Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Assessment Policy - Criteria and Standards - Based Assessment

Document Reference Number	HEP18/10[v2]
Superseded Version	Assessment Policy - Criteria and Standards - Based Assessment v2.5
NSWIOP Document Number	IOPD15/3725[v2]
TRIM Document Classification	Governance
Framework Part	Part 4 – Course Impact (Encompassing Academic Learning Standards
Approval date	31 March 2021
Publication date	14 April 2021
Summary	This policy provides the framework for student assessment at Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education, using a criteria and standards-based approach.
Keywords	Standards-based assessment, quality of teaching, assessment tasks, assessment criteria, assessment methods, assessment requirements, valid assessment, moderation
Authoring Portfolio	Mental Health
Contact	Director
Consultation	as per Document History
Applies to	Higher Education
Distribution	Higher Education
Related documents	Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Student Academic Misconduct Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Award Courses and Units Approval Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Graduate Attributes Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Graduation Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Review of Grade Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Special Consideration Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Teaching and Learning Plan HETI Records Management Policy NSW Health Privacy Management Plan PD2015_036
Review date	April 2023
Risk Assessment	As per Attachment 1 to this document

Issued under the authority of the Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Governing Council

Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Assessment Policy - Criteria and Standards - Based Assessment

Policy Statement

This policy outlines the principles and procedures for all forms of assessment in higher education at Health Education and Training Institute (HETI) Higher Education. HETI Higher Education uses a criteria and standards-based approach to student assessment which requires that criteria be identified, and performance standards be described so that students know the level of performance required for all assessment task, including research-based capstone tasks.

Aims and Objectives

1.   This policy provides the framework for student assessment at HETI Higher Education.

2.   This policy applies to all assessments at HETI Higher Education except as noted in Clause 3.

3.   This policy does not apply to Professional Development (PD) and Formal Education Course (FEC) students except as outlined in the Advanced Standing Policy.

Overview

4.   The Assessment Policy is closely aligned with HETI Higher Education's Quality and Assurance Framework, which provides an overarching approach to curriculum design, delivery and support. The Framework identifies key principles against which HETI Higher Education plans and measures its success and identifies areas for improvement. The Assessment Policy is an example of how the Framework has been applied to assessment.

Principles

5.   At HETI Higher Education, assessment tasks are aligned with the appropriate AQF level for the course.

6.   At HETI Higher Education, assessment is based on established criteria and standards, not ranking, and:

a. aligns with learning outcomes which reflect course and unit learning outcomes and relevant graduate attributes

b. guides and encourages effective student learning through constructive feedback based on established criteria and standard

c. fairly, validly and reliably measures student performance of intended learning outcomes

d. defines and maintains academic standards

e. provides performance standards to students in Unit Learning Guides (ULGS) and the Learning Management System (LMS).

f. is fair, equitable, ethical and does not disadvantage any student.

7. At HETI Higher Education, in each unit, students are provided with opportunities to demonstrate intended learning outcomes through a variety of types of assessment tasks

8. HETI Higher Education is committed to maintaining high standards of academic integrity by ensuring that assessment tasks are monitored to detect and eliminate all forms of academic misconduct. The HETI Higher Education Student Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures provides detailed information concerning HETI Higher Education's approach to academic integrity.

9. The number and nature of assessment tasks will be consistent with the Unit Learning Guide approved through the Award Courses and Units Approval Policy http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures and variations will only be permitted to the extent that they are consistent with this policy.

10. Assessment may also be varied on the basis of the principle of Reasonable Adjustment (see Definitions Clause 12g).

11. HETI Higher Education expects students to regularly and actively participate in scheduled educational activities, including but not limited to lectures, tutorials and online discussions. For assessment purposes no marks in any unit may be awarded purely for attendance or general class participation.

