



## ASSESSMENT POLICY

<b>Authorised By:</b>	Academic Board	Revision: 6.14
<b>Last Amendment Date:</b>	Revision Date: 06 Feb 2023	
<b>Review Due Date:</b>	Next Review: 06 May 2025	
<b>Related Documents:</b>	<a href="#">Student Progression Policy</a> <a href="#">Student Retention and Success Policy</a> <a href="#">Academic Quality Assurance Systems Policy</a> <a href="#">Moderation Policy</a> <a href="#">Students with Disabilities Policy</a> <a href="#">Staff Recruitment Policy</a> <a href="#">Student Grievance Policy</a> <a href="#">Graduate Attributes</a> <a href="#">Student Integrity Policy</a>	
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	Academic Director	
<b>Review:</b>	Scholarship Committee	

Any person who requires assistance in understanding any aspect of this document should contact the Responsible Officer

### 1. Overview

The goal of assessment is to direct and encourage effective learning. The effective assessment of subject learning outcomes is an essential component in the teaching and learning process. For this reason, assessment tasks must be given careful attention in the planning and implementation of any subject and be subject to regular review. This document and the publications to which it refers describe Tabor's general assessment policy and procedures.

### 2. Scope and Applications

This policy and its associated procedures apply to assessment in undergraduate and postgraduate Higher Education awards.

### 3. Policy Principles

- 3.1. A variety of assessment methods will be employed in any particular subject in order to obtain a valid and reliable assessment of learning; see Appendix G - Glossary of Higher Education Assessment Terms. An assessment may be either formative or summative.
- 3.2. Each summative assessment will validly and reliably measure the student's learning against the

stated learning outcomes for the subject. Whenever possible, an assessment should reflect the likely context in which a student might be required to demonstrate their achievement of particular learning outcomes.

- 3.3. Assessment tasks wherever possible will offer students an appropriate level of choice and flexibility.
- 3.4. Principles of equity will be applied to assessments, taking account of disability, cultural, and linguistic needs. Where students have an identified disability then the College will make “reasonable adjustments to teaching and assessment methods in order to enable students with disabilities to participate and succeed in its courses”; see [Students with Disabilities Policy](#).

#### 4. Procedures

##### 4.1. Assessment plans and strategies

- 4.1.1. Students will be informed at the beginning of each subject as to the tasks, requirements, and strategies to be employed in assessing the subject, normally including any particular rubrics involved in the assessing of submitted work.
- 4.1.2. The following table summarises the expected minimum number of words of assessment for standard coursework subjects offered by Tabor:

AQF level of subject	Credit point value	Minimum word count
5	6 cps	4500
7	6 cps	5000
8	6 cps	5500
9	6 cps	6000
9	12 cps	10,000

- 4.1.3. Assessment schedules will normally provide for early formative feedback to students.
  - 4.1.4. In the case of parallel taught subjects, lecturers should ensure that the work for assessment assesses the AQF specific learning outcomes of the undergraduate and post-graduate subjects.
  - 4.1.5. Heads of Program /Course Coordinators and Deans of Faculties are responsible for providing advice to lecturers on the type and requirements of assessment.
  - 4.1.6. Lecturers, Heads of Program / Course Coordinators, and Deans of Faculties are responsible for monitoring the efficacy of assessment tasks set for particular subjects.
  - 4.1.7. Heads of Program / Course Coordinators and Deans of Faculties are responsible to ensure that markers are appropriately qualified and that they understand assessment processes at Tabor. This will include the moderation of assessment grading of all assessors new to Tabor.
  - 4.1.8. The postgraduate heads of program / course coordinators, in partnership with the appropriate Dean of Faculty, is responsible for confirming the suitability of assessors for research projects and ensuring an efficient process in the assessment of these projects; see [Staff Recruitment Policy](#) and Guidelines for Assessors (see Appendix F).
  - 4.1.9. The Dean of Faculty is responsible for overseeing the process of examinations where they form part of the assessment for a subject (see Appendix H)
- ##### 4.2. Attendance Requirement
- 4.2.1. It is expected that all students enrolled in a subject participate fully in the learning opportunities, reading assignments, and assessment tasks that contribute to the holistic learning experience created by the lecturer. In some courses participation may include compulsory attendance.
  - 4.2.2. Because of the pedagogical choices made by a subject lecturer or because of the

particular delivery mode of a subject, it may be necessary for the successful attainment of the subject learning outcomes that attendance and participation in lectures is an assessable requirement.

- 4.2.3. Students will be informed in writing via the subject description of the attendance requirement for that subject.

4.2.3.1. When attendance is assessed, lecturers must ensure that there are opportunities for students to fulfil the attendance requirement in another way if non-attendance is outside of the students' control (such as sickness).

#### 4.3. Marking and Grading System

- 4.3.1 Subject lecturers, assisted in some subjects by appropriately qualified assessors, carry out marking of assessment tasks.

- 4.3.2 Tabor's grading system has been constructed so that the grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment.

- 4.3.3 Tabor utilises the following grading scale:

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Range</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<b>HD</b>	High distinction	85-100%	Highly Proficient
<b>D</b>	Distinction	75-84%	Advanced
<b>C</b>	Credit	65-74%	Proficient
<b>P</b>	Pass	50-64%	Adequate
<b>NGP</b>	Non-Graded Pass	N/A	Assessed at a minimum of Adequate level
<b>F1</b>	Fail 1	40-49%	Inadequate
<b>F2</b>	Fail 2	0-39%	Significantly Inadequate
<b>NGF</b>	Non-Graded Fail	N/A	Assessed at an Inadequate level

- 4.3.4 The awarding of grades is a deliberative process which requires the exercise of professional judgement; hence, all new markers must undergo a process of supervision and internal moderation before any grades are released to students.

- 4.3.5 Marking identifies the quality of the work against specific criteria appropriate to the individual assessment item and provides students with constructive, quality feedback about their work.

- 4.3.6 Tabor requires its assessors to use rubrics for the grading of all assessment work to ensure consistency and transparency. These must specify the criteria by which the assessment work will be graded and should be based on the relevant generic rubrics the College has developed.

- 4.3.7 Further information about assessment tasks and the connection between assessment tasks and subject learning outcomes should be clearly articulated in the Unit Description and / or the subject's Tabor Online page.

