

Student Assessment Policy

1. Purpose	This Policy outlines the principles that govern EIA's management of assessments, the responsibilities and obligations associated with assessments.
2. Regulatory Alignment	HESF: 1.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment; 2.2 Diversity and Equity; 2.4 Student Grievance and Complaints; 3.1 Course Design; 5.2 Academic and Research Integrity; 5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement; 5.4 Delivery with Other Parties; 6.3 Academic Governance; 7.2 Information for Prospective and Current Students 7.3 Information Management
3. Scope	This policy applies to all EIA staff and students that are involved in the assessment process.
4. Policy	
4.1 General	4.1.1 EIA is committed to developing and implementing assessment strategies that support and maintain the quality of student learning and as against the expected learning outcomes. 4.1.2 Clear information about assessment task requirements, submission formats and deadlines must be described in the Unit Outline and provided to students through the Learning Management System (LMS). 4.1.3 Students are required to: • Understand and satisfy the requirements to pass a unit; • Submit all assessments by the deadline; • Accept any penalties that apply to late submissions; • Display academic integrity and avoid misconduct; and • Act on feedback relating to assessments, academic performance and ongoing progress within and between units of study. 4.1.4 Students must be able to demonstrate they have achieved the expected learning outcomes specified in the unit outline so as to successfully complete the unit. 4.1.5 Grades awarded accurately reflect the level of student attainment.

4.2 Assessment Design	4.2.1 Assessment methods will afford students opportunities to achieve and demonstrate the expected learning outcomes, as specified at a unit and course level. 4.2.2 The Course Coordinator will determine the assessment methods and ensure they are consistent with the expected learning outcomes being assessed. 4.2.3 The Course Coordinator is responsible for coordinating and monitoring assessment design processes to ensure they are fair and consistent. 4.2.4 Assessment tasks will be designed so that they are specific, measurable, achievable and realistic. Assessment items will be current, relevant and authentic so as to support graduate attributes and job readiness. All assessment tasks must be criterion referenced. 4.2.5 No single piece of assessment in each unit must be worth more than 50% of the unit's total marks. Each unit must contain at least three independent assessments and the first assessment should not be scheduled later than week 5 to diagnose student engagement with learning and understanding of the subject. 4.2.6 Any major changes to the assessment design within a unit shall be discussed at the SPEC (comprising of Dean/Associate Dean, Course Coordinator and Subject Expert) through the unit review process, reported to the Faculty Forum and approved by the Academic Board. 4.2.7 The proposal for major changes should address the following points: a. The rationale behind the need for modifying the existing strategy; b. How the revised strategy will enhance the achievement of learning outcomes; and c. The expected impact of the revised strategy on the workloads of both students and staff members. 4.2.8 The Course Coordinator is responsible for the assessment schedule and may delegate the task of writing assessments to lecturers. Lecturers are required to: a. Make information about assessments readily accessible; b. Provide timely feedback on assessments submitted by students, whether formative or summative; c. Comply with assessment policies, procedures and timeframes; d. Measure student progress and achievements in an honest, fair, and objective manner; e. Follow EIA's grading system; and
-------------------------------------	--

	f. Document and report on assessment outcomes 4.2.9 The Course Coordinator is also responsible for approving minor changes to the assessment tasks and ensuring the updates of assessment questions across different study periods. 4.2.10 The assessment type offered at EIA may include the following. Other assessment types may be offered following approval by the Dean. a. Closed or open-book examinations; b. Written essays, case studies or project reports; c. Oral, Viva Voce or presentations; d. Multiple choice or true/false questions e. Online or in-class quizzes; f. Group based work. 4.2.11 Hurdle Assessment are assessment tasks which have been specifically mentioned in the Unit Outline as 'Hurdle assessment'. A Hurdle refers to an assessment task designated as essential for passing a unit. Any changes to the Hurdle Assessment within a unit outline shall be approved at the SPEC (comprising of Dean/Associate Dean, Course Coordinator and Subject Expert)
4.3 Examination	4.3.1 Examinations at EIA are specifically designed to assess how well students have achieved the intended learning outcomes defined in the unit outline. 4.3.2 Examinations are also administered to satisfy the requirements of external bodies such as CPA/CAANZ Australia, which may require certain portions of the assessment of a course to be assessed through invigilated examinations. 4.3.3 Examinations will be created by the academic staff with utmost confidentiality and will not be made available or distributed to students prior to the designated examination sessions. 4.3.4 Each examination paper must include explicit information including the unit code, unit title, study period, academic year, exam weightage, duration, reading time (if applicable), number of questions to be answered, and the marks allocated to each question and its parts. 4.3.5 The weighting of the final examination should be between 30% to 50% of the unit total. The complexity