Definitions

12. For the purpose of this policy, the following definitions apply:

a. Assessment Tasks: activities completed by students, either individually or in groups, for the purpose of determining student progress and/or performance. Assessment tasks include, but are not limited to, research-based capstone projects, essays, tests, projects, presentations, and forum posts. Assessment tasks may be used for two purposes:

i.   Summative: tasks which provide the numerical and graded results concerning levels of a student's achievement of the intended learning outcomes of a course and unit of study

ii. Formative: tasks which provide feedback on progress and/or identification of areas that need further development but may not contribute to a student's overall mark or grade for the unit. Formative tasks may include self-and/or peer assessment

An assessment task can be used for both formative and summative purposes.

b. Criteria: specific performance attributes or characteristics that the assessor identifies as essential components of a satisfactory response to an assessment task.

c. Fair assessment: assessment that is commensurate with the expected level of progression through the course, has transparent processes (i.e. marked according to articulated criteria and standards) and provides timely and constructive feedback

d. Feedback: response to assessment by a marker that provides analysis of the extent to which the submitted work demonstrates the required learning outcomes and provides advice as to how to improve performance

e. Marking Rubric: a table setting out and distinguishing between the standards at each level of student achievement

f. Moderation: a quality review and assurance process. It involves regulating the marking of individual markers to achieve consistency in the application of unit outcomes, performance standards and marking criteria

g. Reasonable Adjustment: re-design or readjustment of assessment tasks, procedures or materials to enable students with special circumstances, needs or disabilities to have equal opportunity to demonstrate unit learning outcomes.

h. Standards: statements in a marking rubric describing the levels of quality of student performance of each criteria in an assessment task

i. Valid assessment: the explicit and clear alignment between intended learning course and unit learning outcomes and the assessment methods used to measure student achievement of those outcomes.

Procedures

Design of Assessment Tasks

13. Assessments that carry a weighting towards the final mark for the unit will be advised in the Unit Learning Guide and will be consistent with this policy and the documentation approved through the Courses and Unit Approvals process.

14. Normally there will be at least one assessment task for each 50 hours of study from which the final mark and grade for a unit is derived. A specific weighting for each item of assessment must be nominated (e.g. 25%). The weighting will not be expressed as a range (e.g. between 20 and 35%).

15. Determining the amount of assessment given should rely on a balance between effective measurement and effective learning; assessments should be comprehensive enough to measure achievement, but not so excessive as to detract from learning.

16. It is expected that for each 50 hours of study within postgraduate units at HETI Higher Education, assessment tasks in each unit will not exceed the equivalent of 1700 words, or equivalent effort, with assessment size adjusted for units of different duration *pro rata*.

17. Each unit will have:

    a. unit learning outcomes that support the relevant course learning outcomes, and have been informed by HETI Higher Education Graduate Attributes in the context of the overall program and the discipline area
    b. assessable tasks developed to measure student achievement of unit learning outcomes (constructive alignment)
    c. a detailed description of the nature and requirements of assessment tasks
    d. standards developed by applying professional judgements about expected levels of student performance in relation to assessment criteria. Standards will be benchmarked against acceptable levels of performance within HETI Higher Education, discipline and/or the profession
    e. clear criteria and standards of performance in marking rubrics developed for each assessment task, based on criteria published in the Unit Learning Guide. These criteria and standards will be described in marking rubrics so that students are informed about the level of performance required for each assessment task.
    f. clear guidelines and instructions for format and submission of assessment tasks.

18. When designing the assessment schedule for the unit, consideration must be given to balancing the appropriate percentage weighting to be assigned to each assessment task

and its length (see Clause 16). An appropriate mix of assessments should be consistent with learning outcomes and offer diverse modes of assessment type where possible.

19. HETI Higher Education encourages the use and assessment of group tasks in accordance with its Graduate Attributes a and b which emphasise the importance of being able to work collaboratively in the health industry.

20. Assessment may target group processes and skills, or the product of group work, or both, depending on unit learning outcomes. The ability to perform effectively in group work tasks should only be assessed where there is a unit learning outcome that requires students to demonstrate capacity to work collaboratively in groups.

21. Group assessment tasks must be structured in such a way that all members of the group are required to participate as equally as possible.