- 4.3.8 Tabor does not utilise a norm-based approach to grading, whereby grades are assigned by reference to the achievement of other students or the group norm. Grade distribution analysis is conducted at the end of semester and regularly discussed at Academic Board meetings to ensure consistency of grading across time and identify potential problems or issues. This is supplemented by the College's regular process of external moderation, which involves consideration of markers' grading standards and practices by external academic experts.

#### 4.4 Timing

- 4.4.1 Markers will normally return marked work to students within two weeks of the due submission date. Students should expect feedback before submitting subsequent work and the submission schedule should be constructed so as to allow for this.
- 4.4.2 Subject Lecturers will finalise grades in Tabor Online within four weeks of completion of semester.

#### 4.5 Appeals and Resubmissions

- 4.5.1 Students may appeal a grade if they believe it does not adequately reflect their achievement of the assessment criteria or that the grade is based on criterion that was not adequately communicated to students in the wording of the assignment task itself. Procedures for re-marking are detailed in the Pass Mark, Re-submission and Re-marking procedures at Appendix A.
- 4.5.2 Students may be granted the opportunity to resubmit an assessment (or to sit a supplementary examination), for which they have received a fail, unless the fail is the direct result of the application of a late submission penalty. Procedures for re-submission are detailed in the Pass Mark, Re-submission and Re-marking procedures at Appendix A.
- 4.5.3 Students may be allowed to repeat failed subjects the procedures for which are outlined in the Repeating Failed Subjects procedures at Appendix B.
- 4.5.4 Students who believe that they have not been treated fairly in the assessment process should make use of the [Student Grievance Policy](#).

#### 4.6 Graduate Attributes

- 4.6.1 The AQF requires that the College demonstrates that generic learning outcomes appropriate to the level of the award are being achieved by students. [Graduate Attributes](#) provides a summary of the attributes expected of the College's Higher Education graduates.
- 4.6.2 Courses should be designed in a way that ensures that students achieve the identified graduate attributes. They will be directly addressed in the College's core curriculum.
- 4.6.3 It is an expectation that lecturers provide students with the necessary instruction to help with the development of these graduate attributes and, when students exhibit a below-level capacity, make them aware of the additional support provided by the College.

#### 4.7 Continuous Improvement

- 4.7.1 Subject lecturers, under the supervision of their Dean of Faculty, will be responsible for developing, reviewing and revising subject assessment plans whenever the subject is taught.
- 4.7.2 Tabor will validate its assessment strategies by reviewing and evaluating assessment processes, and will document any action taken to improve the quality and consistency of assessment.

#### 4.8 Quality Assurance

- 4.8.1 Deans of Faculties are responsible for monitoring the quality of assessment within their Faculty.
- 4.8.2 The Academic Quality Assurance Committee, which reports to the Academic Board, works with Deans and Faculties to monitor the quality of assessment across the College.
- 4.8.3 Tabor's primary mechanism for assuring the quality of its assessment is a process of internal and external moderation. For further details see the College's Moderation Policy.

#### 4.9 Referencing for Academic Assignments – See Appendix C

- 4.9.1 In cases where the assessor believes there is an integrity issue raised by a submitted piece of work the assessor should follow the procedures outlined in the **Student Integrity Policy**.

5 **Definitions**

See [Global Definitions](#)

6 **Communication / Training**

Deans of Faculties are responsible for training their staff in the requirements of this policy and the policy will be published in the Tabor Policy Repository

## APPENDIX A - RE-SUBMISSION AND RE-MARKING PROCEDURES

### 1. Overview

Tabor acknowledges that students may, from time to time, believe they have grounds for dissatisfaction with the grade awarded for an assessment task. In addition there are occasions where an undergraduate student fails an examination or assessment task. This appendix provides direction for students and staff when a student wishes to apply to have an assignment re-marked and where students are offered, and choose to take advantage of, an opportunity to take a supplementary examination or re-submission (this offer is only available once for each examination or assignment). Tabor is committed to fairness, consistency, reliability and continuous improvement in the assessment of student work.

### 2. Procedures

#### 2.1. Re-Submission

- 2.1.1. Any undergraduate student at Tabor may request to re-submit work for a particular assessment task (or to sit a supplementary examination) for which the student has received a fail, excluding any deduction for late submission penalty.
- The request should be made to the subject lecturer within 10 working days of the return of the assessment task
  - The maximum grade allowable for a resubmitted assessment task or a supplementary examination is a Pass (unless the marker considers that there are exceptional circumstances which warrant the full range of grades being available).
  - Students will not be permitted to re-submit work more than once for a particular assessment task or to undertake more than one supplementary examination.

#### 2.2. Re-Marking

- 2.2.1. Subject to the conditions set out below any student may request a re-mark for a piece of work submitted for assessment if the student believes it has not been marked appropriately. Students should note that the nature of some assessment tasks (for example, a live performance) means that a remark will not always be possible.
- 2.2.2. In the first instance a student should immediately and informally discuss their concerns regarding the mark given with the person who marked the assessment. If the student is still dissatisfied then the process outlined below should be followed:
- If the student is still dissatisfied after an informal discussion, he/she should provide a written statement indicating the reason(s) for dissatisfaction to the Dean of Faculty. An unmarked copy of the piece of work in question must be attached to the written request. If the Dean of Faculty is the original marker the request should be addressed to the President. This request should be made within 1 calendar month of the assessment being returned.
  - If in the opinion of the Dean of Faculty or President there are reasonable grounds for a re-mark the Dean of Faculty or President will organise a re-mark by a third party. An unmarked copy of the work in question and a statement of the assessment task and marking criteria must be provided to the new marker.
  - The Dean of Faculty or President may also consider if further actions are required for the professional development of the marker.
  - In the absence of reasonable grounds being established, the Dean of Faculty or President will provide the student with a written explanation as to why the request was denied.
  - Where a re-mark is granted the new mark awarded will stand (whether higher or lower than the original mark).

- If the student is dissatisfied with the decision made by the Dean of Faculty he or she may appeal in writing to the President citing their reason(s) for dissatisfaction. The President will provide a written response to the student within 10 working days of receipt of the appeal.
- If, at the conclusion of this process, there is continuing dissatisfaction, the student should be referred to the Student Grievance Policy.