	and duration of each examination should be suitable and proportional to its assigned weightage. 4.3.6 The moderation of examinations is a crucial element of EIA's quality assurance mechanism to ensure that students are provided with the optimal chance to showcase their acquired knowledge and skill. It is mandatory for all final examination papers to be moderated internally and approved by the Course Coordinators. 4.3.7 Examinations are held within the examination period and at EIA, unless otherwise specified under EIA's Third Party Agreement. 4.3.8 Course Coordinators hold the responsibility of ensuring that qualified markers are assigned to grade examinations. When marking the examinations, the following factors must be taken into account: ○ If a student provides more components than necessary for a specific question, markers should only consider and grade the required parts as specified in the instructions; ○ Markers must clearly indicate the marks assigned to each question and its respective parts. ○ Markers must clearly indicate the marks awarded for each question and part thereof. 4.3.9 When students fail to appear for an examination at the scheduled date and time, they will be considered as having failed the examination and will receive zero marks, unless they provide valid documentation justifying the absence. In such case, special consideration rules apply.
4.4 Late submission and special consideration	4.4.1 EIA may grant special consideration to students who present evidence of extenuating circumstances that may have negatively impacted on their academic performance. To ensure a fair and equitable response, EIA may: • Provide an extension to the original deadline for the assessment task; • Provide an alternative form of assessment; • Allow the students to discontinue a unit without penalty; or • Take no further action. 4.4.2 Students who are granted special consideration will not receive allocated additional marks nor have their marks adjusted without first undertaking an alternative assessment. 4.4.3 Late submission of assessments without an approved extension will incur penalties. The usual penalty is a

	deduction of 10% from the allocated mark for each day or portion of a day that the assessment is overdue. A 'day' in this case refers to any day when campus administration is operational. Assignments handed in more than 10 days past the due date will receive no marks. 4.4.4 Deferred examinations will only be granted to students who are able to prove that unexpected and/or exceptional circumstances prevented them from sitting a scheduled assessment item.
4.5 Supplementary exam or assessment	4.5.1 A supplementary exam or assessment may be provided upon recommendation of SPEC under the following circumstances: a. When a student has failed the final unit marginally before completing a course (e.g., with a mark ranging between 45% to 49%) or b. When a student is granted special consideration or c. When a student has pass grade marks (aggregate marks more than 50%) but has failed to achieve at least 40% in hurdle assessment. 4.5.2 Where a student has marginally failed a unit and completes a supplementary assessment, the final grade awarded for the unit is limited to a Supplementary Pass (SP) or Supplementary Fail (SN). 4.5.3 Where a student completes a supplementary assessment as a result of a successful special consideration application, his/her work will be assessed as per normal; standards grade allocation apply.
4.6 Assessment feedback and results release	4.6.1 Lecturers are required to provide timely feedback to students throughout the study period. 4.6.2 Graded assessments must be returned within two (2) weeks of their submission. Queries must be responded to within one (1) week, or more if the student agrees. 4.6.3 Feedback will be provided using a variety of methods, including informal discussions in lectures and tutorials, appointments during consultation hours, emails and phone calls, and formal reviews of individual work and/or examination papers on request. 4.6.4 Students will receive their assessment results directly through the Learning Management System (LMS). 4.6.5 Examination results will be included in the overall final unit results and will not be provided as separate task results. 4.6.6 A final grade will be awarded to students based on their performance in all assessments completed during

