

STUDENT ASSESSMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Contents

1.	Overview	1
2.	Rationale for assessment.....	1
3.	Forms of assessment	2
4.	Generative artificial intelligence and assessment	3
5.	Notification of assessment.....	4
6.	Timing and weight of assessments.....	4
7.	Submission of assessment items.....	5
8.	Penalties for late submission	5
10.	Special consideration.....	6
11.	Assessment feedback.....	7
12.	Reasonable adjustment	8
13.	Requirements for successful completion of a unit of study.....	8
14.	Resubmission	8
15.	Publication of results.....	9
16.	Review of an assessment decision.....	9
17.	Version history	10
	Appendix A: Definition of Mitigating Circumstances.....	11
	Appendix B: Grade Definitions.....	12

1. Overview

- 1.1. This policy aims to outline the process of collecting relevant evidence and making informed judgements to evaluate student learning outcomes.
- 1.2. Kingsford Institute of Higher Education (“the Institute”) has designed this policy to ensure that the design of student assessment tasks determines the extent to which students have met the learning and skills outcome requirements within a unit of study and to assist teaching staff to make decisions about the performance of individual students within a unit of study.

2. Rationale for assessment

- 2.1. The rationale for assessment is to:
 - a. Promote, enhance, and improve the quality of student learning through feedback that is clear, informative, timely, constructive and relevant to the learning needs of the student;
 - b. Measure and confirm the standard of student performance and achievement in relation to a unit of study’s defined learning outcomes;
 - c. Reward student effort and achievement with an appropriate grade;
 - d. Provide relevant information to continuously evaluate and improve the quality of the curriculum and the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process.

3. Forms of assessment

- 3.1. Some assessment is formative; it is specifically intended to monitor student learning to provide ongoing feedback that students can use to improve their learning, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and target areas that need work. It can also help teachers and other support staff to recognise where students are struggling and address problems immediately.
- 3.2. Other assessment is summative; its objective is primarily to evaluate student learning by comparing 'high stakes' assessment tasks against specific standards or rubrics to evaluate and measure progress towards achievement of learning outcomes. Summative assessment results are recorded as marks or grades that are factored into a student's permanent academic record. Teachers also provide constructive and timely feedback on summative assessment tasks to help students improve their learning and achieve the required learning outcomes. Furthermore, critical reflection on the outcomes of assessment tasks, both formative and summative, can inform teachers and students not only about the quality of student learning and achievement but also about the effectiveness of teaching.
- 3.3. Normally, the assessment of a unit of study will:
 - a. Have a minimum of two but no more than three graded assessments;
 - b. Have no single assessment task worth more than 50% of the total mark for the unit of study (except for capstone units);
 - c. Include an early formative assessment task within the first third of the study period to identify the need for additional support for individual students¹ (except for capstone units);
 - d. Limit group assessment to 40% of the total mark for the unit of study.
- 3.4. The forms of assessment for each unit of study will be set out in the documentation given to students at the commencement of each unit of study.
- 3.5. Types of assessment include but are not limited to:
 - a. **Written exams** - may take the form of short answer questions, multiple-choice questions and essays, where appropriate.
 - b. **Written assignments** - may take the form of essays, literature reviews, reports, work logs, portfolios, and reflective journals, amongst others.
 - c. **Seminars/presentations** - typically based around formal discussion groups where students will be delegated particular topics for research and will be required to present their findings at subsequent seminars. Marks are allocated according to the standard of these presentations.
 - d. **Practical assignments** - students may be required to complete a series of practical assignments designed to test students' abilities under 'real world' conditions.
 - e. **Data sets** – students may be required to compile a data set from one or more sources.
 - f. **Algorithms** – students may be required to develop a process or rules for calculations or other problem-solving operations.
 - g. **Program code** – students may be required to write a computer program in a specified language
 - h. **Generative artificial intelligence prompts and output** – students may be required to write a generative AI prompt and critique the output from the model.

