



GRADES AND RESULTS Procedures

DEFINITIONS

Terms in this document, for which definitions are not provided in the text or may not be self-evident or for which usage at ACC may differ to that in other higher education institutions are as follows:

Assessors: Designated staff or associates of the College who have been given responsibility for assessing student learning outcomes (knowledge and skills), be it a written or oral assessment or clinical practice based.

External Avenues of Appeal: Avenues of Appeal that are external to, and independent of the College and which are specified in the ACC Student Academic Appeals Procedures.

Formative assessment: A range of formal and informal assessment procedures conducted by academic staff to monitor student learning and to provide ongoing feedback that can help students identify their strengths and weaknesses and target areas that need work.

Learning outcomes: The knowledge and/or skills to be demonstrated by students in assessments integral to the unit.

Re-mark: Where a Unit Coordinator authorizes a piece of assessment to be marked a second time and by one or more alternative assessors, in order to confirm the appropriateness of the original grade or suggest a change in grade.

Assessment: Includes examinations, essays, tutorial assignments, reports, practicums and any other means by which the College assesses whether student have achieved the learning outcomes associated with a unit of study.

Graded assessment items commonly require attainment of 50% or greater to pass. Certain practical assessments in units with significant mapping against CCEA competencies, will have a pass mark at 70%. When this is applicable, this is clearly stated in the unit profile and the examination and assessment document.

Review and Confirmation of Grades: This process involves consideration of final grades and interim results submitted by a Unit Coordinator to the Grade Moderation Committee for review and endorsement, prior to the date that the final grades are provided to the Academic Board for approval and subsequent release to students. A process of quality assurance, including a review of the distribution of grades and assessment moderation, occurs prior to the release of grades for each semester or term. Assessment moderation is a process separate from the marking of assessments, which ensures that an assessment outcome (e.g., mark and/or grade) is fair, valid and reliable, that assessment criteria have been applied consistently, and that any differences in academic judgement between individual markers can be acknowledged and addressed. It ensures consistency in marking within student cohorts and across time.

Stream: A scientific or professional discipline or body of knowledge which forms an essential part of the

program curriculum. Streams at the ACC comprise one or more units of study.

Student Academic Appeal Committee: A Committee of the Academic Board, which is chaired by an independent member of the Academic Board and which is convened specifically for the purpose of considering a Student Academic Appeal, on procedural grounds. This Committee is available as a formal avenue for review of all manner of student academic issues including review of grade, academic progress and academic misconduct.

Unit Coordinator: The academic staff member who is responsible for the design, delivery and assessment of a scientific or professional discipline or body of knowledge which forms an essential part of the program curriculum.

Term: Half a semester, normally comprising 8 weeks. Different units of study are delivered and assessed each term.

Unit (or Unit of Study): An element of a Stream, that has specified student learning outcomes and requires satisfactory performance in assessments that measure student performance regarding learning outcomes.

PURPOSE

The related Grades and Results Policy and these procedures outline the range and nature of academic results and grades that may be allocated to ACC students and how they are allocated.

The procedures provide a clear outline to students of the processes involved in lodging a request for a review and/or an appeal, should they have concerns about the process by which their grade was determined.

Staged review and appeals avenues and processes and their timelines are described in detail and the possible outcomes and their implications for students are addressed. As a result of grade review, student grades may be raised, lowered, or remain the same. In extreme circumstances, students have the right to appeal through the Student Academic Appeals Committee, which makes a recommendation to the Academic Board. Decisions arrived upon by the Academic Board are final and result in no further internal avenue or right to appeal by the student.

SCOPE

This policy applies to examinations and all other forms of assessment undertaken by domestic and international students enrolled at the ACC.

PROCEDURES

1. Review of Grade

1.1. Feedback

- 1.1.1. Students are encouraged to seek feedback on all assessment items throughout the term in order to gain perspective on the level of competency achieved within the term. All assessment feedback should provide a clear indication to the extent to which they have or have not satisfied assessment criteria.
- 1.1.2. Students should ensure they read through and understand all constructive feedback provided by assessors throughout the term particularly in regard to formative assessment. Should the feedback lack

clarity or appear ambiguous the student should seek clarification in order to understand achievement of learning outcomes.