## APPENDIX B – REPEATING FAILED SUBJECTS PROCEDURES

### 1. Overview

From time to time students fail subjects of study and are required to repeat them in order to complete their studies successfully. This procedure addresses the issue of repeating subjects of study and is compliant with regulations for Higher Education Providers in Australia as set down in the [Higher Education Support Act \(2003\)](#) and [Guidelines](#) and [The Australian Quality Training Framework](#).

Tabor is committed to providing reasonable opportunities for students to complete their course of study in ways which do not undermine the integrity of the course. The following procedures have been developed in order to provide clear direction to students and staff.

### 2. Procedures

#### 2.1. Coursework Enrolments:

- 2.1.1. If a student fails a required subject in any course, the student will not be able to complete the course without repeating this subject.
- 2.1.2. To repeat a subject a student must re-enrol in that subject.
- 2.1.3. The tuition fee for a repeated subject will be the normal subject fee at the point of repeating.
- 2.1.4. The student will be expected to repeat all elements of the subject, including the assessment tasks, unless the Subject Coordinator (normally the lecturer for that subject) authorises alternative arrangements. A student who is to repeat a subject may arrange an appointment with the Subject Coordinator to discuss possible alternative arrangements.
- 2.1.5. Alternative arrangements may include a reduction in attendance or assessment tasks, depending on what the student has satisfactorily completed previously.
- 2.1.6. Any alternative arrangements must be fully documented, one copy to be given to the student and another copy kept in the student's record.
- 2.1.7. To pass a subject, a student must meet all the requirements for the subject and must attain the learning outcomes/objectives of the subject at the required standard. The Subject Coordinator must ensure that satisfactory completion of the work set for the repeating student will enable the student to meet the learning outcomes/objectives of the subject.
- 2.1.8. If a student fails a core subject for a second time, the student procedures for academic support will be applied. The student will be required to complete the failed subject successfully in order to be removed from academic support status.
- 2.1.9. If a student fails an elective subject the subject may be repeated. Alternatively, the student may instead choose another elective subject.
- 2.1.10. Students will not be permitted to repeat a failed subject more than twice (i.e. attempt a subject for the third time) without permission from the Dean of Faculty.

#### 2.2. Subjects involving a teaching practicum:

- 2.2.1. If a student fails a subject involving a teaching practicum component the student will not be able to complete the course without repeating this subject.
- 2.2.2. A second attempt at a teaching practicum subject will be allowed only if the student has demonstrated reasonable reflection and capacity to address the inadequacies in their first attempt.
- 2.2.3. Student teachers who fail to demonstrate a sound level of competence in their final Pedagogy subject will not be permitted to undertake a teaching internship and will not be able to complete their degree.

#### 2.3. Research Subjects or Theses



- 2.3.1. If a student fails a research subject or project in any course, the student will not be able to complete the course without repeating the subject or resubmitting the thesis.
- 2.3.2. If the Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator in conversation with the Dean of Faculty and Academic Director permits resubmission of a thesis the required revision must be completed within a prescribed time (which will not normally exceed twelve months) and only one resubmission of any thesis will be permitted. Successful thesis resubmissions will be graded on the basis of the individual circumstances giving rise to the requirement to resubmit.
- 2.3.3. If the Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator in conversation with the Dean of Faculty and Academic Director determines that a candidate will not be awarded the degree and not be allowed to resubmit the thesis, the student fails the course. Students will be allowed to exit with a lower nested award where course requirements have been met.

## APPENDIX C - ACADEMIC ASSIGNMENT RESOURCE RECOMMENDATION

The following table outlines the recommended minimum expectations regarding the number of substantial artefacts used as research / referencing for academic assignments.

Level	Tutorials	Assignments	Assignments	Assignments
	=/< 500 words	<1,200 words	1,200–2,000 words	> 2,000 words
Degree (AQF Level 5 / 7)	3	5	8	12
Graduate (AQF Level 9)	3	5	10	15

Strongly recommended is use of the Unit (subject) recommended texts list, and use of the library on-shelf collection and of their research on-line data bases.

Please note that substantial resources are considered to be resources such as scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, discipline textbooks, and other scholarly artefacts. You-tube, personal blogs, Wikipedia or other unsubstantiated web-based sources may also be used but these are not generally regarded as substantial academic artefacts.

## APPENDIX D – TABOR ESSAY RUBRIC

*This rubric is designed to serve as a guide only and should be adjusted / modified to fit the needs of your assignment and the learning outcome/s it assesses.*

	<b>Content (40%)</b>	<b>Evidence of Research (10%)</b>	<b>Argument and Expression (20%)</b>	<b>Structure (20%)</b>	<b>Referencing and Grammar (10%)</b>
<b>High Distinction</b>	Demonstrates an exceptional (sophisticated and thorough) understanding of the ideas and issues involved.	Engages with a comprehensive range of relevant, high-quality academic resources, seamlessly integrated into discussion as evidence and support for argument.	Develops a highly sophisticated argument that leads to a persuasive and compelling conclusion. This may involve demonstrating the superiority of their case to other plausible cases.  Displays a masterful capacity to express concepts with clarity and precision.	Includes all key structural elements, which are appropriately utilised.	Fulfils the formal requirements of citation and referencing with no errors. Contains virtually no errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar.
<b>Distinction</b>	Demonstrates an advanced understanding of the ideas and issues involved.	Engages with more than the expected range of relevant, academic resources, integrated into discussion as evidence and support for argument.	Develops a strong / rigorous argument that leads to an insightful conclusion. This may involve engaging possible counterarguments to their case.  Displays an advanced capacity to express concepts with clarity and precision.		
<b>Credit</b>	Demonstrates a commendable understanding of the ideas and issues involved.	Engages with the expected range of relevant, academic resources as evidence and support for argument. <sup>1</sup>	Develops a well-reasoned argument that leads to a clear conclusion. This may involve acknowledging possible counterarguments to their case.  Displays a good capacity to express concepts with clarity.		Fulfils the formal requirements of citation and referencing, however, there may be some minor errors. Contains a limited number of errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar

<sup>1</sup> The expected range is 0.5% of the word count.

