



The University of Sydney

Report of the Teaching and Learning Committee

Review of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*

Background

1. Establishment of Working Party 2
2. Process of Development and Consultation 2 – 3

Recommendations and Amendments

1. Recommendations of the Teaching and Learning Committee 3
2. Amendment of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework* 4-36

Background

1. Establishment of Working Party

At its meeting of 14 May 2003, the Academic Board noted the establishment of a working party to review the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*.

The Teaching and Learning Committee established a Working Party to review the Policy comprising:

Associate Professor Mike Prosser (Chair), Director, Institute of Teaching and Learning
 Dr Stephen Cattle, Faculty of Agriculture, Food & Natural Resources
 Dr Ian Maxwell, Faculty of Arts
 Mr David Bowan, Director, Student Centre
 Mr Matt Hall, President, SUPRA
 Ms Jo Haylen, President, SRC

2. Process of development and consultation

The Working Party met in May 2003 and agreed to review the resolutions using the following principles:

- is the policy internally consistent;
- is the policy consistent with other University policies; and
- can/do faculties comply with the requirements of the policy.

In addition, the Working Party noted that Sections 5 and 6 were the subject of another review regarding special consideration. Accordingly, it was agreed that these sections would not be included in the overall review of the resolutions.

Major issues were identified regarding quality assurance, implementation and compliance, standards, student rights and responsibilities and the definition of norm-referenced versus standards-referenced marking.

At its meeting in June 2003, the Working Party noted that a concurrent review on Academic Board policy regarding award with honours, and a review of examination procedures by the Student Centre would need to be taken into account. It was also agreed that Archives and Records Management Services would be consulted on the accuracy of references in the resolution to record-keeping practices.

From the Working Party's initial review and procedural advice from Student Centre and the Archives and Records Management Services, a revised version of the resolutions was created. This first draft was circulated to Faculties in October 2003, with responses requested by 7 November 2003.

A wide range of suggestions and issues was raised as a result of this consultation with faculties, and further revisions were made to the document. Issues addressed in the second version included the removal of the section on honours grading, the distribution of merit grades, the use of calculators in examination and consistency in nomenclature.

The second draft was discussed at the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting of 24 February 2004. From this discussion a third draft was prepared which addressed issues such as the removal of a section on University medals (to be included in the Academic Board Resolutions: *Award with Honours*) and clarification of what advice is to be provided to students regarding assessment (with particular reference to scaling) and when this advice is to be provided.

At its meeting of 30 March 2004, the Committee made a number of further changes (outlined in the report of this meeting) which resulted in the attached final version of the amended resolutions.

Recommendations and Amendments

1. Recommendations of the Teaching and Learning Committee

The Teaching and Learning Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board amend the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework* as set out in the attached version of the resolutions.

The Teaching and Learning Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board amend the Academic Board Resolutions: *Award with Honours* to insert the section on University Medals which has been deleted from the revised version of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*.

The proposed amendments address the issues raised in the first part of the report. It is pointed out that the Committee has significantly amended the numbering style in the revised document, to address concerns raised about accurately identifying distinct sections within the document.

The Committee will be reporting to the Academic Board at a later date regarding a proposal for the implementation of these amendments.

Recommendation

That the Academic Board:

- (i) amend the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*, with effect from the 29 April 2004; and
 - (ii) amend the Academic Board Resolutions: *Award with Honours* to insert the section on University Medals which has been deleted from the revised version of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*;
- as set out in the report presented.



The University of Sydney

Academic Board Resolutions: Assessment and Examination of Coursework

Approved by: Academic Board on 13 December 2000

Last amended: ~~14 November 2001~~ 28 April 2004

Date of effect: ~~1 January 2002~~ 29 April 2004

Part 1 - Preliminary	5
1.1 Commencement	5
1.2 Purpose	5
1.3 Authority.....	5
1.4 Revision.....	5
5. Dictionary.....	5
1.56 Related Documents.....	6
Part 2 – Principles, Criteria and Responsibilities for Assessment	7
2.1 Statement of Principles.....	7
2.2 Criteria for Effective, Efficient and Acceptable Assessment.....	10
2.3 Rights and Responsibilities	13
Part 3 - Grades	17
3.1 Common Result Grades.....	17
3.2 Distribution of Merit Grades	19
3. Honours Courses and Grading	21
4. University Medals	21
Part 4 - The Conduct of Examinations	23
4.1 Principles	23
4.2 Examination Procedures	23
4.3 Conduct of Examinations and Determination of Results	24
4.4 Processing and Releasing Results	25
4.5 Security of Examination Papers and Results.....	26
4.6 The Use of Computers and Calculators in Assessments	27
4.7 Examinations – Emergency Evacuations	27
Part 5 – Special Consideration Due to Illness and Misadventure.	29
5.1 Introduction	29
5.2 Principles for the dealing with cases of special consideration	29
5.3 Responsibilities.....	29
(1)5.3.1 Responsibilities of the University	29
(2)5.3.2 Responsibility of faculties.....	29
(3) 5.3.3Responsibility of Students.....	30
5.7 Documentation	33
5.8 <i>Aegrotat</i> and posthumous awards.....	34
Part 6 – Special Examination Conditions <u>Accessible Examination and Assessment Arrangements for People-Students with Disabilities or Other Special Needs</u>.....	35
Part 7 – Glossary	36

Part 1 - Preliminary

1.1 Commencement

These Resolutions commence on 1 January 2002.

1.2 Purpose

(1)The purpose of this document is:

(a)1.2.1 to set out the principles underpinning the University's approach to assessment and examination of coursework award courses and units of study;

(b)1.2.2 to identify responsibilities for ensuring that the principles are implemented;

(c)1.2.3 to be a resource document containing all Academic Board policies relating to assessment and examination of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework; and

(d)1.2.4 to be a resource document containing the procedures used in the assessment and examination of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework award courses, pursuant to Senate rules and regulations, Academic Board policies and to the requirements of the relevant administrative systems.