¹ Refer also section 6 of the *Student Progression and Exclusion Policy and Procedure*

4. Generative artificial intelligence and assessment²

- 4.1. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) is an AI model capable of generating text, images, code, video, and audio. Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT and Copilot produce text from large datasets in response to text prompts.
- 4.2. All students must develop capabilities in the ethical use of generative AI relevant to their discipline and future professional practice through ethical engagement with generative AI tools in learning and teaching activities and assessments. In addition, educators must consider AI's current and potential uses in professional contexts and platforms such as Microsoft Office and search engines when developing unit or course learning outcomes, activities, and assessments.
- 4.3. Expectations regarding the appropriate use of generative AI in assessment tasks and learning activities should be consistent with institutional guidelines and require clear communication with students. Such communication includes clear instructions in any documentation for students (e.g., in learning guides and through the learning management system). In addition, expectations should align with AI providers' terms of use and curriculum requirements.
- 4.4. To ensure procedural fairness, it is essential to communicate to students any inappropriate uses of generative AI that may result in academic misconduct. Students should be aware of the potential for detection software (e.g., Turnitin) to detect generative AI use and that they risk academic misconduct (reference *QAF018 Student Academic Integrity*) if using generative AI without appropriate acknowledgement by following the referencing guidelines provided by their institution.
- 4.5. Dialogue with students early in units and courses will improve a shared understanding of how and when they can use AI tools. In addition, students will benefit from examples of how and when generative AI has been used and acknowledged and which tools to use.
- 4.6. Students should be aware of the limits of generative AI. Limitations of generative AI include biased or negative responses due to interaction with a "raw model". Another limitation is the potential for 'AI hallucinations', which results when the system provides a response that is not factual. Such inaccuracy is due to inadequate training of the model or the system's inability to interpret specific data. A further limitation is that of currency; the responses given by the generative AI model will only be as up-to-date as the information in its training data.
- 4.7. Students should have opportunities to develop AI literacy. Therefore, the Institute will develop tools and resources to assist students in learning to use generative AI in ways appropriate to our Institutional context.
- 4.8. AI tools may be used within institutional guidelines to support learning and assessment design, e.g., to generate assessments, feedback forms and exams. However, critical evaluation of generative AI output is required to ensure appropriateness against learning outcomes.
- 4.9. Unit and course learning outcomes, assessment tasks and marking criteria may require review to incorporate the ethical use of generative AI or to indicate when not permitted.
- 4.10. In designing formative and summative assessment tasks, teaching staff should consider the capabilities of generative AI. For example, assessment tasks that award marks for summarising a topic area and online quizzes may no longer be valid measures of student achievement, and new approaches may be required to promote creativity and originality.
- 4.11. Students must use AI models ethically and responsibly, consistent with *QAF018 Student Academic Integrity* and this policy.

² Drawn from <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-04/aain-generative-ai-guidelines.pdf> accessed 10 May 2023

5. Notification of assessment

- 5.1. A fundamental aspect of developing a unit of study is the specification of the prescribed assessment tasks, directly relating them to the unit objectives and learning outcomes, the course structure, and the intended teaching methods and learning strategies. By the end of the first week of the study period, Educators should ensure that students are fully informed about unit objectives and learning outcomes, study expectations, and assessment requirements.
- 5.2. The details of all assessment tasks should be stated clearly in the *Unit Outline*, including the unit's assessment plan, the weighting of each assessable component, its marking criteria or rubrics, and submission dates.

6. Timing and weight of assessments

- 6.1. Students are expected to progressively achieve the learning outcomes of a unit of study throughout the unit. Therefore, tasks set during the study period must evaluate their progress against established criteria. Such tasks should contribute to the final assessment in a unit of study.
- 6.2. Assessment tasks should be designed carefully, first, to keep in proportion student time commitment and the weight of the assessment task in the overall assessment, and second, to reflect, as far as possible, the importance of each task in determining the effectiveness of students' having met the unit learning outcomes. This might mean a critical task, such as a final assessment, is weighted heavily. Care should be taken to avoid imposing a heavy imbalance of assessment load toward the second half of the study period. Assessment should reflect the unit level and the credit points assigned.
- 6.3. Normally, one or more assessment tasks should be set, submitted, marked and returned to students by the mid-point of a unit. Although students need regular feedback on their progress, set assessment tasks should be kept to a sufficient minimum to enable students to make judgements about their progress. In addition, due dates for assessment tasks should be spread to give students periods for reflective learning free from the pressure of a looming deadline.
- 6.4. Some disciplines expect students to practise skill development continuously. To evaluate students' ability to perform such ongoing tasks, consideration should be given to strategies for self-assessment. In this way, students can obtain evidence concerning their level of understanding of the work and skill development while avoiding the stress of frequent formal appraisal by an assessor.
- 6.5. Apart from examination scripts, all assessed work should be returned to the student allowing the student to query the assessment result for clarification either then or later. Teachers are encouraged to provide constructive and timely feedback to students on all assessment events, including final examinations.
- 6.6. *Unit Outlines* should advise students at the beginning of a study period how all assessment results will be combined to produce an overall mark for the unit. In particular, the unit outline should make expressly clear:
 - a. the weight of each task in contributing to the overall mark;
 - b. the marking criteria or rubrics used to determine the overall mark;
 - c. minimum standards applied to specific assessment tasks, and the consequences if such standards are not met (including failure to submit particular tasks);
 - d. rules regarding penalties applied to late submissions; and
 - e. precise details of what is expected regarding the presentation of work for assessment.
- 6.7. The *Unit Outline* should also make clear to students that the aggregated mark for the unit of study will be moderated. Moderation may result, in some cases, in a variation of the final grade awarded to the student for the unit of study, which is inconsistent with the individual marks awarded to the student for individual assessment items.