Pass	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the ideas and issues involved.	Engages with a limited range of relevant, academic resource as evidence and support for most of the argument.	Develops a basic argument that leads to a conclusion. Displays an adequate capacity to express concepts.	Adheres to basic structural elements of an essay but may misunderstand certain elements (e.g., introduces new material in the conclusion).	Generally fulfils the formal requirements of citation and referencing, however, there may be some errors. Contains a number of errors in spelling, punctuation, and grammar but still at a satisfactory standard overall.
Fail	Provides an inadequate answer to the question and demonstrates a lack of understanding of the ideas and issues involved.	Engages with an insufficient range of relevant material, not as many or not at the level required. Resources not used to support argument.	Exhibits little evidence of sustained argument and lacks cohesion. Demonstrates a poor command of the English language.	Displays little evidence of basic structural elements of an essay.	Shows little care for formal requirements of citation and referencing. Contains significant spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors.

## APPENDIX E - TABOR ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES – HIGHER EDUCATION

Content .....

Structure .....

Argument .....

Presentation .....

Grammar .....

Referencing .....

General Comments .....

Marker Name \_\_\_\_\_ Marker Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date marked: \_\_ / \_\_ / 20\_\_

Assignment Grade: ..... Percentage: ..... Minus penalty for late submission: .....

Final grade (including %) .....

Grade	Description	Range	Assessment
HD	High distinction	85-100%	Highly Proficient
D	Distinction	75-84%	Advanced
C	Credit	65-74%	Proficient
P	Pass	50-64%	Adequate
NGP	Non-Graded Pass	N/A	Assessed at a minimum of Adequate level
F1	Fail 1	40-49%	Inadequate – May qualify for resubmission
F2	Fail 2	0-39%	Inadequate – No resubmission

## APPENDIX F- GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSORS

### Introduction

**Please take note:** Once PRINTED, this is an UNCONTROLLED DOCUMENT. The current version of this document is kept on the Tabor Corporate Document Repository.

Tabor offers a range of degrees that culminate in a research project assessed by external academics. While the nature and requirements of these projects differ from discipline to discipline, there are some common elements of the assessment process shared by all. These guidelines offer a brief introduction to the process of assessment at Tabor in general and are provided to all academics who are recruited by Tabor to assess a student's research. The following headings will guide you through the basic structure of the assessment process from beginning to end.

### *Notification of Intention to Submit*

6-8 weeks before submitting their project, students are required to notify their Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator of their intention to submit. This process is undertaken by the student and their supervisor by means of the Notification of Intention to Submit form which can be accessed on Tabor Online. This form allows the Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator time to begin finding assessors for the project so that when it is finally submitted, there is an efficient transition into the assessment process.

### *Appointment of Assessors*

The appointment of appropriate assessors is of critical importance because the decision as to whether the degree will be granted is contingent on the reports of the assessors. The assessors must assess not only the candidate's knowledge and understanding of a body of knowledge, but also the candidate's approach to research and their ability to implement and complete a sound research study, including developing hypotheses, discussing arguments, and analysing data/ideas. The following points are to be noted:

1. Two assessors, including at least one external assessor, will be appointed to assess each project.
2. The Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator is responsible for ensuring that assessors are suitably qualified and have relevant and current research experience, as well as establishing and maintaining a register of suitable assessors. Guidelines for the appointment of assessors are developed by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee to the standards required by the AQF:
  - a. Assessors should have a relevant doctorate or, when appropriate to the research topic, a research masters and significant industry experience.
  - b. Assessors should be in a position normally to submit a grade within six to eight weeks of receiving the submission from Tabor.
3. The Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator will invite the preferred assessors to function in this role, providing them with:
  - a. the candidate's name, the degree for which the project is being submitted, the field in which the research has been undertaken, the title of the project, an abstract of the project including the methodology to be used, and the name(s) of the supervisor(s);
  - b. information on Tabor's policy regarding the release of assessors' reports and contact between assessors;
  - c. details of the procedures which will be followed in the event of a lack of consensus between assessors;
  - d. Tabor's standard report form approved by the AQAC;
  - e. details of the deadline for responding to the invitation to assess (normally four weeks) and the of maximum time allowed from the receipt of a project for assessment until the submission of a report (normally 2 months).
4. Should an invited assessor be unable to accept the invitation or fail to respond to this invitation within the specified timeframe, despite receiving a reminder notice, an approved reserve assessor will be invited to assess the project.
5. The identity of assessors will not be released to the candidate until after the assessment report is received.

### *Conflicts of Interest*

While the Postgraduate Heads of Program / Course Coordinators of each faculty will do their utmost to ensure there are no conflicts of interest between the assessor and the student or both assessors, it is incumbent upon the assessor to signal a potential conflict of interest if they suspect one to be present.

### *Timeframe*

Assessors are expected to have carefully read the project and completed their reports within 6-8 weeks of receiving the project. If a delay appears likely, please advise the Postgraduate Heads of Program / Course Coordinators so that alternative arrangements may be made.

### *Assessor Responsibilities*

Assessors are expected to read the project closely and carefully. Assessors must then complete the Assessor's Recommendation Summary as well as a more detailed report based on the Detailed Report Template. These documents will be provided by the Postgraduate Heads of Program / Course Coordinators and will outline both the nature of the award in which the project sits and the particular criteria that the project is required to meet.

To complete the Assessor's Recommendation Summary, assessors are to assign a percentage grade to the project. The percentages correspond to the following categories:

**85-100% High Distinction:** An extremely high level of expertise/competence in demonstrating understanding of the topic, comprehension of the concepts involved, and practical and/or presentation skills.

**75-84% Distinction:** A high level of expertise/competence in demonstrating understanding of the topic, comprehension of the concepts involved, and practical and/or presentation skills.

**65-74% Credit:** A commendable level of expertise/competence in demonstrating understanding of the topic, comprehension of the concepts involved, and practical and/or presentation skills.

**50-64% Pass:** An adequate level of expertise/competence in demonstrating understanding of the topic, comprehension of the concepts involved, and practical and/or presentation skills.

**>50% Fail** the project may either be:

In the event of a fail, the assessor should also select one of the following options:

- The candidate should be invited to rewrite the project and then resubmit it for a re-assessment.

OR

- The candidate should not be invited to rewrite and resubmit the project.

These two options can be expanded as follows:

**Invitation to Resubmit:** This option should be chosen if an assessor sees sufficient potential in the project alongside significant concerns. The Invitation to Resubmit stipulates that an assessor is willing to allow the student to resubmit their project for assessment by the same assessor following a major rewrite that addresses comments suggested by the assessor and supervised by the Principal Supervisor (and co-supervisor where appropriate). This process may only be undertaken once per manuscript per candidate and the re-assessment result shall be absolute. The best possible result for a resubmission is a Pass.