	each unit of study. The grade must be given using the EIA grading system outlined in the table below. 4.6.7 The final unit marks and grades will be released based on the student’s ID, sent to their EIA email address on the grade release date published in the academic calendar. 4.6.8 Students who haven’t completed the AIM (Academic Integrity Module) will have their final grades withheld for the enrolled units until they have successfully finished the module. 4.6.9 A Conceded Pass must be approved by the Dean or delegate as a concession to a student who has met all of the following conditions: a. The unit is the final unit required by the student to complete the course of study b. The student has received an aggregate mark in the unit of 45% or greater, but less than 50% c. The student has submitted all the required assessments in the unit d. The student has not been recorded in the Academic Misconduct Register more than once in the course of study e. The student must apply for the Conceded Pass in writing to acadop@eia.edu.au 4.6.10 A student may request to review their grade for an individual assessment task or unit if they believe that a mistake may have occurred in the grading process and/or the compilation of their final results. 4.6.11 The student should contact the Course Coordinator to discuss their concerns about their grade within five (5) working days of being notified of the grade. 4.6.12 The Course Coordinator or delegate will review the grade and discuss the outcome of the review with the student within five (5) working days of the request being made. 4.6.13 EIA will use the grading system, which includes the following:												
	<table><tr><th>Code</th><th>Description</th><th>Mark (%)</th><th>GPA Value</th><th>Explanatory Information</th><th>Grade Status</th></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	Code	Description	Mark (%)	GPA Value	Explanatory Information	Grade Status						
Code	Description	Mark (%)	GPA Value	Explanatory Information	Grade Status								

	HD	High Distinction	80-100	4	A high distinction indicates an outstanding level of performance against most/all of the learning outcomes and requirements. For example, the student's work is based on well-substantiated arguments (i.e., based on in-depth research and solid findings), reflects critical thinking and analysis, and provides unique insights.	Final (complete)
	D	Distinction	70-79	3	Distinction indicates performance at a high level against most of the learning outcomes and requirements. For example, the students' work reflects well-thought-out arguments,	Final (complete)
	C	Credit	60-69	2	Above average	Final (complete)
	P	Pass	50-59	1	Average. Satisfies requirements. Competent and capable	Final (complete)

	CP	Conceded Pass	45-49	0.5	Refer to Section 6.7.6	Final (complete)
	N	Fail	0-49	0	The student fails to achieve a pass grade in a unit having attempted to complete the assessments and/or the student fails to achieve 40% of the allocated marks in the hurdle assessment as specifically mentioned in the unit outline.	Final (incomplete)
	NA	Fail – No Attempt		0	The student did not attend/submit assessments	Final (incomplete)
	EX	Exemption Granted		N/A	Student has exemption granted in accordance with the RPL Policy	
	CON	Continuing		N/A	Unit in progress	Temporary
	SP	Supplementary Pass	50	1	Student passed a supplementary assessment	Final (complete)

	SN	Supplementary Fail	0-49	0	Student failed supplementary assessment	Final (incomplete)
	WDR	Withdrawn		N/A	Student withdrew without academic penalty	Final (incomplete)
	WF	Withdrawn Fail		0	Student withdrew after academic penalty date	Final (incomplete)
	SPC	Special Consideration		N/A	Special consideration has been granted	Temporary
	DEF	Deferred Assessment		N/A	A deferred assessment has been arranged	Temporary
	GNS	Grade Not Submitted		N/A	A grade was not entered when results were certified	Temporary
4.7 Assessment moderation		4.7.1 EIA implements assessment moderation to ensure that accurate and consistent evaluations are made regarding a student's performance, while also upholding academic integrity. The assessment methods and criteria used to evaluate student work are established in advance and clearly communicated to students. Moderation of assessments will be conducted to ensure their suitability for the specific unit and level of difficulty, consistent application of assessment criteria, and reliable outcomes.				
		4.7.2 The process of moderation entails cooperation among academics with the goal of evaluating assessment tasks and criteria prior to the start of a unit. It also involves reviewing the assessments' outcomes, such as marks or grades, upon completion, to ensure:				

	a. The assessment tasks are suitable in relation to their alignment with the learning outcomes of the unit; b. The assessment criteria are appropriate, considering the attributes against which assessments are evaluated; c. The marks/grades are appropriate, taking into account the performance standards achieved based on the assessment criteria. It is important that all markers in the unit apply the same marking standard to ensure fairness, and d. The results awarded for each task, as well as the final mark and grade for the student in the unit, are fair, reliable and consistent.
4.8 Appeals	4.8.1 A student may appeal against a final grade for a unit within ten (10) working days of formal notification of the result as outlined in the Student Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.
Administrative Details	
Policy Owner	Managing Director
Implementation Officer	Dean
Approved Authority	Academic Board
Definitions	See EIA Glossary of Terms