22. Staff shall monitor groups to ensure that:

   a. the group's progress is satisfactory
   b. group members are collaborating effectively and fairly

23. Where there is documented evidence through the monitoring process specified above of a member of a group failing to participate in the activities required to fulfil the assessment task, the student may be awarded an adjusted or fail grade for the task.

Criteria to Achieve a Passing Grade

24. In order to achieve a passing grade in HETI Higher Education units, students must:

   a. Submit all assessment tasks
   b. Achieve a total mark of 50% or more for the unit

Moderation

25. All assessments with a summative component will be subject to moderation.

26. Moderation consists of the assessment and comparison of results of a sample of assessment tasks by at least two assessors, one of which should be the unit facilitator.

27. Moderation for each assessment occurs

   a. before the marking of all assessments commences to ensure a consistent application of criteria and standards; is applied to all assessment tasks, based on a sample of at least two submitted assessment

b. after marking for the purposes of checking Fail and High Distinction grading. Unit Facilitators may also review:

   i. any asessment at random;

   ii. borderline results; and

   iii. submitted assessments that the marker finds difficult to assess accurately

28. In cases where a consensus concerning consistency of marking standards proves difficult to achieve, the Unit Facilitator must advise the Faculty Support Academic of any significant problems associated with the marking of the assessment.

29. In cases where a consensus concerning consistency of marking standards cannot be achieved, the Unit Facilitator must consult the Faculty Support Academic or their nominee for in order to arrive at a resolution.

30. The moderation process results in a consensus concerning the standards applied to all assessment tasks. Resolution of discrepancies in marking of individual tasks should not be simply a matter of averaging the two results but rather arriving at an agreed mark based on consultation. Within larger classes, the Unit Facilitator may apply the 'gold standard' method of moderation with any differences in the moderation being noted in the moderation register. Significant issues should be raised with the Faculty Support Academic.

31. The results of moderation are recorded in the Moderation Register by the Unit Facilitator.

32. The Faculty Support Academic will monitor the Moderation Register for compliance and the resolution of significant divergence.

33. A report on moderation will be included in the annual Course Report submitted to the Academic Board.

Short-term Extensions and Late Submission of Assessments

34. Students seeking one-week extension must apply through myHETIconnect prior to the due date of the assessment. Students seeking more than one week extension need to apply for special consideration through myHETIconnect prior to the date of assessment and outlining reasons for their application with evidence. Reasons under which an extension may be granted include but are not limited to illness, misadventure, and work demands. Extensions will not be granted after the due date.

35. Procedures required for students seeking extensions beyond one week are outlined in the HETI Higher Education Special Consideration Policy http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures.

36.   If the Director Education and Training does not agree that an extension is justified, the student will be advised that an extension will not be granted.

37.   If a student is dissatisfied with the rejection of the application for extension, then normal procedures for handling appeals will be followed as outlined in the HETI Student Grievance Procedure http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures.

38.   Extensions cannot be granted beyond the week following the last teaching week except where an extension has been approved as a result of an application for special consideration in accordance with the HETI Higher Education Special Consideration Policy http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures.

39.   Except where an extension has been approved, the following penalties will apply to the late submission of an assessment task:

   a.   A student who submits an assessment task after the due date of submission will be penalised if they do not apply for an extension or Special Consideration. The penalty will be 10% of the available marks. No submission will be accepted after fourteen days post-due date without an extension or Special Consideration application approval.
   b.   Assessment tasks submitted late without an extension or special consideration condition will not be marked after 14 days.
   c.   Assessments that are not received (i.e. within two weeks) following the due date will be assigned a Fail grade for the assessment. In accordance with the criteria for achieving a passing grade that require the submission of all assessment tasks (see Section, Clause 25a of this policy), the student will be awarded a Fail Incomplete or Fail Non Attempt grade (see clause Administrative Grades – Table 2). If the student wishes to complete the unit, they will be required to re-enrol in the unit and pay fees.
   d.   When an extension or special consideration date has not been met, the above penalties apply.