- 6.8. Emphasis should be placed on appropriate referencing conventions and requirements, the degree of cooperation permitted between students, and what constitutes academic dishonesty and the consequences of committing it as outlined in *QAF018 Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure*.

7. Submission of assessment items

- 7.1. Students must submit assessment items at the time and date specified in the *Unit Outline*. Assessment items submitted after the due date will be penalised unless the student has prior written approval for an extension of time to submit that item.
- 7.2. Assessments must be submitted by the due date in the form specified in the *Unit Outline*. Where assessment items are submitted electronically, the date and time the email was received will be considered the date and time of submission. Physical submissions are to be time and date stamped as a record of receipt.

8. Penalties for late submission

- 8.1. An assessment item submitted after the assessment due date without an approved extension or mitigating circumstances will be penalised. The standard penalty is the reduction of the mark allocated to the assessment item by 10% of the total mark applicable for the assessment item for each day or part day that the item is late (a 'day' for this purpose is defined as any day on which campus administration is open). Assessment items submitted more than ten days after the assessment due date are awarded zero marks.
- 8.2. Extensions to assessment deadlines based on mitigating circumstances shall be at the educator's discretion and must be granted in writing. Mitigating circumstances are those outside of the student's control that have harmed the student's work or ability to work.

9. Extensions to assessment deadlines

9.1. Policy

- 9.1.1. Students may apply for an extension to an assessment deadline based on mitigating circumstances. These circumstances outside the student's control potentially impact the student's ability to complete assessment tasks by the due date specified in the relevant unit timetable. Students are normally expected to produce evidence (e.g., a doctor's note) supporting their claim for an extension based on mitigating circumstances.
- 9.1.2. Mitigating circumstances are defined in *Appendix A*.
- 9.1.3. Applications for an extension to an assessment deadline must be made *ahead* of the original deadline for an assessment; they cannot be granted after the deadline has passed. However, students may apply for *special consideration* when a deadline has passed and they believe their ability to complete assessment tasks by the due date has been compromised (Section 10).

9.2. Procedure

- 9.2.1. Students should apply to their Unit Educator for an extension to an assessment due date using *FRM019 Request for Extension to Assessment Deadline*. The application should normally include evidence supporting the claim of mitigating circumstances. Applications must normally be made *no later than three working days* before the originally specified due date.
- 9.2.2. Before deciding, the Unit Educator should refer to the *FRM090 Register of Assessment Extensions*.
- 9.2.3. Where an extension has previously been granted in the unit at hand or where there is a pattern of applications for extensions across two or more units, the student is deemed at risk academically.

- 9.2.4. Where a student is deemed at risk, the application for extension should be referred to the Course Coordinator for review under section 3.2 *QAF095 Student Progression and Exclusion Policy and Procedure*.
- 9.2.5. Where a student is not deemed at risk, the Unit Educator will normally decide on an application for an extension to an assessment deadline within two working days of receiving an application for an extension.
- 9.2.6. The maximum period of extension allowed will normally be seven calendar days later than the originally specified deadline.
- 9.2.7. Extensions to assessment deadlines are at the discretion of the Unit Educator.
- 9.2.8. Their decision to grant an extension (or not) should be documented on the form submitted by the student, with copies sent to the student, the Course Coordinator and the Dean. The Dean will enter the extension details on the *FRM090 Register of Assessment Extensions*.
- 9.2.9. Where the student does not accept the refusal of a Unit Educator to grant an extension, and the student does not accept this, they should be referred to *QAF090 Student Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure*.

10. Special consideration

10.1. Policy

- 10.1.1. Students whose ability to submit or undertake an assessment item is affected by mitigating circumstances may be eligible for special consideration. However, no consideration is given when the condition or event is unrelated to the student's performance in a component of the assessment or when it is considered not serious.
- 10.1.2. Mitigating circumstances are defined in *Appendix A*.