**Refusal of Invitation to Resubmit:** This option should be chosen if the assessor thinks that the project indicates an

**Please take note:** Once PRINTED, this is an UNCONTROLLED DOCUMENT. The current version of this document is kept on the Tabor Corporate Document Repository.

inadequate level of expertise/competence in demonstrating understanding of the topic, comprehension of the concepts involved, and practical and/or presentation skills.

### *Coordinating Different Grades*

In those cases where both assessors assign the same mark, no action is required.

In those cases where both assessors assign different marks, the Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator will adopt the following procedures:

#### TWO Passing Grades:

- (a) If both assessors assign a passing grade and there is a difference of less than 15%, then the final grade is the average of the two percentages. The Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator is to calculate this average and record this as the official mark.
- (b) If both assessors assign a passing grade and there is a difference of 15% or greater, then the assessors will be invited to discuss the grades and agree on a final mark. If no agreement can be reached, a third assessor will be engaged and their grade will be final.

#### An Invitation to Resubmit AND a Passing Grade:

If one assessor invites a resubmission and the other assigns a pass, the student will be permitted to resubmit the project after undertaking the process outlined under **Invitation to Resubmit**. On resubmission, only the assessor who has assigned the fail will re-assess the project and their second grade will replace the previous fail. Note, the best possible grade for a resubmission is a Pass.

#### TWO Invitations to Resubmit:

If both assessors invite a resubmission, then the student will be permitted to undertake the process outlined under **Invitation to Resubmit** and both assessors will re-assess the project.

#### A Refusal of Invitation AND a Passing Grade:

In the event that one assessor assigns a fail and refuses an invitation to resubmit while the other assessor assigns a passing grade, a third assessor who must be external to Tabor College and selected in accordance with Tabor's Guidelines for the Appointment of Assessors will be appointed to replace the assessor who has assigned the fail. Where a third assessor is appointed, that assessor will not have access to the reports of the other assessors prior to their assessment of the project. The third assessor's assessment will override the grade of the assessor they have replaced.

#### An Invitation to Resubmit AND a Refusal of Invitation

If both assessors fail the project but only one invites resubmission while the other refuses resubmission, the student will be assigned a failed grade without the opportunity to resubmit.

#### TWO Refusals of Invitation to Re-Submit:

If both assessors fail the project and refuse the invitation to re-submit, then the student will be assigned a failed grade and will not be given the opportunity to re-submit.

### *Resubmission for Assessment*

In those instances where both assessors invite the student to rewrite their project and to resubmit it for assessment, the student must work with their supervisor/s to address the assessors' comments. The rewrite must be completed within no more than 4 months. The student should record any changes made using a table such as the following:



Changes Required by the Assessors	Changes made by the Student	Location where changes have been made

Once the required changes have been made and the supervisor/s are satisfied that the project be re-submitted for assessment, it is the task of the Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator to send the project to the assessors for re-assessment. After the re-assessment, the findings of the assessors are final, and there is no avenue for the student to either attempt further rewrites to the project or to request re-assessment.

#### *Remuneration*

Assessors will receive appropriate remuneration for their professional services. Remuneration differs depending on the type and length of project being assessed and the year in which the project was begun. The exact amount will be specified in an invoice that will be forwarded to the assessor along with the project. Assessors may also need to fill out a form entitled "Statement by Supplier". This form.....Please contact the relevant Postgraduate Head of Program / Course Coordinator if you are unsure as to whether or not you need to fill out this form.

## Appendix G - Glossary of Higher Education Assessment Terms

### 1. WHAT IS ASSESSMENT?

- 1.1. **Assessment** is the method(s) and procedures by which a student's academic progress and performance is measured in a subject. The purposes of assessment are to:
  - 1.1.1. assist student learning related to outcomes;
  - 1.1.2. make judgements about students' achievements;
  - 1.1.3. evaluate the effectiveness of teaching programs; and
  - 1.1.4. to inform decisions about students' future learning.
- 1.2. **Academic tasks** are any tasks or activities that may be used to gauge the progress of student learning and determine the student's results for the subject. Assessment tasks are identified below.
- 1.3. **Formative assessment** is assessment that is intended to provide feedback to students on their level of performance. Marks are not used to formulate a student grade for an assessment task or for the subject, but for identifying future steps for teaching and learning.
- 1.4. **Summative assessment** is assessment that is marked and where the mark is used to formulate a student grade for the assessment task and the subject.

### 2. COMMON FORMS OF ASSESSMENT

- **Annotated bibliography** – a bibliography in which each citation is followed by an annotation containing a brief descriptive and/or evaluative summary, synopsis, or abstract. The description helps the reader evaluate the content and usefulness of each item to his/her own research.
- **Blog** – the term blog comes from weblog, which is an online personal diary or journal. Blogs are generally available for the public to read and to enter comments about the entries or postings. Blog content ranges from personal activity to political, technical, educational, and other special-purpose content.
- **Book review** – a book review always has 2 parts: (1) summary of content – this demonstrates that the student has read and comprehended the basic arguments of the book; and (2) critique of the book – this demonstrates the student's ability to engage critically with the material read and to identify strengths and weaknesses as well as to deal with issues regarding the relevance of the book.
- **Case study** – an actual case or hypothetical case that illustrates how one would deal with a given situation. Normal structure is to provide background, define problem, identify options, and suggest a course of action where appropriate.
- **Critique** – an essay or article that gives a critical evaluation.
- **Dissertation** – written presentation of an investigation or piece of research, normally taking the form of an extended essay being less rigorous in its style and layout requirements than a thesis. The content reflects the findings of the investigation.
- **Essay** – an answer to a question in the form of continuous connected prose. The object of the essay should be to test the ability to discuss, evaluate, analyse, summarise and criticise. An essay should contain: (1) an *introduction* – defines the topic and identifies what will be argued in the body of the essay; (2) *development* – the body of the essay, organised paragraphs with logical sequence, usually without headings; (3) *conclusion* – sums up, no new information, clarifies outcomes; and (4) *references/bibliography*. Also refer to **research paper** below.
- **Examination** – exams are done under comparatively short, timed conditions and usually under observed conditions which ensure they are the student's own work. Exams normally require written (or essay) responses to questions that are only made known at the time of the examination; however 'seen' exams, 'open-book' exams and 'multiple-choice question' exams are common variations. See Appendix
- **Group task** – an assessment task that is undertaken by groups of students working collaboratively.
- **Individual task** – an assessment task that is undertaken by an individual student.