Marking of Assessment Tasks and Awarding Final Grades

40.   Students will be advised in the Unit Learning Guide how all marks and grades for both assessment tasks and final grades for the unit are to be determined.

41.   Notwithstanding Clause 41, HETI Higher Education reserves the right to review and moderate the distribution of marks in individual assessment tasks and final grades where there is evidence of anomalies in the marking of individual assessment tasks and/or the calculation of final grades. In the case of individual assessment tasks, Unit Facilitators or the Faculty Support Academic may refer marks awarded to the Directors

for adjudication which may result in an adjustment of marks, subject to Clause 43 of this policy. In the case of final grades, HETI Higher Education Academic Board delegates responsibilities for ensuring the validity of grades awarded, including adjustment and moderation of assessment results and final grades, to the Examiners Committee, in accordance with Clause 37c of the HETI Higher Education Academic Governance Policy.

42. Normally a student will receive a mark in relation to how well they have performed against the assessment criteria and standards for assessment tasks and a final mark and grade based on the combination of results for all the assessment tasks based on the grading system in Table 1 below.

43. For all grades in Table 1, a mark and grade for an assessment task and for the combination of results for all the assessment tasks in a unit will be determined on the scale of 0 to 100%.

Table 1 – Grades for Individual assessment tasks and Final Grades for Units:

Grade	Description	Percentage
High Distinction	Sustained high-level of achievement in completing all components of the task and outcomes of the unit.	85-100 [H]
Distinction	Predominantly high-level of achievement in completing all components of the task and outcomes of the unit.	75-84 [D]
Credit	Sound achievement, with some high-quality performance, in completing all components of the task and outcomes of the unit.	65-74 [C]
Pass	Sound achievement in completing all components of the task and outcomes of the unit.	50-64 [P]
Fail	Inadequate and/or inaccurate performance in completing all components of the task and outcomes of the unit.	0-49 [F]

Other grade classifications that may be awarded as final grades to students are included in Table 2.

Table 2 – Administrative Grades

Grade	Description
Fail Incomplete (FI)	Student has failed to complete one or more of the mandatory assessment requirements for the unit but either has not officially withdrawn from the unit or has done so after the census date without providing evidence of misadventure.
Fail Non-Attempt (FNA)	Student has failed to complete any of the mandatory assessment requirements for the unit.

Withdrawn Before Census Date (WBC)	Student submits documentation to withdraw from the unit(s) before or on Census Date (without academic penalty).
Withdrawn After Census Date (W)	Student withdraws from the unit after the relevant census date due to providing appropriate evidence for extenuating circumstance or misadventure (without academic penalty).
Deferral (DEF)	Student submits documentation to defer enrolment after census date is covered by approved special consideration (without academic penalty).
Deferral Before Census Date (DBC)	Student submits documentation before census date without academic penalty
Incomplete (I)	Results pending.
Academic Credit – Specified (AS)	Academic credit for specified units
Academic Credit – Unspecified (AU)	Academic credit for unspecified units

Return of Marked assessment tasks

44.   HETI Higher Education expects that academic staff will normally return marked assessment tasks with feedback to students no more than three weeks from the date received at HETI Higher Education.

Re-marking an Assessment Task

45.   HETI Higher Education permits a student to apply to the Unit Facilitator for the task to be re-marked because the original marking was considered unfair or inconsistent with the application of the marking rubric. This application must be made no later than one week after the marked assessment task has been made available to the student.

46.   If the Unit Facilitator agrees that there is a reasonable case for a review or re-mark, the Unit Facilitator will arrange for the review or re-marking of the unmarked originally submitted task to be conducted by an academic with appropriate levels of expertise and experience. Only a single re-mark will be permitted, and the result of the re-mark will be recorded as the final mark for that assessment task, irrespective of its position relative to the original marks.

47.   If the Unit Facilitator does not agree that a re-mark is justified, the student will be advised that the assessment task will not be re-marked.

48.   If a student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, the student may apply to the Director Education and Training for a formal assessment review, providing detail of the reason for the request. Then normal procedures for handling appeals will be followed as outlined in the HETI Student Grievance Procedure.