10.2. Procedure

- 10.2.1. Students must apply in writing to the Course Coordinator for special consideration within three days of the due date of the assessment item or exam.
- 10.2.2. When considering the application for special consideration, the Course Coordinator may take into account one or more of the following:
 - a. The student's performance in other assessment tasks in the unit;
 - b. The severity of the event;
 - c. The student's academic standing in other units and the course; and
 - d. Any history of previous applications for special consideration, especially where they indicate a chronic problem.
- 10.2.3. If an application for special consideration is accepted, any one of the following outcomes may be appropriate:
 - a. No action is taken;
 - b. Additional assessment or a supplementary examination is undertaken. Additional assessments may take a different form from the original assessment. If a student is granted additional assessment, the original assessment may be ignored at the discretion of the Course Coordinator. Consequently, a revised mark based on additional assessment may be greater or less than the original mark;
 - c. Marks obtained for the completed assessment tasks are pro-rated to achieve a final percentage result;
 - d. The deadline for assessment is extended;
 - e. The student is allowed to discontinue the unit of study without failure. (This is unlikely to occur after a final assessment.)
- 10.2.4. When reviewing requests for special consideration, particular attention will be given to the progression and completion of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

11. Assessment feedback

11.1. Policy

- 11.1.1. The Institute will ensure it provides students with constructive and timely feedback from Unit Educators, enabling them to understand the reason for their assessment results.
- 11.1.2. Feedback will be against marking rubrics, which communicate standard assessment grades to students and educators, enabling standards-based assessment.
- 11.1.3. Marking rubrics contain descriptors of the grades for various criteria, e.g.,

		GRADES				
		↓				
		<i>HD</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>N</i>
Knowledge and understanding						
Critical thinking skills						
Research skills						
Communication skills						
↑		↑				
CRITERIA		DESCRIPTORS				

- 11.1.4. *Criteria* are the properties or characteristics against which Unit Educators assess the quality of the assessment task. *Grades* are levels of achievement or performance. *Descriptors* typify the content required to demonstrate the achievement of each grade for each criterion.
- 11.1.5. Criteria have assigned marks weighted against descriptors based on the percentage bands associated with grades.
- 11.1.6. Descriptors provide the foundation for feedback to students but, in practice, should not be replicated *verbatim*. This is because feedback's primary aim is formative, enabling individual students to improve their performance in future assessments. Accordingly, written feedback based on descriptors should be tailored to each student.
- 11.1.7. Students will normally receive a grade for each assessment and an overall grade for each unit they are enrolled in. Individual assessment grades will reflect the marks awarded for individual assessment items. The overall grade will reflect the sum of marks for all assessment items.
- 11.1.8. During each unit, students will be provided with an evaluation of their performance against the marking criteria and rubric for each assessment task.
- 11.1.9. The Institute's grade definitions are in *Appendix B*.

11.2. Procedure

- 11.2.1. Excepting the final assessment in a unit, written feedback on individual assessments will normally be given to students no later than 14 days after the assessment due date.
- 11.2.2. In the case of the final assessment of a unit, excepting 'capstone' units assessed through substantial written projects, written feedback on the final assessment will normally be given to students within seven calendar days of the last day of the term in which the unit was taught.
- 11.2.3. In the case of a capstone unit assessed through a substantial written project, written feedback on the assessment will normally be given to students within 28 calendar days of the last day of the term in which the unit was taught.
- 11.2.4. Written feedback on individual assessments will include the mark and grade level achieved by the student in the assessment.
- 11.2.5. Written feedback on individual assessments will include formative feedback based on the grade descriptors for criteria tailored to individual student

assessments to explain the grade level awarded. The descriptor must not be reproduced *verbatim*.

- 11.2.6. Once all assessments are completed and the Dean approves results for a unit endorsed by the Results Review Committee, an overall mark and unit grade are published and notified to students.

12. Reasonable adjustment

12.1. Policy

- 12.1.1. Students with a disability may request a reasonable adjustment to an assessment task to accommodate their disability. Adjustments to an assessment must account for any unique characteristics of the student. In addition, any adjustments made must be 'reasonable' to not impose an unjustifiable hardship upon the Institute.
- 12.1.2. Proposed adjustments will normally be developed in consultation with the Student Support Officer before the commencement of the student's studies at the Institute and will apply to all units.