1.2. Informal Consultation

- 1.2.1. Students are entitled to feedback on each piece of assessment. Feedback is designed to clearly indicate the student's level of achievement or lack thereof. Students are encouraged to seek clarification through informal consultation should there be confusion or lack of feedback on assessment tasks or resultant grade/mark.
- 1.2.2. Informal consultation may also be sought for clarification on the overall grade awarded for a unit once grades have progressed through the moderation process, have been ratified by the Academic Board and are available for release. At this point, marking errors, omissions or discrepancies may be corrected. Students are required to maintain a record of the staff with whom informal consultation has been conducted as well as a record of the date of consultation and the outcome.
- 1.2.3. A request for informal consultation may be done in person, via telephone or e-mail.
- 1.2.4. Requests, which involve the viewing of examination scripts, must follow the appropriate Assessment of Coursework Procedures.
- 1.2.5. Timelines for Informal consultations are as follows:
 - i. Consultations must be conducted within five (5) working days of the consultation request.
 - ii. Consultations regarding assessment task results must be requested within two (2) working days of grade release.
 - iii. Consultations regarding an overall unit grade must be requested within two (2) working days of grade certification and publication.

1.3. Grounds for Grade Review

- 1.3.1. Following informal consultation, students have the right to apply for a grade review should they continue to have concern about the process by which a grade has been determined.
- 1.3.2. A review of grade is administered by the Academic Dean.
- 1.3.3. As a result of grade review, grades may be changed (raised or lowered) or maintained.
- 1.3.4. A student application may be considered should a student reference one or more of the following reasons:
 - Demonstrable inconsistencies within the marking and the assessment requirements or criteria;
 - Lack of consistent or clear feedback throughout the term;
 - Demonstration of feedback provided within the term, which was inconsistent with final assessment feedback;
 - Difficulties sustained by the student due to breakdown within College systems or procedures;
 - Difficulties sustained by the student due to a breakdown within the delivery of unit material, inequitable treatment, lack of assessment criteria, or misinformation within unit content or prescribed reading material.
- 1.3.5. An application for review will NOT be considered on the following grounds:
 - Comparison against another student's performance;
 - Questioning learning objectives or assessment methods;
 - Close proximity in obtaining the next level of grade;

- Poor teaching;
- Personal or medical issues which should have been dealt with through supplementary assessment or extension procedures;
- Belief that the grade is not reflective of the individual effort;
- Result may affect the student's enrollment status, financial situation or visa status;
- A re-mark based on the student's belief that extra marks are deserved.

1.3.6. An application for review will be rejected in the event that:

- No attempt was made to engage in informal consultation prior to submission of a grade review application;
- The submission of assessment items were incomplete;
- The student has not complied with unit attendance requirements;
- No reasonable grounds for the application have been identified;
- Work has already been assessed and reviewed by at least 3 other people with significant knowledge of the unit content.

1.3.7. Application submissions for a review of grades must be completed and received no later than seven (7) days after informal consultation.

1.3.8. Changes in application timelines maybe accepted should a student demonstrate extenuating circumstances.

1.4. Review of Grade Process

1.4.1. Students are encouraged to seek informal consultation on all assessment items throughout the term, however only one review of grade is permissible for each subject. Additionally, a review of grade will only be permissible against an assessment item that has previously been addressed through the informal consultation process.

1.4.2. A formal review of grades must be made through a written application process.

1.4.3. A statement containing the details of previous informal consultation is required within the review of grade application. The statement should include such detail as: where, when and with whom the consult was held as well as any applicable outcomes. If an informal consultation did not occur, reasons must be given as to why this process was bypassed.

1.4.4. Upon receipt of the application the Academic Dean will review the submission along with all supporting documentation to determine whether it should proceed. The application will be accepted or rejected on the basis of the sufficiency of the material presented and the appropriateness of the justification. The outcome of this initial screening process will be communicated to the student concerned via e-mail. within five (5) workings days of receipt of the application.

1.4.5. Results of the application will either be:

- Successful; allowing for the continuation of the review of grade process; or
- Rejected; in which case the reason(s) for application denial will be provided.

1.4.6. Successful lodgment of the review of grade application will result in consultation between the Academic Dean, Subject Coordinator and relevant Assessors. A full review of the nominated items of assessment will be performed leading to an agreed resolution.

