking and alignment of marking processes with the assessment criteria. The Working Group found that there are a wide range of appropriate and readily implemented strategies that could be used for moderation.

**Recommendation 6 – Assessment moderation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>MID-TERM</th>
<th>LONGER-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That assessment in all units employ a process of moderation, which may take several appropriate forms, to ensure consistent marking and alignment with the assessment criteria. Adjustment of marks may be employed as part of moderation.

The Working Group recommended some mechanism to support a reasonable distribution of grades in any particular unit or major. Moreover, the Working Group recognised that the distribution of marks and grades may be spread in odd ways as the result of problems with the degree of difficulty of assessment items, or problems with assessment items that do not adequately discriminate between students with different levels of knowledge and skills. There might also be differences in the way that different assessors apply marking keys and/or marking rubrics. As a consequence, the Working Group recommends that the new policy on assessment include University wide direction on adjustment of marks and also guidelines on appropriate distribution of grades within units at UWA.

**Recommendation 7 – Proportions of grades awarded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE</th>
<th>MID-TERM</th>
<th>LONGER-TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That the new University Policy on Assessment include parameters on the proportions of grades that can be awarded within units.

### 5 Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August - October 2015</td>
<td>• Consultation on draft recommendations from the Working Group and draft UWA Policy on: Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October/November 2015</td>
<td>• Consideration of new policy by Curriculum Committee, Education Committee &amp; Academic Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| January – December 2016 | • Technical development  
                        | • Communication strategy  
                        | • Professional support and learning for staff to adapt to new processes  
                        | • Modifications to assessment within units |
| 2017               | • Implementation |
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### Background
Assessment of student learning is an important educational function of the University with teaching practices designed to engage, challenge and transform students throughout their courses.

Changes at the sector level and within UWA over recent years, in particular the introduction of new courses in 2012 and the first graduating cohort in 2014, make it timely to conduct a comprehensive review of assessment policy and practices within UWA.

### Purpose
The University is committed to the systematic review and evaluation of its activities and a cyclical review of policy is an integral part of its strategic planning and quality assurance.

The purpose of the review of assessment is to ensure internationally benchmarked assessment practices are meeting the needs of domestic and international students. This review is an important component of the evaluation of the success of NC2012 and the roll-out of the Education Futures Vision, with a particular focus on transformative teaching.

### Review Framework
It is proposed that a Review of Assessment Working Group be established, to work in consultation with established groups, networks and committees, including:
- Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning/Education) network
- Education Futures Strategy Group
- Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees
- Curriculum Committee

The Review of Assessment Working Group report, including proposed amendments to the University Policy on Assessment and other related policies, will be referred to the Education Committee and Academic Council for consideration and endorsement/approval.

### Proposed Membership:
Professor Grady Venville, Dean of Coursework Studies will convene the Working Group. Membership will be invited from across the University with expertise in a range of assessment practices and related policy, including representation from:
- Academic Board
- Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) network
- Faculties
- Teachers – small group, large group, first year, online/MOOCs
- Student Services
- Academic Policy Services
- Centre for Education Futures
- Student Guild

### Specific Objectives
- To improve the student learning experience;
- To ensure high quality assessment practices at national and international levels;
- To ensure consistency of approach across and within Faculties;
- To review and update the University Policy on Assessment;
- To review and update associated policies, including the University Policy on Assessment Mechanism Statements and the University Policy on Supplementary Assessment.
**Scope**

- Review/audit of associated University policies and faculty/school policies;
- Benchmark best practices – national and international;
- Sustainability (workload, innovative practices, changing environment and technology);
- Uptake of LMS for assessment purposes;
- Consistent practices/penalties across faculties (exceeding word count, submission and late submission, marking tutorial participation, etc);
- Feedback practices and effectiveness/impact;
- Use and application of plagiarism detection software (eg Turnitin);
- Quality of assessment mechanism statements as part of Unit Outlines;
- Marking (ungraded passes and fails, scaling, exam mark breakdown, grades etc);
- Possible use of progressive and summative marks and grades in development of a student retention and success model;
- Exam timetables and scheduling;
- Assessment at a distance (online proctoring).

**Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approximate Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a Review of Assessment Working Group</td>
<td>Within existing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of policy writing expertise and executive officer support (APS)</td>
<td>Within existing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, data collection, surveys (existing and new) (Office of DCS, APS and IRU)</td>
<td>Within existing resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and provision of assistance/training to staff with changes to assessment via the new LMS – Blackboard (Centre for Education Futures)</td>
<td>Within existing resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparation and First Steps**

- Finalisation of Membership and agreed Terms of Reference for the Review of Assessment Working Group;
- Agree parameters for Review;
- Agree tasks and areas of responsibility for each member of the Working Group;
- Consider data requirements and appropriate benchmarking.

**Timing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Working Group and Terms of Reference</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering, task allocation, clarity of issues, benchmarking</td>
<td>March – June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and consultation (networks, groups, committees)</td>
<td>June – August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulation of Report and Policy, including ongoing consultation</td>
<td>August – October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee approval process:</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Committee</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake by Faculties and Student Services, for practical components in preparation for first semester 2016 examinations period</td>
<td>January - June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake by Faculties for 2017 offerings via CAIDi course approval process</td>
<td>January- April 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Draft recommendations resulting from the benchmarking process by members of the Working Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest</th>
<th>Draft Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Student Experience** | **Practices of Providing Feedback to Students on Learning and effectiveness/impact**<br>a. University level website to resource good feedback practices as part of a broader strategy for professional development. Collection of good practice within university to support continuous improvement.  
  b. University to articulate Statement of Principles on Assessment, Moderation and Feedback  
  i. Principles to include Transparent, timely, formative, legitimate…  
  ii. Mandate Faculty and Course-level response to these Principles, including an annual review of Units by Faculty Education Committees and report to Education Committee (via?)  
  iii. University to collate and publish Faculty-level policy responses  
  iv. University to explore effectiveness and impact of changes in feedback practices  
  Recommended change would render University policy transparent and encourage a sense of legitimacy by developing principles with the support of the Student Guild; allow courses, majors and unit coordinators to defend their practice where it reflects these principles; should encourage feedback that was timely and supported student learning. |

| **Consistent practices / Penalties** | **Overview on Late Penalties**<br>1. University-level policy across the undergraduate programs that covers:  
  a. Standardisation of terms (perhaps achieved through UIMS)  
  b. Locus of decision making – standard detailed university policy as default  
  c. Nature of penalty  
  d. How penalty is calculated  
  e. How penalty is communicated to students  
  f. How late a piece needs to be before it will not be marked  
  2. individual units able to make case to School/Faculty Education Committee for opt-out  
  3. Consistency of application sampled  
  Draft Examlar:  
  In the absence of another express rule that has the approval of the Faculty Education Committee and is announced for a unit on UIMS, students who have not received an extension or Special Consideration will be penalised for late submission. A deduction will be incurred of five percent of the marks per day or part thereof. Each 24-hour block is recorded from midday on the day the assignment is due. For example, a student who receives a raw mark of 65 out of 100 on an assessment submitted 1 day late will have their mark reduced to 60. Essays submitted more than 3 days late will not be marked unless they have been granted an extension or Special Consideration. |

| **Overview on Exceeding Word Count**<br>1. University-level policy across the undergraduate programs that covers:  
  a. Standardisation of terms  
  b. Locus of decision making  
  c. Nature of penalty  
  d. How penalty is calculated (what counts as a word, how does it change depending on style of referencing). This needs to be supported by the electronic submission processes established by the university |
2. Individual units able to make case to School/Faculty Education Committee for opt-out
3. Consistency of application sampled

Draft Example:
Assignments must be within the stated word limit. In the absence of another express rule that has the approval of the Faculty Education Committee and is announced for a unit on UIMS, where the limit is specified in terms of the number of words this includes all the words in the text (including definite and indefinite articles, proper nouns, headings and quotations).