12.2. Procedure

- 12.2.1. The student requests reasonable adjustment in writing to the Student Support Officer before commencing the student's studies at the Institute.
- 12.2.2. The Student Support Officer will discuss the student's request with the Course Coordinator and agree on an assessment adjustment plan covering all assessments to be taken in the student's course of study.
- 12.2.3. The assessment adjustment plan may reasonably adjust the procedures for conducting assessments by one or more of the following or other means:
 - a. allowing additional time for the completion of an assessment;
 - b. extending deadlines for an assessment;
 - c. varying question and response modalities for an assessment;
 - d. providing or allowing additional resources or support in examinations.
- 12.2.4. The Course Coordinator and Student Support Officer may agree that no adjustment is required.
- 12.2.5. The Student Support Officer will notify the student of the outcome of their request.
- 12.2.6. The Course Coordinator will notify Unit Educators of the adjustment plan (if any).
- 12.2.7. Where the student does not accept the refusal of the Institute to grant a reasonable adjustment, and the student does not accept this, they should be referred to *QAF090 Student Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure*.

13. Requirements for successful completion of a unit of study

- 13.1. To pass the unit, students must attempt all assessment tasks and achieve at least 50% of the total marks for the unit of study. Students must achieve a mark of at least 40% in their final assessment.
- 13.2. Where a student achieves a total mark of 50% for the unit overall but less than 40% in the highest weighted assessment for the unit, the Course Coordinator will review the overall assessment and contribution of the student and decide on whether to waive the unit requirements and allow the student to pass with their overall mark for the unit.

14. Resubmission

- 14.1. Where a student has completed all assessment tasks and marginally fails a unit of study (i.e., has achieved an overall score of 46-49%), the Course Coordinator may recommend that the student be offered the option of completing additional assessable work which, if completed at the prescribed standard, will result in the student passing the unit.

- 14.2. Where a student has completed all assessment tasks and has achieved an overall grade of 50% or more, but scores less than 40% in the final assessment, then the Course Coordinator may recommend that the student be offered the option of completing additional assessable work which, if completed at the prescribed standard, will result in the student passing the unit.
- 14.3. The grade awarded after finalising the additional assessment is limited to P or F. If the student does not take up the opportunity to complete additional assessment work, the grade remains an F.

15. Publication of results

15.1. Policy

- 15.1.1. All results must be reviewed and adequately approved before publication.
- 15.1.2. The Learning and Teaching Committee will nominate three members (but not any student representative) to meet at the end of each study period as the Results Review Committee to approve results before publication. An independent Learning and Teaching Committee member will Chair the Results Review Committee.
- 15.1.3. The Registrar will act as non-voting secretary to the Results Review Committee.

15.2. Procedure

- 15.2.1. For all units, excluding 'capstone' units assessed through substantial written projects, within seven calendar days of the end of term, Unit Educators will provide to the Dean unit marks and grades and a written report of the conduct of the unit and spread of marks.
- 15.2.2. For capstone units assessed through substantial written projects, within 28 calendar days of the end of term, Unit Educators will provide to the Dean unit marks and grades and a written report of the conduct of the unit and spread of marks.
- 15.2.3. The Dean will collate educator reports and, with the Registrar, will develop an agenda for the Results Review Committee meeting.
- 15.2.4. The Results Review Committee meeting agenda and educator reports will be supplied to committee members at least one week before the meeting.
- 15.2.5. The Results Review Committee will review the reports, provide feedback and endorse the results for approval by the Dean.
- 15.2.6. Once the Dean has approved the results, the Registrar will ensure that the approved mark and grade are recorded in the student database against the relevant unit of study and students are notified of their results by email (out of the student management system).

16. Review of an assessment decision

16.1. Policy

- 16.1.1. A student may request a review of an assessment decision. A request for a review may relate to the decision regarding an individual assessment item or a final grade for a unit of study.
- 16.1.2. The grounds upon which the student may request a review of an assessment decision are:
 - a. That the student believes that an error has occurred in the calculation of the grade; or
 - b. A demonstration that the assessment decision is inconsistent with the published assessment requirements or assessment marking criteria; or
 - c. Both 'a' and 'b'.
- 16.1.3. Each review against an assessment decision is determined on its merits without referencing other applications.