- **Interview** – a conversation between two or more people (the interviewer and the interviewee) where questions are asked by the interviewer to obtain information from the interviewee.
- **Journal** – a student's personal records and reactions to various aspects of learning and developing ideas. Keeping a journal enables teachers and students to reflect on, expand and enhance their practice.
- **Literature review** – a summary and explanation of key studies relevant to a proposed project; a body of text that aims to review the critical points of current knowledge on a particular topic. It does not contain the student's own argument. It should summarise, synthesise, compare, contrast and evaluate the views of others from what has been written about a topic.
- **Multiple choice test** – a test in which students are presented with a question or an incomplete sentence or idea. Students are expected to choose the correct or best answer/completion from a menu of alternatives.
- **Peer assessment** – peer assessment occurs when students provide feedback to other students about their learning. Effective peer assessment should be structured, focussed on the content, process and presentation of the work, and should take place in an environment of trust.
- **Performance** – an evaluation of practical outcomes in which the assessor observes the student in action, demonstrating their skills.
- **Portfolio** – a systematic and organised collection of a student's work that exhibits to others the direct evidence of a student's efforts, achievements, and progress over a period of time. The collection should involve the student in the selection of its contents, and should include information about the performance criteria, the rubric or criteria for judging merit, and evidence of student self-reflection or evaluation. Portfolios may be used for evaluation purposes or for sharing as a record of student achievement.
- **Practicum** – a placement that includes job-related activities and stresses the practical application of theory in a field of study.
- **Presentation** – the process of presenting the content of a topic to an audience; a show or display; the act of presenting something to sight or view.
- **Project** – a complex assignment involving more than one type of activity and production.
- **Quiz** – Short written or oral test, less formal than an examination.
- **Reflection paper** – a reflection paper generally has no research component. It seeks the student's opinion or response to the situation or issue put forward. It does not need to cite a range of sources.
- **Report** – a report is a presentation of gathered information. It is organised under headings, which are often numbered systematically. Sections/headings will vary with the topic, but may include an Abstract (introductory summary) followed by an introduction, suitable subsections, conclusion/recommendations, and references.
- **Research paper** – a type of essay which allows the student to: (1) acquire a greater depth of knowledge in a specified subject area and (2) develop and demonstrate basic research and writing skills appropriate to the subject area. Papers are marked on the depth of research, the ability to put forward a case or explain the point being made, evidence of personal engagement with topic, proper use and referencing of sources, proper format and structure of paper, and general writing style and grammatical ability.
- **Resource folder** – a compilation of copied resources and/or the student's own materials. Students are expected to reference sources, to sort and label categories, and to comment on reasons for including particular items.
- **Self assessment** – involves the student applying the assessment criteria for themselves. This might include the completion of a self assessment task to be handed in with work.
- **Test** – a task, or set of tasks, designed to measure a sample of student understanding/learning. Students are required to apply their knowledge and skills to address a particular challenge or demonstrate understanding of specific topics or processes.

- **Thesis** – a treatise advancing a new point of view resulting from research; usually a requirement for an advanced academic degree. A thesis is expected to add to and may even challenge the body of knowledge in the topic area.
- **Tutorial paper** – purpose is to demonstrate adequate preparation for leading small group discussion on the assigned/chosen topic. It is not a research paper but normally requires the student to consult sources in addition to those that other members of the group would have read. It is not a summary of the relevant chapter of the textbook, although it may make reference to the assigned text. The purpose of tutorials varies from subject to subject as well as the general rule for how many sources should be consulted. It may be an individual or a group task.
- **Unit and Lesson Plans** – a common assessment task for students in Teacher Education. Student should use Tabor formats as a basis and negotiate with their lecturer for particular requirements.

### 3. MEANINGS OF COMMON ASSESSMENT TERMINOLOGY

<b>Account</b>	<u>Account for</u> : state reasons for, report on. <u>Give an account of</u> : narrate a series of events or transaction. Explain (reasons).
<b>Analyse</b>	Study in detail – examine closely, examine in parts – outlining the key features, characteristics and issues and raising the strengths/ advantages and weaknesses/disadvantages – show how the parts contribute to the whole. Identify components and the relationship between them; draw out and relate implications.
<b>Apply</b>	Use, utilise, employ in a particular situation.
<b>Appreciate</b>	Make a judgement about the value of.
<b>Argue</b>	Present a case for a particular concept/idea and highlight examples/significance, and discuss how to respond to counter-arguments.
<b>Assess</b>	Evaluate, judge, measure importance – weigh up the evidence. Make a judgement of value, quality, outcomes, results or size.
<b>Bibliography</b> (compare with reference list)	A list of reference materials such as books and articles used for research. Bibliographies refer to a list of references at the end of an article as well as a collection of information resources on a specific topic published together as a book.
<b>Calculate</b>	Ascertain/determine from given facts, figures or information.
<b>Clarify</b>	Make clear or plain.
<b>Classify</b>	Arrange or include in classes/categories.
<b>Comment</b>	Express one's response to the concept/idea clearly and moderately and provide suitable evidence for the response.
<b>Compare</b>	Search for differences and similarities between two or more concepts/ideas.
<b>Compare and contrast</b>	Describe the similarities and differences between two subjects or aspects of a