Where author-date or Harvard-style referencing has been approved by the Unit Coordinator, the word count for those assignments also includes author-date citations in-text such as (Daly, 2009) as well as page numbers that are part of citations (Daly, 2009, p. 34). However, it does not include the list of references that you include at the end of your document. Where citation by footnotes are permitted, unless otherwise stated in the assessment instructions they are not included in the word count provided they are used only to give citations or other brief information. If footnotes are used more extensively to provide commentary then these additional words should be counted.

The marks will be reduced by the percentage by which the word limit was exceeded.

4. Class Participation
No consistent pedagogic underpinning in this area at either UWA or benchmarked institutions. Issues include:
1. Can marks be awarded just for attendance?
2. Can penalties be applied for non-attendance?
3. On what basis are marks awarded?
4. Is there a maximum to be allowed for class participation?
5. How is participation to be linked to learning outcomes?
6. In which contexts is participation being assessed?
   a. Is participation assessed in online contexts?
   b. Is participation assessed in lectures?

Recommendation
Insufficient data to create University policy. Recommend Academic Developer be asked to create model rubrics to guide consistent decision-making within policy settings set by individual Unit Coordinator. Need to align rubric with learning outcomes. Example provided by UWA Business School.

Examination and Marking
5. Exam rules
That there be discussion as to if a student does not have their ID card then they are not permitted to sit their exam. The current practice puts the onus on the unit co-ordinator to determine whether the student who actually sat the exam was indeed the intended one, in cases where no ID is presented.

That there be discussion on whether seat numbers should be allocated to students for each exam. Such a practice would make detection of substitute students easier because invigilators would have pre-prepared sets of photographs.
That students who do not attend an exam (without a valid, e.g. medical, reason) not be allowed to sit the exam at an alternative time, perhaps subject to a one-chance policy. That is, lateness for an exam would not be acceptable.

6. Supplementary and deferred examination
That supplementary exams not be awarded, except subject to the existing UWA-wide rule concerning a student’s last unit required for graduation, and that the required eligibility mark be 45-49%.
That alternative assessment in lieu of deferred exams, and timing of deferred exams be discussed.

7. Using computers in exams and digital exams
Trial the use of computers in small units and wait for the outcomes of the OLT funded project.
Trial the use of Proctor U for the invigilation of online exams in the Business School when the necessary legal details are sorted.

8. Formative and summative assessments
- Defines and prescribes formative assessment, e.g.
  - Formative assessment is assessment for learning. It occurs through a period of instruction and allows students to develop and practice skills. Formative assessment is accompanied by feedback which shows the student how to improve.
  - Summative assessment is assessment of learning. It typically takes place at the end of a period of learning and instruction, or in the case of modular units, at the end of a module.
- Requires formative assessment in all units, e.g.
  - All UWA units include formative assessment opportunities spread appropriately across the teaching period.
- Establishes minimum requirements for the number of assessment tasks, e.g.
  - All UWA units include two or more assessment tasks, reflecting the range and complexity of learning objectives in the unit, or in the case of a thesis or project-based unit, at least one multi-component, staged assessment task.
- Indicates a maximum weighting for assessment tasks, e.g.
  - No single assessment task (or component) is weighted at more than 70% of the overall grade.
- Sets expectations for the timing of feedback, e.g.
  - Feedback\(^1\) is available on all assessment tasks (or components) within 2-3 weeks of the submission date and at least 1 week before the next assessment item.
  - Indicates a minimum and maximum timing of assessment tasks, e.g.
    - At least one formative assessment task occurs within the first 5 weeks of the teaching period, and no assessment tasks are due within 2 weeks of the final examination period.

9. Grades and reporting of Grades
Supplementary exams: All faculties have the same policy for supplementary exams (if the students needs it for degree completion). Some exceptions. Science level 1 units.
Failed component is only at a faculty level for ALVA design units final folio.
Eligibility for supplementary exam is at a set range for all faculties except Law where the range is 40%-49% for LLB.

Comments from Benchmarking Exercise

---

\(^1\) Feedback can take a variety of forms. (See the University of Adelaide website for suggestions.)
- Hard to find information on a university policy on failed components.
- UWA has the same supplementary exam policy as the other universities in the benchmarking exercise.

**Options / DRAFT Recommendation**

- Failed components to be included as a university policy with guidelines for appropriate use. E.g. Introduction of a “hurdle” assessment in a unit, which must be passed, and guidelines on mechanism of alternative assessment if “hurdle” assessment is not passed.
- Percentile rank on all academic transcripts.

### 10. Marking conventions

- A university wide policy for marking of exams. (anonymous)
- Options of different marking mechanisms for faculties as a means of quality control. E.g. double marking for a sample of assessment items, moderation for a sample of assessments that are marked by inexperienced markers.
- A university wide policy for the timing of returning of marks.

### 11. Norm and Criterion based assessment

Adopt a criterion reference system but provide guidelines as to expected distribution in some or all grades - in a sense this is a mixture of both norm and criterion reference systems but is more educationally defensible compared to a norm reference system as it does relate student performance to the expected outcomes specified in each grade. Of course if it were to be adopted the university would need to resolve the expected distributions in each grade and whether this should be the same for all units at all levels.

### Assessment Delivery

#### 12. Assignment submission

Mandate University wide policy similar to Curtin University for online submission of all text-based assignments via Blackboard LMS.

#### 13. Plagiarism detection software analysis

Options
1. Retain inconsistency and allow individual unit coordinators/faculties to determine method of plagiarism detection (if any).
2. Mandate University wide policy similar to Curtin University for online submission of all text-based assignments via Blackboard LMS using Turnitin. This will eliminate labour intensive practices, improve the student experience and reduce risk of poor record keeping.
Appendix C: List of parameters around aspects of assessment to be included in the new University-wide policy on assessment

Minimum requirements for assessment within a unit
- Each unit must have a unit outline including an assessment plan and an Assessment Mechanism Statement, which sets out clearly the way in which the final result for the unit is calculated, published via the LMS.
- Each unit must employ at least two summative assessment items of different methods.
- The number of assessment items set for a unit must be proportionate to the 150 hours of student workload represented by the credit weighting of the unit. Normally, for a 6 point unit, this would not be more than three summative assessment items.

Weighting of assessment items
- An assessment item in a unit may comprise up to 70 per cent of the total assessment of the unit.
- Where a unit comprises a formal University examination component, it normally makes up for at least 40 per cent of the total assessment of the unit.
- Where a unit has a group assessment task where the contributions of individual students cannot be identified, the assessment item is limited to no more than 30 per cent of the total assessment for the unit and all members of the group are awarded the same mark.

Marking
- Each assessment item must have either a marking key for assigning marks or a rubric for indicating the standard of student work that is aligned with the assessment criteria, and is used consistently by all members of a teaching team, across all campuses and all modes of teaching.
- Wherever possible and practical the anonymity of students in the marking process is maintained and retained until the grade for the assessment has been formally recorded on the student record system.
- The marking of all examinations must be undertaken anonymously.

Grades
- That the proportion of distinction and high distinction grades must not be more than 50% for any Level 1-3 unit and 60% for any Level 4+ unit. That the proportion of high distinction grades must be at least 10% in Level 1-3 units, 15% in Honours units and 20% in other Level 4+ units.