16.2. Procedure

- 16.2.1. In the first instance, students should approach their Unit Educator, where appropriate, to discuss their concerns about the assessment decision within seven calendar days of formal notification of the assessment result.
- 16.2.2. Where the issue regarding the assessment decision is unable to be resolved between the student and the Unit Educator, a request for a review may be made in writing on the prescribed form (*FRM021 Request for Review of an Assessment Decision*) and lodged with the Course Coordinator within 14 calendar days of formal notification of the assessment result
- 16.2.3. The Course Coordinator (or the Dean, if the Course Coordinator is the Unit Educator) will normally respond to the request to review an assessment decision in writing within 14 calendar days of receipt of the request and may confirm or vary the original decision.
- 16.2.4. All decisions relating to reviews of assessment decisions will be reported to and reviewed by the Learning and Teaching Committee.
- 16.2.5. Where a published result is varied, the student record will be adjusted accordingly in the student database, and the student will receive a revised notification of their result.
- 16.2.6. If a student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of the review of an assessment decision, they may utilise *QAF090 Student Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure*.

17. Version history

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Sections modified
1.0	Academic Board	9 June 2023	Document creation and initial approval

Document owner: Dean

Appendix A: Definition of Mitigating Circumstances

A.1 Normally, mitigating circumstances include, but are not limited to:

- a. Serious accident or incident, including the impact of a natural or industrial disaster;
- b. Serious public health event that disrupts normal working patterns;
- c. Acute or chronic personal illness, including mental health issues;
- d. Serious illness of a close relative;
- e. The recent death of a family member or close friend;
- f. Severe personal disruption (e.g., fire, burglary, jury duty);
- g. Severe personal, family or relationship problems;
- h. **Significant** change of employment circumstances (e.g., substantial new duties, restructuring of employment, new job);
- i. Specific difficulty regarding disability or adjustments;
- j. Unplanned religious observance (e.g., after a family member's death or close friend's death).

A.2 Normally, mitigating circumstances **do not** include:

- a. Alleged medical conditions without supporting evidence;
- b. Social activities (e.g., sporting fixtures, family weddings);
- c. Temporary self-induced conditions (e.g., alcohol or drug-induced 'hangovers,' the effects of prescribed medications with predicted adverse reactions);
- d. Minor ailments and other conditions (e.g., coughs, colds, sore throats, sprains, long-standing medical conditions for which reasonable adjustments could have been made);
- e. Job seeking (e.g., preparing for and going to interviews for a new job);
- f. Domestic or personal disruptions that could have been anticipated and planned for (e.g., family holidays);
- g. Poor time management, including 'assessment stress' especially relating to employment for part-time students;
- h. Resourcing (e.g., computer or Internet difficulties, losing work not backed up on computer disk, other Institute deadlines or deadline congestion, missing books, examination rescheduling).

**Appendix B: Grade Definitions**

Grade	Definition
High Distinction (outstanding performance) Code: HD Mark range: 85% and above	Comprehensive understanding of the unit content; development of relevant skills to an outstanding level; demonstration of an extremely high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and excellent achievement of all unit learning outcomes.
Distinction (very high level of performance) Code: D Mark range: 75-84%	Very high level of understanding of the unit content; development of relevant skills to a very high level; demonstration of a very high level of interpretive and analytical ability and intellectual initiative; and comprehensive achievement of all unit learning outcomes.
Credit (high level of performance) Code: C Mark range: 65-74%	High level of understanding of the unit content; development of relevant skills to a high level; demonstration of a high level of interpretive and analytical ability and achievement of all unit learning outcomes.
Pass (competent level of performance) Code: P Mark range: 50-64%	Adequate understanding of most of the basic unit content; development of relevant skills to a satisfactory level; adequate interpretive and analytical ability and achievement of all unit learning outcomes.
Non-graded Pass Code: NGP	Successful completion of a unit assessed on a pass/fail basis, indicating a satisfactory understanding of unit content, satisfactory development of relevant skills, satisfactory interpretive and analytical ability and achievement of all unit learning outcomes.
Fail (not meet academic standards) (attempted all assessments but did not achieve 50%) Code: F Mark range: below 50%	Inadequate understanding of the basic unit content; failure to develop relevant skills; insufficient evidence of interpretive and analytical ability; and failure to achieve some or all unit learning outcomes.
Fail (non-submission) (did not attempt all assessments and did not achieve 50%) Code: FN Mark range: below 50%	Inadequate understanding of the basic unit content; failure to develop relevant skills; insufficient evidence of interpretive and analytical ability; and failure to achieve some or all unit learning outcomes.
Withdraw with Failure Code: WF	Withdrew from the unit after the census date.



Grade	Definition
Withdraw without Failure Code: WO	Withdrew from the unit before or after the census date with special circumstances.
Credit Granted Code: CPL	Credit has been granted for the unit of study following an application and its approval.