Appeals and Review of Final Grades

49.   A student may appeal against the grade awarded to an individual assessment task in accordance with the provisions of the HETI Higher Education Student Grievance Procedure.

50.   A student may appeal against the final grade awarded at the end of the unit in accordance with the provisions for review of final grades in the HETI Higher Education Review of a Grade Policy http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures.

Matters Affecting Assessment - Special Consideration

51.   HETI Higher Education recognises that there will be circumstances beyond a student's control that may impact adversely on their performance. Under such circumstances, a student may make application for Special Consideration for the assessment task(s) so affected. Definitions of misadventure and extenuating circumstances relevant to special consideration are provided in HETI Higher Education Special Consideration Policy http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures.

Roles and Responsibilities

Director Education and Training

52.   It is the responsibility of the Director Education and Training, with support from the Teaching and Learning Committee to ensure that:

   a.   assessment methods and practices of all academic staff, including part-time and sessional staff, comply with this Policy and other related HETI Higher Education policies
   b.   correct and timely processes are followed by all Staff
   c.   quality processes are implemented to:
        i.   ensure timely and constructive feedback on assessment tasks
        ii. promote consistency in marking standards across units and academic programs
   d.   assessment tasks are aligned with learning outcomes and provide students with a range of experiences in assessment, and are implemented on a course basis
   e.   assessment tasks are staged so that students are not over-loaded and have sufficient time to absorb and make use of assessment feedback in subsequent assessment tasks in the unit. Ordinarily, at least one assessment task will be administered within the first half of the period of study.
   f.   ensure that students who have been given academic support plans requiring reasonable adjustment of assessment tasks are communicated to Unit Facilitators.

g. approve and monitor assessment tasks that have been the subject of reasonable adjustments.

Unit Facilitators and Academic Staff

53. Academic staff carry out their teaching responsibilities under the authority of the Director Education and Training.

54. Unit Facilitators are responsible for:

   a. providing students with a unit learning guide in accordance with HETI Higher Education Unit Learning Guides Policy http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedure

   b. ensuring assessment tasks are designed to measure students' achievement of relevant learning outcomes

   c. developing clear criteria and standards against which the level of student performance in the assessment task can be measured

   d. providing clear guidelines and instructions for the submission of assessment task

   e. ensuring that reasonable adjustment of assessment tasks that are included in any academic support plans for students with special circumstances, needs or disabilities are implemented.

   f. Being familiar with relevant policy and procedures

55. In developing and marking assessment tasks, Unit Facilitators are to:

   a. ensure assessment methods are valid for the relevant field of education

   b. assess the performance of students' work fairly, objectively and consistently against the criteria and standards

56. In providing feedback to students, Unit Facilitators and academic staff are required to:

   a. ensure that feedback is timely and:
      i. justifies the mark given against the stated assessment criteria and standards
      ii. identifies what could have been done to achieve a higher mark (feedforward)

   b. make provisions for consultations with students seeking information regarding the determination of their results for a reasonable period after assessment tasks have been returned and after the final results are released;

   c. follow HETI Records Management Policy and Procedures to ensure adequate records of marks and any relevant comments on individual student assessment tasks

d. maintain the public sector principles for privacy in relation to students (refer to the section Information Protection Principles, as at https://www.ipc.nsw.gov.au/information-protection-principles-public

e. ensure actions taken in instances of suspected student cheating, collusion and/or plagiarism are consistent with HETI Higher Education Student Academic Misconduct Policy available at http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures

Students

57. Students have a responsibility to:

a. familiarise themselves with HETI Higher Education Assessment Policy - Criteria and Standards-Based Assessment

b. ensure they read and understand the assessment requirements, including word count, and note the due dates and methods for submission of assessments provided in the Unit Learning Guide, seeking clarification from the Unit Facilitator if required

c. actively engage with the learning activities and resources provided in their units by HETI Higher Education to help them prepare their assessment tasks

d. follow the Unit Facilitator's guidelines and instructions for format and submission of assessments

e. obtain the relevant information on assessments in the unit from the Unit Facilitator when enrolling in a unit after teaching has commenced

f. ensure that HETI is advised of any disability, chronic health condition or other circumstance that may necessitate the reasonable adjustment of assessment tasks as a component of an individual academic support plan either on the HETI Admission Form or as soon as possible if the disability or health condition is contracted after admission.