Word Limits & Penalties
- A late submission penalty of five per cent of the total mark allocated for the assessment item is deducted per day for the first seven days (including weekends and public holidays) after which the assigned work is not accepted. Each 24-hour block is recorded from the day the assignment is due.
- Assessments submitted later than seven days after the deadline receive a mark of zero, unless an application for mitigation is approved.
- For all written assessments, where relevant, guidance is given to students on the maximum word limit in order to assess the learning outcomes.
- Where an assignment exceeds the word limit, a penalty of one per cent of the total mark allocated for the assessment task is applied for each one per cent in excess of the word limit.
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The University of Western Australia

University Policy on: Assessment

Purpose of the policy and summary of issues it addresses:
Assessment and feedback are integral to the student learning experience – and form a key part of the coursework units that are delivered to students. This policy sets out the principles that govern the approach and management of formal assessment for coursework students within the University. The policy comprises the following parts:

Part 1: University Standards for Assessment
Part 2: Governance of Assessment Standards
Part 3: Academic Provisions for Coursework Units
Part 4: Examinations
Part 5: Grading System

Definitions:
the University means The University of Western Australia
assessment criteria specify how markers evaluate students’ knowledge, understanding and skills, and are based on intended learning outcomes
assessment item is a body of work used to gauge student learning, e.g. an essay, project, assignment or examination
assessment task is a piece of work that forms part of an assessment item
Assessment Mechanism Statement means the details of the way in which the final result for a unit is arrived at.
assessment outcome refers to the mark given for an assessment item
elite athletes means students identified and recognised as an elite athlete under the Elite Athlete Friendly University Network Agreement
criterion-referenced assessment is one where a student’s work is assessed with reference to written criteria derived from learning outcomes
examination includes end of semester (initial), mid-semester and summer session examinations, tests run by faculties, and practical laboratory examinations, but does not include assignments
Failed Component (FC) is a component that a student must pass in order to obtain an overall pass in a unit.
final grade means the letter code assigned to indicate the level of a student's academic performance in a unit
final mark means the student’s aggregate percentage mark in a unit once any adjustment has been applied
formative assessment is assessment for learning meaning an assessment item or activity that has a developmental purpose with feedback for students about their learning, and may carry a mark
formal University examinations are those administered by the University via Student Administration within Student Services.
invigilator means a person who supervises students during an examination
marking keys are an explicit statement about what an assessor expects of students when they respond to a question in an assessment task. They are essential to fair assessment because their proper construction underpins reliability and validity
marking rubrics is a scoring tool that explicitly represents the performance expectations for an assignment or piece of work. A rubric divides the assigned work into component parts, i.e. criteria, and provides clear descriptions of the characteristics of the work associated with each criterion, at varying levels of mastery. Rubrics can be used for a wide array of assignments: papers, projects, oral presentations, artistic performances, group projects, etc. Rubrics can be used as scoring or grading guides, to provide formative feedback to support and guide ongoing learning efforts, or both.
marking scheme, which is made available to students, is an overview of how marks are allocated for an assessment item
moderation of marking is a process to ensure consistent, fair and reliable marking against academic standards
negative marking is where a mark(s) is/are deducted for unanswered questions or incorrect answers
relevant board means a board relevant to the case in point. The relevant board may include a position or a body of people with authority to carry out the function concerned (e.g. board of examiners who are responsible for considering assessments made by schools)
student adviser means the position with responsibility for providing advice in relation to the University rules and policies that apply to the student concerned and may be called the Sub-Dean, Associate Dean, Student Adviser, Faculty Administrative Officer or Senior Faculty Administrative Officer
summative assessment is assessment of learning meaning any assessment that contributes to the final grade/mark of a unit to provide a measure of student performance in relation to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria.
University working day means a weekday other than one that is specified by the University as a University holiday
PART 1: University Standards for Assessment

Preamble
Part 1 of the policy deals with key standards for the conduct and management of assessment at the University.

1 Assessment standards:

1.1 The University is committed to assessment that is fair, integral, valid and efficient. Assessment is:

a) **Fair** if it:
   i. provides opportunities for all students to demonstrate their learning;
   ii. promotes behaviour consistent with the [University Charter of student rights and responsibilities (UP07/132)](UP07/132) and the [University Policy on Academic Conduct (UP07/21)](UP07/21); and,
   iii. is transparent and clearly communicated.

b) **Integral to the learning process** if it:
   i. is used for formative and summative purposes;
   ii. is designed to promote student engagement with course content; and,
   iii. is timed to promote effective learning.

c) **Valid** if it:
   i. evaluates student learning outcomes;
   ii. is criterion-referenced;
   iii. conforms to national, discipline and professional standards (where appropriate); and,
   iv. is regularly reviewed and moderated.

d) **Efficient** if it:
   i. uses digital tools where appropriate; and,
   ii. measures student learning and provides effective feedback with minimal resources.

PART 2: Governance of Assessment Standards

Preamble
Part 2 of the policy deals with the governance of assessment standards, including responsibilities for monitoring assessment standards and ensuring consistency with regard to assessment practices and processes across the University.

Policy statement:

2 General principles

2.1 The University ensures that assessment processes and practices:
   a) are consistent and maintain high standards;
   b) report performance against the intended learning outcomes; and
   c) are regularly evaluated (with feedback from staff, students and others).

3 Roles and responsibilities

3.1 Assessment and academic achievement standards are monitored at the school/discipline/faculty levels.

3.2 The following are the roles for ensuring quality assessment processes, practices and standards:

| Student | A person who is enrolled in a course of the University and has a responsibility to participate actively, positively and with integrity in learning, teaching and research activities; complete and submit all required assessment tasks within specified timeframes; and undertake assessment tasks in an honest and trustworthy manner. |

Page 3/19 10 September 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examiner/Assessor</td>
<td>A person internal or external to the University, who is in control of assessing any aspect of a student's performance in a unit/course, is responsible for moderating that performance in relation to set standards and assigning marks. Examiners are required to provide feedback to students on their performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invigilator</td>
<td>A person internal or external to the University, who is employed on a casual basis, is responsible under instructions from the Examinations Office (Student Administration) for the proper and efficient conduct of an examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course / major coordinator</td>
<td>A person with the responsibility for the management of teaching and assessment of a course / major including developing course assessment plans, standard setting with the teaching team (tutors)/ unit coordinators, undertaking and guiding moderation processes including coordinating moderation between examiners through Boards of Examiners, where applicable, and recommending grades. Where a course is offered on more than one campus, this role is undertaken by the Primary Course Coordinator, who is responsible for assuring that the assessment standards and outcomes are consistent across all campus offerings of the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit coordinator</td>
<td>A person responsible for coordinating a unit in a course is responsible for the student learning process including, conveying to students clear advice about the aims and the desired learning outcomes of the unit, the assessment requirements, the relationship between the assessment requirements and the expected learning outcomes, the relative weighting of assessment components, the application of agreed assessment criteria and standards and the provision of feedback. The coordinator is responsible for reviewing, moderating and uploading the marks and feedback provided to students to ensure consistency in academic achievement standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School/Discipline</td>
<td>A person, appointed by the Faculty Dean, responsible to the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning/Education) or equivalent for ensuring compliance with University and professional accreditation processes and the quality assurance of units and courses including assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Associate Dean (student affairs) or equivalent | A person responsible for managing a range of student assessment matters including, but not limited to, the following:  
- reviews honours classification, honours dissertation grades, applications for alternative, central initial and deferred examination;  
- considers student request for review and appeal on grades, deferred assessment other than central end of semester examinations, special consideration matters and action on inability to locate student assessment; and  
- reviews individual student's academic progress. |
| Academic Conduct Advisor         | A person responsible for managing student academic conduct, issues and responses to findings of academic misconduct. |