	topic. When considering this instruction it is useful to imagine a pair of scales where one idea or interpretation is weighed against another. This requires an <i>“on the one hand/on the other hand”</i> type of answer. You should not write separate and consecutive accounts of each but make comparisons or contrasts for each point.
<b>Construct</b>	Make; build; put together items or arguments.
<b>Contrast</b>	Highlight the differences between two or more concepts/ideas.
<b>Critically (analyse/evaluate)</b>	Add a degree or level of accuracy, depth, knowledge and understanding, logic, questioning, reflection and quality to (the topic).
<b>Critique</b>	Gives a critical evaluation; make a systematic inquiry into the conditions and consequences of a <a href="#">concept</a> or set of concepts and attempt to understand its limitations.
<b>Deduce</b>	Draw conclusions.
<b>Define</b>	State clearly and exactly the meaning of the given concept/idea, taking into account the limits and the range/variations of possible definitions.
<b>Demonstrate</b>	Show by example and with suitable evidence.
<b>Describe</b>	Provide characteristics and features.
<b>Develop</b>	Enlarge upon the basic features/characteristics/reasons and provide greater depth.
<b>Discuss</b>	Identify issues and provide points for and/or against. You will be expected to put forward an idea or contention and use references to the facts to support it, or to weigh the arguments for and against a line of thought.
<b>Distinguish</b>	Recognise or note/indicate as being distinct or different from; to note differences between.
<b>Elaborate</b>	Similar to <b>develop</b> above, express in greater detail.
<b>Enumerate</b>	An item-by-item account, such as the steps in a process.
<b>Evaluate</b>	Make a judgement based on criteria; determine the value of. Investigate a given concept/idea and make a judgement about its relevance, usefulness and validity based on certain criteria after looking at strengths/weaknesses or advantages/disadvantages. The evaluation needs to be based on expert rather than personal judgement. Supporting evidence is required.
<b>Examine</b>	Research a given topic/concept/idea in great detail and depth.
<b>Explain</b>	Relate cause and effect; make the relationships between things evident; interpret how something works or happens; based on supporting evidence.

<b>Explore</b>	Describe in detail and note impact.
<b>Extract</b>	Choose relevant and/or appropriate details.
<b>Extrapolate</b>	Infer from what is known.
<b>Grade/Mark</b> <i>used interchangeably</i>	The numerical % and the descriptive code (High Distinction – Fail 2) awarded for the assessment task.
<b>Identify</b>	Discover the key features/characteristics/reasons/events and discuss in detail. Recognise and name.
<b>Illustrate</b>	Provide examples which support a given response.
<b>Indicate</b>	Focus on specific areas, similar to <b>illustrate</b> above.
<b>Interpret</b>	Draw meaning from.
<b>Investigate</b>	Inquire into and draw conclusions about.
<b>Justify</b>	Support an argument or conclusion.
<b>List</b>	Provide a list of related items in logical sequence.
<b>Mark</b>	Used interchangeably with <b>grade</b> above.
<b>Outline</b>	Sketch in general terms; indicate the main features of.
<b>Predict</b>	Suggest what may happen based on available information.
<b>Propose</b>	Put forward (for example a point of view, idea, argument, suggestion) for consideration or action.
<b>Prove</b>	See <b>demonstrate</b> above.
<b>Recall</b>	Present remembered ideas, facts or experiences.
<b>Recommend</b>	Provide reasons in favour.
<b>Recount</b>	Retell a series of events.
<b>Reference List</b> <i>(compare with Bibliography)</i>	A list of all sources that have been actually cited in a document.
<b>Review</b>	Examine a given topic/concept/idea/book critically, looking at strengths/weaknesses or pros/cons; describe chief features, criticise generally.
<b>Rubric</b>	Rubrics specify sets of criteria that clearly define for both student and teacher what a range of acceptable and unacceptable performance looks like. Criteria define descriptors of ability at each level of performance and assign values to each level. A scoring rubric makes explicit expected qualities of performance

	on a rating scale or the definition of single scoring on a scale.
<b>Show</b>	See <b>demonstrate</b> above.
<b>State</b>	Present the key ideas in a short, concise, clear format.
<b>Summarise</b>	Express, concisely, the relevant details. Provide an outline of the issues under consideration, but concentrate only on the most important facts and details.
<b>Synthesise</b>	Bring together ideas from different places. Putting together various elements to make a whole.
<b>To what extent...</b>	How far does one respond or participate and why? This involves presenting an argument supporting the judgement made from the evidence available. It is important to raise an awareness of alternatives in the analysis.

## Appendix H - EXAMINATIONS AND PROCEDURES

### 1. Overview

Tabor recognises the value of the examination as an assessment task. This policy provides a framework for the organisation of examinations and the conduct of students in examinations by, as far as reasonably possible, providing an environment free from distraction.

#### 1.1. Principles

- 1.1.1. Final examinations are held in some undergraduate subjects, and where this is the case the need for an exam and its weighting will be indicated on the relevant subject information sheet.
- 1.1.2. Student assessment is based on the extent to which an assessor considers that a student has attained the objectives of a subject, as specified in the accredited curriculum documentation. Examinations, assignment and other assessed work are to be designed to complement one another and to provide adequate assessment in all the necessary areas for all students at all levels.
- 1.1.3. If examinations are required, students must present for examination in order to gain a pass in the subject concerned.
- 1.1.4. Generally, examinations account for approximately 30% of the total available subject marks, although there may be some variation from subject to subject.
- 1.1.5. A student's overall grade in examinable subjects will usually be based on the aggregate of term/assignment marks and the examination mark.
- 1.1.6. Examination format may vary from subject to subject, with the use of essay-type answers to unseen questions, an unknown selection of questions taken from a larger number of previewed questions, short-answers, multiple-choice and assertion-and-reason-tests.
- 1.1.7. Most examinations will be closed-book and held under supervision on-campus or in an approved distance education setting. However, open-book examinations may be used in some subjects.
- 1.1.8. Students will be advised by subject lecturers at the start of a subject of the nature of any examinations they will be required to sit.

#### 1.2. Procedures

- 1.2.1. The Dean of Faculty is responsible for overseeing the production of examination papers, and for ensuring that appropriate quality assurance checks are taking place.
- 1.2.2. Examination papers must be prepared using a computer or drive accessed through a confidential username and password.
- 1.2.3. Examination papers must not be stored on shared drives accessible to unauthorised persons.
- 1.2.4. Examinations will usually be held in the week after lectures finish, on the same weekday and in the same timeslot as lectures.
- 1.2.5. The invigilator of any on-campus examination will normally be the subject lecturer for the subject concerned.
- 1.2.6. Having a disability does not exempt students from being required to meet certain standards in their work. All students must demonstrate the required knowledge, understanding and skills to pass in any subject. However some allowances can be made for students with disabilities to enable them to demonstrate the requisite skills and knowledge. Allowances that may be made for students with disabilities include: additional time for examinations (and assignments), and alternative forms of assessment, e.g. oral examinations or multiple-choice examinations rather than traditional written examinations.
- 1.2.7. Students may apply for variations to examination times and/or conditions and/or durations on the grounds of, for example, a medical condition, religious beliefs, scheduling conflicts, or defence force commitments.
- 1.2.8. Students who seek to gain unfair advantage in examinations, e.g. by taking materials into the examination room which are not allowed, copying other students' work or seeking help from other



students in the examination room, will be failed. If detected by the invigilator, they may be dismissed from the examination room.