58. Students are required to:

a. ensure that all assessments are free of any information that may potentially identify individuals, consistent with information in the Unit Learning Guide

b. inform the Cohort Convenor if they have difficulty submitting their assignment electronically

c. keep a copy of their original assessment material and associated Turnitin Report where relevant until two weeks after notification of unit results

d. notify the Unit Facilitator as soon as possible prior to, or at the beginning of, the period of study if they wish to have special requirements accommodated

e. undertake all assessment tasks ethically, including avoiding any action or behaviour which would unfairly advantage or disadvantage any student, in accordance with the Student Academic Misconduct Policy; suspected plagiarism (i.e., the use of another author(s)' work as one's own without proper acknowledgement through referencing) will be brought to the attention of the Teaching and Learning Committee. Penalties are in accordance with the Student Academic Misconduct Policy. Students should be aware that plagiarism detection software is used for all electronically submitted work.

Related Documents

- HETI Higher Education Student Academic Misconduct Policy
- HETI Higher Education Award Courses and Units Approval Policy
- HETI Higher Education Graduate Attributes Policy
- HETI Higher Education Graduation Policy
- HETI Higher Education Review of Grade Policy
- HETI Higher Education Special Consideration Policy
- HETI Higher Education Teaching and Learning Plan
- HETI Records Management Policy
- NSW Health Privacy Management Plan PD2015_036

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Issued	Status	Author	Reason for Change
v0.1	13 November 2015	Draft	Geoff Murphy	Draft document
v0.2	5 January 2016	Draft	Mark Wilbourn	Consolidation of feedback
v0.3	28 January 2016	Draft	Mark Wilbourn	Incorporating feedback from the Policy Review Workshop 28 January 2016
v0.4	11 February 2016	Draft	Mark Wilbourn	Amendment clause 6d page 5 insertion Unit prior to Learning Guide
v1.0	24 February 2016	Final	Mark Wilbourn	As approved by HETI Higher Education Governing Council
v1.1	16 May 2017	Draft	Valerie Rhodes	Amending reference to Academic Misconduct Policy to include the work Student in line with policy name change.
v1.2	17 May 2017	Draft	Mark Wilbourn	Amendment Fail Discontinued wording - student withdrawal
v2.0	28 June 2017	Final	Mark Wilbourn	Approved as a minor change to policy by Chair T&L Committee
v1.0	22 August 2018	Final	Valerie Rhodes	Updated logos, template and new TRIM Reference
v1.1	22 September 2018	Draft	David Baxter	Policy review
v1.3	October 2018	Draft	Silke O'Callaghan David Baxter	Incorporated feedback from policy review, restructure, strengthening clauses and inclusion of references to Professional Development (PD)
v1.3	22 October 2018	Draft	Silke O'Callaghan	Endorsed by the Higher Education Academic Board
v1.3	21 November 2018	Draft	Rhonda Loftus	Approved by Higher Education Governing Council
v2.0	28 November 2018	Final	Jana Chadid	Updated Logos, Published version
v2.0	12 March 2019	Final	Jana Chadid Silke O'Callaghan	Minor amendments made to the administrative grades abbreviations, approved by DET.
v2.0	28 March 2019	Final	David Baxter	Included insertions for research-based capstone approved by Higher