4 Faculty Board of Examiners

4.1 A faculty must appoint a board or boards of examiners to carry out the following roles including, but not limited to, the following:  
  a) consider students' results in units, majors and courses offered by the faculty;  
  b) decide on student progression;  
  c) monitor assessment quality in units, majors and courses by reviewing survey and feedback data from students and peers;  
  d) assure the quality of course/unit assessment plans and moderation processes undertaken within majors/courses;  
  e) identify units, majors and courses with unsatisfactory assessment outcomes and advise the unit-major/course coordinator on actions to improve outcomes;  
  f) monitor and compare grade distributions across units, majors and courses by consulting and negotiating with other relevant faculties, where relevant, and reporting annually on this comparison to the Dean of Coursework Studies;  
  g) monitor school processes for safe, secure assessment submission and return, and ensure the quality and security of exam questions, and exam papers;  
  h) consider students' unit results and ensure they are reported to Student Administration for recording and publication, and carry out any other task relating to students' results that may be delegated to them by the faculty concerned; and  
  i) determine prize and award recipients, and report its decisions to the Prizes Unit within Student Administration.

4.2 A faculty board of examiners is normally chaired by the dean of the faculty concerned, or nominee.
4.3 A faculty board of examiners may delegate one or more of its functions to the dean or another member or members of the board of examiners.

4.4 A faculty governance document must refer to section 4.1 of this policy for identifying the role of its board of examiners together with any faculty-specific delegations.

5 Board of Examiners of the Curriculum Committee
5.1 By delegation of the Curriculum Committee, the role of the Board of Examiners of the Curriculum Committee is delegated to the Dean of Coursework Studies who deals executively with all related academic matters including, but not limited to, the following:
   a) the award of honours classifications, where these are not routine in nature, or relate to joint-honours classifications for new undergraduate degree courses;
   b) academic progress in exceptional cases that have been escalated for further deliberation; and
   c) faculty recommendations on applications for readmission from students who have been previously excluded for a period of at least 12 months from an undergraduate degree course or a diploma course.

6 Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee (or equivalent)
6.1 By delegation of the Faculty Board, the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee or equivalent is responsible for quality assurance in the conduct of assessment by:
   a) identifying emerging learning, assessment and teaching issues;
   b) developing processes in relation to learning, teaching and assessment; and
   c) articulating, implementing and monitoring standards for learning and teaching at the University.

7 Exemptions
7.1 The Faculty Dean or delegate has the authority to consider and approve exemptions as provided for in the following clauses of this policy: 9.2.1(b); 9.2.2 (a); 9.2.2 (b); 10.2.2; 12.3; 14.4; 16.2; and 30.4.2.
7.1.1 Any approved variation referred to in 7.1 must be recorded and reported annually to the Dean of Coursework Studies for monitoring purposes.

PART 3: Academic Provisions for Coursework Units

Preamble
This part of the policy sets out the principles that govern the delivery of formal assessment for coursework students within the University.

Policy statement:

8 Aims of assessment
8.1 Each unit taught at the University aims to balance and integrate the provision of:
   a) formative assessment which may include:
      i. self-assessment;
      ii. peer-assessment;
      iii. tutor-assessment;
      iv. collaborative-assessment; and
   b) summative assessment which must also have a formative function.

8.2 An assessment item is designed to determine:
   a) students’ understanding and skills prior to the teaching / learning process; or
   b) the effectiveness of the teaching / learning process.

9 Minimum unit assessment requirements
9.1 General requirements
9.1.1 All formal assessments contributing to the University’s award must be:
   a) conducted in English, except in the case of units taught in foreign languages; and
   b) designed to measure or evaluate the student’s knowledge and skills.
9.1.2 Each unit must have an assessment plan, a written Assessment Mechanism Statement, which sets out clearly the way in which the final result for the unit is calculated, and a unit outline, published via the Learning Management System.

9.2 Assessment plan

9.2.1 Assessment items and methods

a) Assessment items must be tailored to meet unit learning outcomes that include higher order learning and skills.

b) Each six-credit point unit must employ at least two summative assessment items and normally up to three summative assessment items of different methods including, but not limited to, the following:
   (i) examinations and tests: selected and/or constructed response, practical and oral examinations;
   (ii) assignments: written, oral, planning, problem-solving, reports, research-based, practice-based, reviews, research (e.g. dissertations)
   (iii) assessment based on:
       o observation or record of practice;
       o performance, creation or discussion; and
       o active participation, which does not include attendance alone.

c) An assessment item may comprise a number of tasks completed at different times in a unit (for example, a knowledge quiz assessment item may consist of a set of short weekly quiz tasks).

d) The number of assessment items set for a unit must be proportionate to the 150 hours of student workload represented by the credit weighting of the unit (6 credit points).

e) All undergraduate students must have an opportunity to receive formative feedback in the first five weeks (or equivalent for units taught in non-standard teaching period) of the commencement of their unit.

9.2.2 Assessment item weighting

a) An assessment item normally comprises at least 10 per cent and up to 70 per cent of a unit’s final mark.

b) Where a unit comprises a formal University examination component, the component normally constitutes at least 40 per cent of the unit’s final mark.

c) Where a unit comprises a group assessment task which is presented as a single entity and where the contributions of individual students cannot be identified:
   (i) the assessment item is limited to no more than 30 per cent of the unit’s final mark; and
   (ii) all members of the group are awarded the same mark.

d) The assessment of a group item that is prepared and presented as a single entity within which the contributions of individual students are identified, is not limited to the weighting restrictions referred to in 9.2.2 (c)(i).

9.2.3 Assessment criteria, marking schemes and rubrics

a) In accordance with the Higher Education Standards, each unit adopts a criterion-referenced method of assessment.

b) Each assessment item has assessment criteria aligned with the learning outcomes that provide the basis for evaluating and differentiating the quality of a student's work.

c) Assessment criteria are aligned with the University grades and grade descriptors (see part 5 (Grading System) which provides the University grades, grade codes and corresponding marks and descriptors).

d) Each assessment item must publish either a marking scheme for assigning marks or a rubric that is aligned with the assessment criteria, and is used consistently by all members of a teaching team, across all campuses and all modes of teaching.

9.3 Assessment Mechanism Statement

9.3.1 The University is committed to communicating the aims and details of all summative assessments items to students.

9.3.2 Each unit includes an Assessment Mechanism Statement that:
   a) lists summative assessment items, their weighting and requirements, if any, for passing the items;
   b) explains how assessment items relate to the unit learning outcomes;
   c) identifies the requirement(s) of any failed component, where relevant in a unit, and the consequences for not meeting that/those requirement(s);
d) specifies submission procedures and deadlines, and consequences of late, incomplete or non-submission;

e) outlines academic conduct requirements such as referencing of sources and consequences of academic misconduct as indicated in the **University Policy on Academic Conduct (UP07/21)**;

f) notes constraints (e.g. word limits) where applicable, and consequences of breach of constraints;

g) specifies minimum requirements relating to tutorial attendance and active participation where applicable, and consequences for failing to meet minimum requirements;

h) provides information about any marks adjustment process, if applicable, and a link to this process; and

i) informs about marking schemes and/or grade criteria for each assessment item.