1.4.7. The Academic Dean will notify the student, within ten (10) working days, the final outcome of the application.

2. Appeals

- 2.1.** A Student has the right to challenge the outcome of the grade review in the following circumstances:
- i. An application for grade review was denied/unsuccessful;
 - ii. The review of grade procedure did not follow due process.
- 2.2.** All appeals must be lodged in accordance with the Student Academic Appeals procedures and submitted within fifteen (15) working days of notification of the review of grade outcome.
- 2.3.** The determination of the Student Academic Appeals Committee is the first student avenue for internal appeal within the College. Should a student be dissatisfied with this first internal review and appeals process, they will be provided with details of a further internal avenue of appeal, through the Academic Board, and external appeals, as detailed in the ACC Student Academic Appeals Procedures.

RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Lecturer

- i. The lecturer is responsible for the grading of each assessment item in the unit against the related rubric
- ii. The grade for all, with the exception of the last, assessment item is updated in the Learning Management System and made visible to students.

2. Unit Coordinator

- i. The Unit Coordinator is responsible to review the overall grades for the unit
- ii. The Unit Coordinator prepares the first section of the Grade Moderation Form which includes:
 - a. Grade distribution
 - b. Highest mark, lowest mark and average mark
 - c. Unit Coordinator comments
 - d. Outstanding results
 - e. Adjustments to raw results
 - f. Recommendations.

3. Grade Moderation Committee

- i. The Grade Moderation Committee considers the first section of the Grade Moderation Form for each unit
- ii. The Grade Moderation Committee considers the following and completes the Grade Moderation Form which includes:
 - a. Feedback on grade distribution
 - b. Agreed scaling, adjustments or moderation of results
 - c. Actions for students with a final mark between 47.5% and 49.4% (noting that each is rounded up such that 49.5% is rounded to 50%)
 - d. Actions to finalise the outstanding results
- iii. The Grade Moderation Committee then endorses the draft final grades for consideration and endorsement by the Learning and Teaching committee and approval by the Academic Board.

4. Learning and Teaching Committee and Academic Board

- i. The Learning and Teaching Committee and the Academic Board are provided with the following for consideration:
 - a. Grade Moderation Forms for all units
 - b. Minutes of the Grade Moderation Committee

- c. Grades spreadsheet which includes the draft final grade for each student in each unit
- ii. The Learning and Teaching Committee considers the grades information and endorses the grades for approval by the Academic Board
- iii. The Academic Board considers the grades information and approves the grades.

5. General Manager

- i. Upon approval of the grades by the Academic Board the General Manager updates the Learning Management System for any grade amendments
- ii. The General Manager then makes the final grades visible in the Learning Management System and advises students that final grades are available
- iii. The General Manager approves the replication of the grades from the Learning Management System to the Student Management System, where the grades are reported via TCSI.

IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

The Academic Dean is responsible for ensuring compliance with, and monitoring and review of the above procedures.

All ACC academic staff are responsible for complying with these procedures and for ensuring compliance monitoring occurs through exception reports generated after the Review and Confirmation of Grades each Semester.

REVIEW

The ACC's *Grades and Results Procedures* document is normally reviewed every three years.

It is a policy of the ACC that any Policy or Procedure may be reviewed earlier as indicated by internal or external factors (including but not limited to such factors as changes in the guidelines of regulatory authorities, accreditation/registration requirements of the profession, or relevant legislation at state or federal level) as determined the Board of Directors and/or Academic Board.

RELATED POLICY DOCUMENTS

- Grades and Results Policy
- Academic Credit and Recognition for Prior Learning Policy
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Academic Progress Policy and Procedures
- Student Support Policy
- Students at Risk Policy
- Attendance Policy
- Review of Grades Policy
- Student Academic Appeals Procedures
- Assessment of Coursework Policy and Procedures.

VERSION CONTROL

Document: A011 Grades and Results Policy and Procedures		
Responsible Officer: Academic Dean		
Initially Approved by: Academic Board		Date: 11 November 2020
Reviewed and approved by: Academic Board		Next Review: March 2023
Reviewed and Approved: Academic Board		Date: 14 December 2022
Reviewed and Approved: Chair Academic Board		Date: 14 April 2023
Version: V2.1	Replaces version(s): V2.0	Date: April 2026
HESF	1.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment	1.4.3 1.4.4
Nature of Change	<p>December 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate Policy and Procedures • Consolidate A011 Grades and Results and T004 Review of Grades • Include Diploma program • Convert Subject to Stream • Confirm unit rather than subject • Detail the procedures • Confirm the involvement of the Grade Moderation Committee and approval of grades by the Academic Board. <p>April 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor amendments to align with the agreed policy framework • Clarify the responsibility for implementation and monitoring of the procedure. 	