				Education Governing Council.
v2.0	24 April 2019	Final	Jana Chadid	Minor format amendments, published version
V2.1	9 July 2019	Draft	David Baxter	Amendments to policy to align with the HETI HE Equity and Diversity Framework.
V2.1	30 September 2019	Draft	Susan Grimes	Endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee
v2.1	24 October 2019	Draft	Susan Grimes	Endorsed by the Academic Board
v2.1	04 December 2019	Draft	Susan Grimes	Approved by the Governing Council
v2.2	14 January 2020	Final	-	Published
v2.3	03 February 2020	Noted and Endorsed	Susan Grimes	Organisational changes; new position title, and responsibilities. Assessment remark procedure revised. Noted & endorsed by the T&L Committee.
v2.3	24 February 2020	Endorsed	Susan Grimes	Organisational changes; new position title, and responsibilities. Assessment remark procedure revised. Endorsed by the HEAB.
v2.3	25 March 2020	Approved	Susan Grimes	Organisational changes; new position title, and responsibilities. Assessment remark procedure revised. Approved by HEGC.
v2.3	14 April 2020	Published	-	Published on the HE Website.
v2.4	02 June 2020	Draft	Susan Grimes	Edits to the policy for changes in moderation and the smaller 50-hour units. Endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

| v2.4 | 15 June 2020 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Edits to take out the requirement of minimum number of assessments

'Out of Session' endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| v2.4 | 25 June 2020 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Endorsed by the Higher Education Academic Board (HEAB) |
| v2.4 | 22 July 2020 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Approved by HEGC |
| v2.4 | 14 August 2020 | Final | - | Published |
| v2.5 | 15 September 2020 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Changes to the moderation; extension and late submission clauses to align these with the new Student Management System.

Endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee. |
| v2.5 | 22 September 2020 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Changes to the moderation; extension and late submission clauses to align these with the new Student Management System.

Endorsed *(Out of Session)* by HETI Higher Education Academic Board. |
| v2.5 | 30 September 2020 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Changes to the moderation; extension and late submission clauses to align these with the new Student Management System.

Approved by HETI Higher Education Governing Council. |
| v2.5 | 14 October 2020 | Final | - | Published |
| v2.6 | 13 January, 2021 | Draft | Susan Grimes | Minor edits for clarity around numbers of assessments per hours of study; clarification of late submission penalties.

Endorsed by the T&L |

				Committee.
v2.6	04 March 2021	Draft	Susan Grimes	Endorsed by the Academic Board
v2.6	31 March 2021	Final	Susan Grimes	Approved by the Governing Council, with some wording changes under clause 12.
V2.6	14 April 2021	Published	-	-

MPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST – COMPLIANCE SELF ASSESSMENT

Assessed by:	Date of Assessment:		
IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS	**Not commenced**	**Partial compliance**	**Full compliance**
1. Presentation of key changes and messages was provided to all key stakeholders			
	Notes: Training session was conducted Jan/Feb 2019		
2. Quizzes were conducted to assess all key stakeholders knowledge and application to practice of the updated policy clauses			
	Notes: Relevant Director conducted and assessed the quiz Jan/Feb 2019		
3. Reflection/evaluation; Training session to assess progress of implementation			
	Notes: Session planned for June/July 2019		
4.			
	Notes:		
5.			
6.			
	Notes:		

RISK ASSSESSMENT

<Document Title>

1.	Policy/Process being assessed		Notes
	Document Number		
	Publication date		
	Scheduled review date		
	Date of this risk assessment		
	Name & position of assessing officer		
2.	**Summary of policy purpose (from PD Cover Page)**		
3.	**Agency (HETI) key roles & responsibilities as per PD**		
4.	**Risk Assessment**		
4.1	**Identification of risks – what might happen & how?**		
	1. 2.		
4.2	**Analysis of risks – combined estimate of the consequence & likelihood of the risk, using NSW Health Risk Matrix (attached)**		
	• **Consequence:** • **Likelihood:** • **Risk rating:**		
4.3	**Evaluation of risks – comparison of the level of risk as determined against a predetermined criteria to determine whether a level of risk is acceptable or needs to be treated.** Risk level assessed after implementing treatment: • **Consequence:** • **Likelihood:** • **Risk rating:** **Evaluation –**		

Risk Assessment Approval

Name & position of approving T2 Officer:	
Date:	