9.3.3 Once the Assessment Mechanism Statement is published in the Unit Outline, it may only be altered in minor details (e.g. delayed due dates), with such changes communicated to all affected students in writing via their student email and the Learning Management System.

9.3.4 Changes in the forms, methods or number of assessment items are not permitted once the teaching period has commenced.

9.4 **Unit outlines**

9.4.1 Faculties must ensure that unit outlines for all units are available to students electronically via the Learning Management System at least one working day prior to commencement of the semester or teaching period.

9.4.2 Unit outlines must include:

a) unit aims and learning outcomes consistent with UWA Handbook content;

b) an Assessment Mechanism Statement;

c) confirmation as to whether recorded lectures will be available via the University's Lecture Capture System;

d) a schedule of topics, readings and other unit activities;

e) the web address for the **UWA Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities (UP07/132)**;

f) advice on the review and appeals process;

g) links to information on Academic Conduct Essentials (ACE) and reference to the **University Policy on Academic Conduct (UP07/21)**;

h) contact details of the unit coordinator;

i) contact details of the Student Guild and Student Services; and

j) information on learning support through STUDYSmarter, UniAccess and the UWA Library.

10 **Submission and presentation of text-based work for summative assessment**

10.1 **Method of submission**

10.1.1 All text-based work prepared for summative assessment must be submitted digitally, using a common digital form, through Turnitin to the University's Learning Management System. The digital form must seek student declaration that the assessment is the student’s own work.

10.1.2 Students must retain a copy of their assignment that is submitted for assessment via the Learning Management System.

10.1.3 Marks finalised for each summative assessment task are to be entered into and published via the Learning Management System, which is the University's approved secure repository, in a timely manner so that feedback is provided within 10-15 University working days of the assessment item’s published submission date.

10.2 **Principles of submission and penalty for late submission**

10.2.1 Deadlines for submission must be communicated to students; this communication must be clear, explicit and clearly stated via unit outlines.
10.2.2 Unit coordinators must ensure that the deadlines for submission of an assignment do not coincide with the pre-examination study period and the period during which formal University exams are conducted. Exceptions may be considered for postgraduate coursework courses, where there are no examinations.

10.2.3 Methods for granting of extensions to the submission deadline for assessed work must ensure that all students are treated fairly and consistently. The following circumstances are not acceptable grounds for extensions:
   a) inability to have an assignment word processed by the due date;
   b) other assignments due on or about the due date;
   c) computer, printer or internet break-down;
   d) foreseeable work commitments;
   e) holiday travels including overseas.

10.2.4 The following consequences of late or non-submission must be made clear to students:
   a) a penalty of 10 per cent of the total mark allocated for the assessment item is deducted per day for the first 7 days (including weekends and public holidays) after which the assigned work is not accepted. Each 24-hour block is recorded from the time the assignment is due.
   b) where assignments are graded Pass/Fail, failure to submit the assignment in time may result in the student not being permitted to take the final exam at the end of the semester or a teaching period and being unable to progress to the next level of the course or to graduate in the case where it is the final unit of the course; and
   c) assessments submitted later than 7 days after the deadline receive a mark of zero, unless an application for mitigation is approved in accordance with the University Policy on Special Consideration (UP11/23).

10.3 Word count (or equivalent in non-alphabetic languages)
10.3.1 For all written assessments, where relevant, guidance is given to students on the maximum word limit in order for the learning outcomes to be assessed.

10.3.2 Where word limits apply, students must be informed of the word limit, why it is being used, what is included, and how aspects such as reference lists and appendices are treated. Where a word limit is used, it comprises all words in the text including:
   a) definite and indefinite articles;
   b) proper nouns;
   c) headings and quotations;
   d) where author-date referencing style has been used, in-text references including author-date citations and page numbers (e.g. Daly, 2009, p. 34); and
   e) footnotes and/or endnotes other than those that exist purely for referencing purposes (e.g. where full references occur in these notes).

10.3.3 Where relevant, students must be asked to include a word count in the submission.

10.3.4 Where an assignment exceeds the word limit, a penalty of 1 per cent of the total mark allocated for the assessment task applies for each 1 per cent in excess of the word limit.

10.4 Academic referencing
10.4.1 Each unit must provide guidance and links to support materials on the most appropriate referencing style for the discipline.

11 Marking
11.1 Anonymous Marking
11.1.1 Student anonymity is preserved wherever possible and practical in the marking process.

11.1.2 The marking of all faculty and University administered examinations must be undertaken anonymously.

11.2 Negative marking
11.2.1 Negative marking is not permitted to be used as part of any assessment.
11.3 **Standardisation/moderation of marking**

11.3.1 Moderation is employed to ensure appropriate and consistent marking standards across units, and that assessment outcomes are fair and reliable. Outcomes of a moderation process for an assessment item/task are confidential only to assessor(s) and direct reporting lines.

11.3.2 A range of different models of practice in relation to standardisation and moderation of marking may be used, reflecting discipline differences and conventions. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

a) **marking standardisation exercises**: where a group of assessors independently mark sample pieces of work, then compare and discuss the marks to establish consistent marking standards.

b) **double blind marking**: where two assessors independently mark a piece of work, then agree on a mark;

c) **double open marking**: where two assessors jointly mark a piece of work; and

d) **second marking**: where a second assessor reviews a marked piece of work to confirm or challenge the mark.

11.3.3 Standardisation/moderation of marking, using appropriate marking keys or rubric, applies to all units, with unit coordinators selecting which moderation model(s) to use by considering the:

a) nature of the material or task to be assessed;

b) number, experience and role of staff involved in the marking process;

c) level of study of the unit;

d) relative importance in terms of weighting of the assessment item;

e) significance of the decision arising from the mark awarded;

f) norms of the discipline; and

g) expertise and views of any external examiner(s).

11.3.4 To ensure consistency all summative marking processes for an assessment item/task are numerical, unless an alternative scheme is approved by the relevant board and is clearly communicated to students.

11.4 **Adjustment of marks**

11.4.1 Adjustment of marks may be employed to ensure that:

a) the quality of marking across a group of students is consistent;

b) the grades awarded are a valid indicator of the achievement of a cohort; and

c) unforeseen circumstances that arise during the assessment period or in the assessment regime are rectified.

11.4.2 Adjustment of marks may be used when:

a) a cohort from one tutorial group has a considerably different average mark from the cohorts in other tutorial groups due to marking inconsistencies;

b) the average mark for the cohort differs considerably from their performance in other assessments in the same subject;

c) a single examination question, problem or assessment task proves problematic;

d) unanticipated anomalies in the shape of mark distribution occur (e.g. marks are highly concentrated in a narrow band around the median).

11.4.3 Where marks are adjusted to correct abnormal group performance:

a) the raw marks and the marking rationale must be available;

b) the adjustment function must apply to all raw marks and not reverse rank-order any student;

b) the rationale for mark adjustment and the impact on marks must be clearly recorded and maintained; and

d) the system used to identify potential units for mark adjustment must be transparent.

12 **Failed component**

12.1 A failed component may be assigned to an assessment item to mandate a minimum level of performance as a requirement for passing the unit. The consequences of not meeting a failed component must be made explicit to students in the Assessment Mechanism Statement.
12.2 Failed component requirements must be:
   a) determined on pedagogical grounds;
   b) measurable; and
   c) used only where necessary to enhance student performance and to ensure mastery of
core discipline elements, especially in disciplines where there are professional and/or
technical applications that require students to demonstrate minimum competency
standards or 'fitness to practice'.

12.3 Where a unit comprises more than one failed component requirement, the sum of all failed
component requirements must normally not exceed 70 per cent of the total assessment for
the unit.