- 1.2.9. Complaints about dishonesty in examinations, as well as students who seek to give assistance to other students in the examination room, are to be reported, in writing, to the Registrar, who will investigate each case and notify the students concerned, in writing, of the action to be taken.
- 1.2.10. Students have the right to access their examination papers. Where possible, Faculties will return examination scripts to students to assist the learning process.
- 1.2.11. Faculties that do not return examination scripts to students must retain them in a secure location for a minimum of one year and up to three years after the examination period.
- 1.2.12. A student who fails a test or examination may be granted a supplementary test or examination after a further period of study, provided that the student's performance in other components of the assessment has been satisfactory. Supplementary examinations may be granted on the following grounds:
  - Medical: Where an illness or injury prevents a student attending an examination or significantly impairs his or her preparation for, or performance in, an examination
  - Compassionate: Where personal circumstances prevent a student attending an examination or significantly impair his or her preparation for, or performance in, an examination
  - Last Subject: Where a student has failed in only one final full-year or one final semester course that could complete his or her course for an award

## Appendix I - Student Workload Guidelines

For an extended discussion, please see the larger report of Student Workload Guidelines developed early 2021.

### Notes:

- Student workload – and an ‘hour’ of study - is a *dynamic* equation that incorporates several variables.
- An effective student workload is aimed at maximising a student’s potential and experience with deep, cumulative learning. It aims to avoid student overloading experiences.
- There are 24cps in a fulltime semester of study. This is equivalent to 600 hours of work estimated on a 37.5 hour<sup>2</sup> working week for 15 weeks<sup>3</sup>. This means there are approximately 150 hours of study required in a 6cps subject.
- The total expectation upon students should not exceed this. This includes all face-to-face contact time, reading, and assessment writing (including research).
- This hourly requirement is the same for all AQF levels of study. However, what a student is able to achieve in an hour of study will change at each AQF level.
- Lecturers should consider and monitor the expected time demands upon an “average student” in preparing their subject (approximately 80% of students).
- Student workload is most usefully measured by notional hours of effort rather than word counts; word counts do not translate well to alternative forms of assessment.<sup>4</sup> Word counts are less relevant than the intellectual work required to complete tasks and achieve learning outcomes.

### Summary

- 6 credit points (cps) = 150 hours of student study time
- The normal assessment load expectations<sup>5</sup> (expressed in terms of “word count” equivalence)

6cps	Hours	“Word Count”	Avg. hours per 1000
AQF 5	64	4,500	14
AQF 7	64	5,000	13
AQF 8	64	5,500	12
AQF 9	64	6,000	11
12cps			
AQF 9	160	10,000	20
AQF 10	160	10,000	20

- Common estimation of reading time (in pages/hour). Technical v General reading

pages/hour	Technical Reading	General Reading
AQF 5	14	20
AQF 7	18	25
AQF 8	22	30
AQF 9	26	45
AQF 10	30	45

- Common estimates of assignment writing time (in hours per 1000-words of task)

Hours per 1000	Research	Writing	Total
AQF 5	8	7	15
AQF 7	8	6	14
AQF 8	7	6	13
AQF 9	7	5	12
12cps			
AQF 9/10	15	5	20

<sup>5</sup> These guidelines are applicable for coursework subjects at the appropriate AQF levels.

Assessment workload – suggested equivalences<sup>6</sup> -

adapted from Latrobe University's Student Guidelines (Morgan, 2020)

Not all assessment is essay based. Establishing relativities between assessment considers the following variables:

- Assignment complexity
- Amount of time required to develop and deliver the response/assessment
- Proportion of creative, reflective, analytical thought and evidence of deep learning

The following table provides common examples of assessments. Please note that these equivalences are not fixed and should be carefully considered by lecturers in light of the subject context.

Assessment type	Broadly equivalent to 1000 essay words
Written/multiple choice examination	1 hour
Essay in foreign language	500 words
Group essay	750-1000 words/member
Reflective journal or learning log	1500 words
Verbal presentation	20 minutes
Group presentation	10 minutes/member
Clinical practicum assessment	20 minutes
Multimedia Resource	1750 words

Calculating Assessment “Word Counts” and “Time Cost”

6cps	Assessment Hours	Nominal “Word Count”	Avg. hours per 1000
AQF 5	64 <sup>7</sup>	4,500	14
AQF 7	64	5,000	13
AQF 8	64	5,500	12
AQF 9	64	6,000	11
12cps			
AQF 9	160	10,000	20
AQF 10	160	10,000	20

*E.G. An assessment task for AQF 5 with 14 hours study time = ‘1000 words’, 20% of the final grade.*

Examples of Allocating Student Hours across a Subject

	AQF 7	AQF 9
Weekly Lectures	33	33
6 Tutorials, each with 15pp journal reading	6+5	6+4
Textbook reading: 300pp (AQF 7); 350pp (AQF 9)	17	13
Additional assigned reading	25 - G: 375pp T: 180pp	30 - G: 540pp T: 470pp
Assessment tasks	5,000-words	6,000 words
Total student study hours	150 hours	150 hours

<sup>6</sup> Taken from Latrobe Universities' workload guidance <https://policies.latrobe.edu.au/download.php?id=65&version=1&associated>, in addition to Fielding (2008) Student Assessment Workloads: a review, from Learning and Teaching in Action: Assessment <https://www.celt.mmu.ac.uk/ltia/issue17/fielding.php>

References:

Federation University Australia, (2016) CLIPP Student Workload Guidelines

[https://federation.edu.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/277767/FedUni\\_Student\\_Workload\\_Guidelines\\_V2\\_April\\_2016.pdf](https://federation.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/277767/FedUni_Student_Workload_Guidelines_V2_April_2016.pdf) , Accessed 25 January 2021

Fielding, A (2008) Student assessment workloads: a review, Learning and Teaching in Action Vol 7, Issue 3 pp 7-15. Accessed 20th Jan from <https://www.celt.mmu.ac.uk/ltia/issue17/fielding.pdf>

Morgan, D. (2020) Course design guidelines - Subject workload. Latrobe University. Accessed August 5 2021, <https://policies.latrobe.edu.au/document/status-and-details.php?id=150>