13 Supplementary or alternative assessment (other than examinations)
13.1 There may be exceptional circumstances, outside special consideration and deferred
assessment provisions, where the following arrangements may be made for particular
students:
   a) alternative assessment: may, for example, be necessary if teaching resources such as
      prescribed texts are not available at short notice.
   b) special individual arrangements: may need to be made for supplementary assessment
      items to be set for students for whom the carrying out of a specific assessment item, as
      originally set out, is not possible (such as unanticipated resource access problems).
      These arrangements are directly negotiated between the student and the unit
      coordinator with due consideration given to issues of equity and assessment validity.
      The agreed arrangements must be placed on the student file and lodged electronically in
      the student's record.

13.2 Supplementary and alternative assessment arrangements may only be considered for
students with genuine documented hardship claims and mitigating circumstances, which
must be administered in accordance with the University Policy on Special Consideration
(UP11/23).

14 Failure and reassessment
14.1 A unit coordinator may approve re-submission of a failed assessment item.

14.2 Where re-submission of a failed assessment item is approved, students have up to five
University working days to produce and resubmit their work for reassessment.

14.3 Where resubmission is approved, the reassessed mark is capped at the assessment pass
mark, unless an application for mitigation is approved in accordance with the University
Policy on Special Consideration (UP11/23).

14.4 To ensure consistency and fairness, reassessment in a form different from the original form
of assessment to determine marks for borderline students is not normally permitted.

14.5 Reassessment is not available to improve upon a mark or grading above the pass level
required for an assessment task in a unit.

15 Student Feedback
15.1 Students are entitled to feedback on all assessed work.
15.2 Student feedback needs to be fit for purpose and may:
   a) fulfil a range of purposes, including clarifying, troubleshooting, correcting, encouraging
      and explaining;
   b) come from many sources, including teaching staff, fellow-students, professional
      practitioners, students' themselves (personal reflections) and external audiences; and
   c) use methods most suitable for student development and engagement, including
      appropriate technologies (e.g. recording spoken feedback).

15.3 Each unit must provide opportunities for students to receive feedback on their ongoing
performance and achievements for each assessment item.

15.4 Feedback must be clearly linked to the learning outcomes and assessment criteria.
15.5 Feedback must be:
   a) prompt: being provided within 10-15 University working days of the assessment item’s published submission date, and at least one week before the next assessment item is due;
   b) informative: highlighting strengths and weaknesses with specific examples and explanations; and
   c) helpful: offering suggestions about how to improve.

15.6 The provision of feedback must be regularly monitored in quality assurance procedures (e.g. SURFs, CEQs, course reviews) and appropriate action taken to address concerns raised.

15.7 Feedback on examination performance may take the form of generic feedback to a student group, e.g. in the form of an ‘examiner’s report’ on each question or similar.

15.7.1 Students are entitled to view their marked examination script within five University working days from receipt of release of results or during the first week of the next semester or trimester; however, this examination script remains the property of the University.

16 Student mobility (Study Abroad) and assessment
16.1 The treatment of assessment during a period of study abroad must be clear and transparent.

16.2 Results obtained overseas during approved study abroad/exchange programs are normally recorded on a pass/fail basis only, and normally excluded from any calculations for postgraduate or Honours applications.

16.3 Where host universities are well known, and especially where exchange agreements are in place, the University may recognise the grades awarded (where appropriate) and create conversion tables so that grades achieved abroad may be used within a WAM calculation at Level 3. If such tables are produced or updated, they must be presented by the Admissions Centre to the Dean of Coursework Studies for verification on an annual basis.

16.4 In advance of choosing a study abroad unit, students must be informed how their marks, grades or credits are treated when they return.

17 Ownership and archiving of students’ assessed work
17.1 Students hold the intellectual property inherent in all work produced for assessments.

17.2 Material produced by students for assessment (essays, projects, dissertations, artworks, digital artefacts, etc.) may be retained pending confirmation of marks awarded by the assessor/board of examiners, possible reviews and appeals and quality audits.

17.3 With the exception of examination scripts, the University endeavours to return to students all assessed work, where applicable.

17.4 Non-digital assessment tasks that have not been collected by the student are retained by the University for six months, after which time they may be disposed of. Arrangements for the disposal of such work are the responsibility of the relevant School.

18 Allegations of cheating and academic conduct
18.1 The University investigates all cases of alleged cheating and academic misconduct and where upheld imposes penalties in accordance with the University Policy on Academic Conduct (UP07/21).

19 Review and appeal
19.1 In cases where there is dissatisfaction with an assessment outcome or result a student may request a review of the academic decision under the University Policy on Review and Appeal of Academic Decisions relating to Students.
PART 4: Examinations

Preamble
Part 4 of the policy deals with the types of examinations held at the University and sets out the principles for ensuring consistency in the conduct and management of examinations.

Policy statement:

20 Administration of examinations
20.1 Types of examinations offered to students may include:
   a) formal University examinations held during the official examination period and administered by Student Administration; or
   b) alternative formal University examinations administered by Student Administration; or
   c) faculty or school examinations held outside the official examination period.

20.2 The frequency and nature of examinations must be decided by faculties in line with any constraints imposed by policies of the University.

20.3 Student Administration, Faculties and the Albany Campus determine appropriate venues where examinations are to be conducted.

20.4 In extreme mitigating circumstances, the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Registrar’s delegate (Associate Director, Student Administration) may approve a venue other than as in 20.3.

21 Formal University examinations
21.1 Formal University examinations referred to in 20.1 (a) include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination type</th>
<th>Examination Period</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial semester / trimester exam / summer exam</td>
<td>Following each semester, trimester or summer session</td>
<td>9am – 6 pm Monday to Saturday inclusive</td>
<td>Generally Crawley and Albany campuses</td>
<td>Venue on the campus at which the unit was taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary exam</td>
<td>Usually 4 weeks before the start of first semester and the week before commencement of the second semester or as determined by the faculty or school</td>
<td>same campus as the initial examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred exam (excluding summer session)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21.2 All formal University examinations are administered for 2 hours only (with an addition of 10 minutes provided for reading time).

21.3 Where examination is available in a unit, the exam paper must be set in a way that demonstrates a level of distinctiveness (at least 50 per cent) from that set in the previous year.

21.4 Non-standard duration examinations must be approved by the relevant board and Student Administration.

21.5 The Faculty and, the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Registrar’s delegate (Associate Director, Student Administration) may approve applications for deferred examinations in one or more units if a student was:
   a) substantially hindered in preparation for an examination; or
   b) absent from or unable to complete an examination.

21.6 Where supplementary examination is available in a unit, the examination is normally available in relation to the:
   a) initial semester / trimester examination; and
   b) deferred examination unless it is not feasible to offer such opportunity because of logistical limitations.
21.6.1 Where supplementary and/or deferred examination is available in a unit, the exam paper must be set in a way that demonstrates a level of distinctiveness (at least 25 per cent) from that set for the initial exam.

21.6.2 The requirements that students must meet to qualify for a supplementary examination are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Unit type</th>
<th>supplementary exam</th>
<th>Requirements to qualify for supplementary exam, where failed component is available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-graduate</td>
<td>Level 1 unit</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>at least a mark of 45 overall in the unit; and at least a mark of 45 in the failed component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last remaining unit in an undergraduate course – applies to Level 1, Level 2, Level 3 unit</td>
<td>Must be provided*</td>
<td>at least a mark of 45 overall in the unit; and at least a mark of 45 in the failed component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit being taught out or no unit of similar content will be available in the next academic year</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>at least a mark of 40 overall in the unit; and at least a mark of 40 in the failed component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td>Level 4/ Level 5</td>
<td>Not available*</td>
<td>As per case submitted by Faculty to the Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Exception for a particular unit requires the Faculty to apply to the Curriculum Committee.

22 Alternative formal University examinations

22.1 The University offers alternative examination arrangements to ensure ongoing compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1992, Disability Standards for Education 2005, and the Elite Athlete Friendly University Network Agreement.

22.2 Alternative examination arrangements must not result in the lowering of academic standards or affect the integrity of the examination process.

23 Faculty Examinations

23.1 Examinations held outside the official period referred to in 20.1 (c) include, but are not limited to, the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other examination types</th>
<th>Examination period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term examinations</td>
<td>Mid / during semester or mid / during trimester exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred summer session examination</td>
<td>Following the initial summer session exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Management of formal University examinations

24.1 Student Administration must:
   a) organise all supplementary, deferred formal and standard duration examinations, regardless of the number of students sitting the examination;
   b) provide an examination timetable to students including the times, dates and places for initial, supplementary and deferred examinations;
   c) notify students via email when the examination timetable is available within the timeframes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination types</th>
<th>Release of timetable to students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>5 weeks before the examination period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>3 days before the scheduled examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary</td>
<td>3 days before the scheduled examination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) process and issue of final unit results in accordance with Part 5 (Grading System) of this policy as soon as possible after completion of the unit; and

e) provide feedback to heads of schools on matters within the school's control that contribute to difficulties in examinations.

24.2 Information about examination times are not given to students over the telephone.
24.3 No one other than Student Administration publishes examination timetable information on the web.

24.4 Students are responsible for accessing their examination timetable through StudentConnect.

25 Invigilation
25.1 Invigilation in all central examination venues during the formal University examination periods must be carried out by invigilators appointed by the Examinations Office, Student Administration.

25.2 All invigilators must attend a training session prior to their first invigilation session.

25.3 During the conduct of an examination, invigilators are required to:
   a) provide instructions immediately prior to commencement regarding the conduct of an examination including recommending 10 minutes of reading time, and making students aware they can take notes and start their answers at any time.
   b) accompany to the University Medical Centre, where appropriate, any student who needs to leave an examination venue due to illness.
   c) report to the student’s allocated course advising faculty student office, via Student Administration, any student found with unauthorised material.

26 Contacting examiners during formal University examination
26.1 The academic member(s) or staff responsible for writing the examination paper or their delegates with knowledge of the paper content must:
   a) be present in the examination venue(s) at the commencement and during the first ten minutes of any examination for which they are responsible.
   b) be available to answer questions from invigilators or examination office staff members while any examination, for which they are responsible, is in progress.
   c) attend an examination venue immediately to answer any queries, including when:
      • alterations are required to their question paper; or
      • one or more students have requested information about a paper and the invigilators consider they cannot convey the answer accurately to the student(s).

27 Exam rules for students
27.1 Any student who commits any breach of the rules set out in this section or is guilty of any misconduct in relation to the examination is subject to action under Statute 17 – Student Discipline.

27.2 Student identification
27.2.1 For all examinations, students must present their student ID card as a form of photographic identification and verification.

27.3 Behaviour during an examination
27.3.1 Students must obey all instructions relating to the conduct of an examination given by an examination supervisor or invigilator. Instructions are given prior to the commencement of an examination and students must be aware of them, if unclear or unable to hear they may ask the supervisor to repeat the instructions.

27.3.2 Students requiring assistance during the examination must raise their arm and wait for an invigilator to come to them.

27.3.3 No communication by word or otherwise between students is allowed in the examination room. Students are subject to disciplinary action if found to be communicating with other students in the examination room.

27.3.4 Smoking and, unless authorised, eating is not permitted in any examination venue.

27.3.5 Students may only bring authorised materials into the examination room. Any student who has brought any unauthorised material whatsoever into the examination room must declare it to the supervisor immediately.
27.3.6 Where a candidate has been found to have unauthorised material, in whatever form, in the vicinity of their desk or on them, whether in the examination room or the toilets or en route to/from the toilets, the matter is reported, via Student Administration, to the student’s allocated course advising faculty student office and disciplinary action is normally taken against them regardless of whether the material has been used at the time it is found.

27.3.7 A student whose conduct is, in the opinion of the Chief Invigilator, disturbing to other students and who persists in such behaviour after receiving a warning from an invigilator may be required to end their examination and leave the venue.

27.3.8 In the event of an emergency, students must follow the instructions given by the invigilators and during an evacuation must refrain from talking or communicating in any other way to anyone except an invigilator.

27.3.9 Academic misconduct, including cheating in examinations, is dealt in accordance with Statute 17 – Student Discipline, the Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline, and the University Policy on Academic Conduct (UP07/21).

27.4 Exam booklets and written responses
27.4.1 Students must not remove pages from answer books or the answer books from the examination room. Such action may be treated under Statute 17 – Student Discipline.

27.4.2 Students must write their examination answers in biro or ink, unless otherwise instructed.

27.4.3 Students whose writing is illegible may be required to have the Schools to organise for their examination answers typed at their own expense or may be recorded as fail.

27.5 Entering and leaving the examination venue
27.5.1 Students may not enter the examination venue until instructed to do so by the Chief Invigilator.

27.5.2 Students are not permitted to enter the examination room more than half an hour after the commencement of the exam.

27.5.3 Arrangements may be made for a student to leave the examination room temporarily under supervision but no student is permitted to leave the examination room until after the expiration of thirty minutes from the commencement of the examination, except in special circumstances.

27.5.4 Where the time of a School-based examination is of one hour duration or less no student is permitted to leave the venue after the commencement of the examination.

27.5.5 Where a student has been permitted by the Chief Invigilator to leave an examination room due to illness, the student is required to seek medical advice on the same day of the exam.

27.5.6 Students are advised ten minutes before the end that the examination is about to conclude. No student must leave their seat until all question papers/answer books have been collected and the announcement is made that students may leave the room.

27.6 Arriving late for an examination
27.6.1 Students arriving late for examinations:
   a) are admitted to the examination hall without question during the first half-hour of the examination period but no additional time is made available to students to complete their examination.
   b) are not permitted to take the exam in its entirety at an alternative time.

27.7 Failure to attend an examination
27.7.1 Failure to attend an examination may only be excused in the case of serious illness or exceptional personal circumstances. Applications for mitigation may be submitted in accordance with the University Policy on Special Consideration (UP11/23).
28 Permitted materials in formal University examinations

28.1 No student may take into the examination room books, papers or electronic aids unless specifically authorised by the Faculty.

28.2 Students bringing pencils, pens and other such items have the option to carry them in a transparent pencil case or bag. Other pencil cases must be left in designated areas.

28.3 Students are not permitted to keep any electronic devices including mobile telephones, music players, or smart watches, on their person during examinations unless with the prior written permission of the Examinations Officer (see section 28.5 on use of calculators in Examinations).

28.4 No student may bring any food and drink into the examination venue, with the exception of water in a transparent plastic bottle from which all labels have been removed.

28.5 Use of calculators in examinations

28.5.1 Calculators with the following capabilities must not be taken into an examination venue:
- programmable;
- able to display graphics; or
- have the capacity to communicate with other devices, including but not limited to Bluetooth.

28.5.2 Student Administration, in consultation with the Faculty of Computing, Engineering and Mathematics, must approve and publish on its website all calculators permitted to be taken into examination venues.

28.5.3 Faculties must adhere to the approved list when stipulating calculators for use in examinations.

28.5.4 Students must be informed whether or not a calculator is permitted in an examination, and where permitted, be provided with:
- a list of approved calculators; and
- a link to this policy.

28.5.5 All calculators taken into an examination venue must be approved and identifiable by a non-removable and non-transferable approved sticker that has been attached by an authorised body or position comprising staff from Student Administration, Course Advising Faculty Student Office, or the Co-op bookshop.

28.5.6 Calculators without an approved sticker taken into any examination or test are removed from the student and returned at the end of the examination or test.

28.5.7 Students who do not have an approved calculator are permitted to sit the examination or test but are not provided with a calculator.

28.6 Use of dictionaries in examinations

28.6.1 The use of monolingual or multilingual dictionaries in examinations is not permitted unless specific approval has been given by the Faculty.

28.6.2 Students for whom English is not their primary language may be permitted to use dictionaries in examination rooms provided they have obtained the relevant written Faculty authorisation which must be presented to the invigilator at the time of entering the examination room.

28.6.3 Electronic dictionaries must not be approved for use in examination venues.

28.6.4 Where permission has been given to use dictionaries in examination venues, the dictionaries must not contain any form of written notes.

28.6.5 Students are subject to disciplinary action under Statute 17 – Student Discipline if they are found to be in breach of 28.6.4.
29 Review of academic decisions relating to students

29.1 A student who is dissatisfied with a decision regarding examinations may request for a review of that decision in accordance with the University Policy on Review and Appeal of Academic Decisions Relating to Students (UP15/1).

PART 5: Grading System

Preamble
This policy sets out the formal principles and requirements for the provisions of final results for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework units. It also aims to ensure that the amendment of examination results and other academic decisions found to be in error after notification to the student, is both equitable, and an accurate record of student achievement.

Policy statement:

30 General principles

30.1 The University ensures that final results appear in notifications of examination results and on academic records.

30.2 Final grades and marks in a unit must not be divulged to individual students before the official release of results by Student Administration.

30.3 The final results for undergraduate units and postgraduate coursework units may be expressed:
   a) both as a percentage mark and a grade derived from that mark; or
   b) solely as a grade without a percentage mark.

30.4 The University grades derived from percentage marks are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Grade Code</th>
<th>Marks:</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Distinction</td>
<td>HD (equivalent to Honours Class I (H1) in intent)</td>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>Excellent performance indicating complete and comprehensive understanding and/or application of the subject matter; achieves all intended unit learning outcomes linked to the assessment tasks; minimal or no errors of fact, omission and/or application present; clear and unambiguous evidence of possession of a very high level of required skills; demonstrated very high level of interpretive and/or analytical ability and intellectual initiative; very high level of competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>D (equivalent to Honours Class II, Division 1 (H2A) in intent)</td>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>Very good performance indicating reasonably complete and comprehensive understanding and/or application of the subject matter; achieves all basic and most higher-order unit learning outcomes linked to the assessment items; some minor flaws; clear and unambiguous evidence of possession of a high level of required skills; demonstrated high level of interpretive and/or analytical ability and intellectual initiative; high level of competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Pass</td>
<td>CR (equivalent to Honours Class II, Division 2 (H2B) in intent)</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>Good performance indicating reasonable and well-rounded understanding and/or application of the subject matter; achieves all basic but only a few higher-order intended unit learning outcomes linked to the items; a few more serious flaws or several minor ones; clear and unambiguous evidence of possession of a reasonable level of most required skills; demonstrated reasonable level of interpretive and/or analytical ability and intellectual initiative; reasonable level of competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>P (equivalent to Honours Class 3 (H3) in intent)</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>Satisfactory performance indicating adequate but incomplete or less well-rounded understanding and/or less well-rounded understanding and/or application of the subject matter; achieves many basic but very few or none of the higher-order intended unit learning outcomes linked to the assessment items; several flaws or many minor ones; clear and unambiguous evidence of possession of an adequate level of an acceptable number of required skills; demonstrated adequate level of interpretive and/or analytical ability and intellectual initiative; adequate level of competence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>N+</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory performance indicating inadequate and insufficient understanding and/or application of the subject matter; achieves few or none of the basic and higher-order intended unit learning outcomes linked to assessment items; numerous substantive errors of fact, omission and/or application present; clear and unambiguous evidence of non-possession of most or all required skills; insufficiently demonstrated level of interpretive and/or analytical ability and intellectual initiative; fails to address the specific criteria; inadequate level of competence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Fail         | N          | 0-44  | Poor performance indicating inadequate and insufficient understanding and/or application of the subject matter; achieves few or none of the basic and higher-order intended unit learning outcomes linked to assessment items; extensively
30.4.1 To ensure parity in marking standards across units, courses and disciplines, the distribution of marks and grades in a unit must comply with the bands set out in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWA Course type</th>
<th>Unit Levels</th>
<th>Cohort being awarded a Higher Distinction / Distinction</th>
<th>Higher distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate courses</td>
<td>Levels 1 - 3</td>
<td>Not more than 50 per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate - Honours</td>
<td>Levels 4 and higher, where relevant</td>
<td>Not more than 60 per cent</td>
<td>At least 10 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30.4.2 Any variation to 30.4.1, in particular due to the size of a cohort, must be approved by the relevant Board of the Examiners.

30.5 A final result for a unit may be expressed solely as a grade without a percentage mark under the following circumstances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Grade obtained</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) When a student has achieved a mark of at least 50 but failed a component that must be passed in order to pass the unit</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>Failed Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Completion of work for a supplementary assessment, including examination</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Passed Supplementary, in which case a mark equivalent to the minimum pass mark is recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Failed supplementary in which case the original mark remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Where certain categories of units are exempt from the requirement to have final results expressed as both a percentage mark and a letter grade (see section 31)</td>
<td>UP</td>
<td>Ungraded Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UF</td>
<td>Ungraded Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Exemption categories of units using the Ungraded Pass and Ungraded Fail grading scheme

31.1 The broad types of units, referred to in 30.5 (iii), are as follows:

a) Category 1: A unit assessed externally is one in which the involvement of external assessors makes it difficult to compare students’ performance in an equitable manner (for example, in-country units, cross-institutional enrolments and practicum units);

b) Category 2: A unit involving group activity in which individual contributions of students cannot be distinguished from those of the group (for example, participation in the University Chorale/Orchestra and compulsory field tours);

c) Category 3: A unit involving skill acquisition and where attendance and participation is sufficient (for example, use of medical equipment, legal skills such as negotiation and mediation);

d) Category 4: A unit in which an acceptable case for exemption has been made for an individual student.

31.2 The ungraded pass and ungraded fail grading scheme, for the categories of units referred to in 31.1, must be approved by the relevant board.

31.3 Proposals for new units or changes to existing units must indicate whether the proposed grading scheme is ungraded pass and ungraded fail, and if so, into which of the exemption categories, referred to in 31.1, the unit falls.

31.4 Ungraded fails have the value of zero in calculations of the Grade Point Average.
32 Amending results and other academic decisions

32.1 The University must formally amend its records and notify students irrespective of outcome, where errors have occurred in the process of:
   a) calculating and reporting final mark or grade;
   b) making academic decisions for admission to courses;
   c) assigning or removing progress status;
   d) awarding scholarships; or
   e) similar situations where errors have been made.

32.2 Where possible, the University strives to ensure that an error found to be made after formal notification of an error referred to in 32.1, does not result in any student at the University losing an opportunity already granted, or prevented from accessing an opportunity that may have otherwise been made available.
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