1.3 Authority

The University of Sydney (Coursework) Rule 2000 (Division 1, 5(4)) requires the Academic Board to establish policies for assessment and examination of coursework.

1.4 Revision

This document is maintained by the Academic Board in consultation with the Registrar. It is published by the Academic Board and also as part of the Manual for Examiners.

(Note: The Dictionary has been expanded and relocated to the end of the document, where it becomes the Glossary)

5. ~~Dictionary~~

~~In this document:~~

~~**Academic unit** means a faculty, academic college, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.~~

~~**Appeal period** means the interval of time, measured from the date of release of results to students, in which a student may appeal against the assessment outcome. The appeal period is 4 months.~~

~~**Assessment or examination** means assessment by written/oral examination, assignments, presentation, theses, etc.~~

Award course means a formally approved program of study which can lead to an academic award granted by the University.

~~**Coursework award course** means an award course not designated as a research award course. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning normally will be dominant. All undergraduate award courses are coursework award courses.~~

~~**Dean** means the dean of a faculty or the director or principal of an academic college, or chairperson of a board of studies.~~

~~**Department** means a faculty (if the faculty does not have an internal departmental structure), board of studies, school, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the university. Departments are responsible for assessing and examining units of study, and in this document the term refers to the department responsible for assessing and examining the unit of study concerned.~~

~~**Faculty** means a faculty, college board or the Australian Graduate School Of Management Limited, as established in each case by its constitution, or, where applicable, a board of studies. Faculties are responsible for award courses, and in this document the term refers to the faculty responsible for the award course concerned.~~

~~**GDA (General Disposal Authority)** means a General Disposal Authority issued by the State Records Authority under the NSW State Records Act 1998. The University is required to comply with these GDAs in keeping its records.~~

~~**IPP** means an Information Protection Principle under the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998.~~

~~**Script Retention Period** means the period from the date of release of results to students during which departments are required to arrange for coursework students to request, peruse and if required copy their script. The Script Retention Period is 4 months.~~

~~**Student** means a person enrolled as a candidate for an award course or unit of study.~~

~~**Unit of study or unit** means a stand alone component of an award course. Assessing and examining each unit of study is the responsibility of a department.~~

1.56 Related Documents

These Academic Board Resolutions refer to, or should be read in conjunction with, the following Senate and Academic Board Resolutions relating to student appeals against academic decisions.

(a) 1.5.1 Student Appeals against Academic Decisions: Senate Resolutions

(b) 1.5.2 Student Appeals against Academic Decisions: Undergraduate and Postgraduate Course Awards: Academic Board Resolutions

(c) 1.5.3 Student Appeals against Academic Decisions: Postgraduate Research Awards: Academic Board Resolutions.

1.5.4 Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework

Part 2 – Principles, Criteria and Responsibilities for Assessment

This Part of the document identifies the principles that should underpin student assessment, and, based on those principles, sets out the criteria which student assessments should satisfy. This leads on to the responsibilities of the University, departments and faculties, academic staff, and students, in ensuring that these criteria are met.

2.1 Statement of Principles

Any system for assessing the progress and achievement of students must be effective, efficient and acceptable. Furthermore, there is a tight link between what students believe are the aims of assessment, and how they learn.

(1) 2.1.1 Effective Assessment

(a) 2.1.1.1 Effective assessment achieves the goals and purposes for which it is undertaken, and does not create perverse incentives. Assessment can have a number of goals and purposes, some of which may be mutually exclusive. These potential conflicts can be minimised by explicit statements about the goals and purposes of each assessment.

(b) 2.1.1.2 The goals and purposes of assessment must reflect and reinforce the goals and purposes of the curriculum. In doing so, the assessment must be a representative test of the knowledge, understanding and skills to be achieved by successful completion of the curriculum. This requirement for representativeness also applies to any further supplementary assessment or re-assessment which students may be required to undergo.

2.1.1.3 The University's academic honesty policy is implemented.

(c) 2.1.1.4 Assessment is often classified as formative or summative. Most assessments include both a formative and summative component.

(i) 2.1.1.4.1 That aspect of assessment which is **summative assessment** is used to certify competence, or to arrange students in a rank order of merit. It certifies the attainment of a standard, and is used as the basis for progression to the next part of a course program, or to graduation. Success at summative assessment is an important goal for students, and will have a powerful impact on the way they study and learn. While summative assessment may motivate students to learn, it should not be the means by which students are induced to study. “Knowledge acquired under compulsion has no hold on the mind” (A.N.Whitehead).

(ii) 2.1.1.4.2 That aspect of assessment which is **formative assessment** is used principally to provide students with feedback on their progress in learning. Not only does it reinforce successful learning, but it is an opportunity for students to expose the limitations in their knowledge and understanding, rather than to hide them. For this reason, tasks which focus largely on the formative aspect of assessment should not be the sole contributor ~~the results of formative assessments should not be used in contributing~~ to decisions about progression or graduation.

Further, feedback from formative assessments should be presented within a timeframe that will enable students to undertake the additional learning they need in order to remedy their weaknesses. Feedback should also be provided in a form that students find useful in identifying their strengths, and in pinpointing areas for improvement. However, feedback should be presented in ways that will encourage self-reliance in learning and in assessment, rather than dependence on authority. Formative assessment also provides students with opportunities for practice on the types of assessment instrument that will be used in summative assessment. Summative assessments can provide useful learning experiences, but their formative value should not be over-estimated.

~~(ii)~~ 2.1.1.4.3 Both types of assessment can be used to provide feedback to teachers about the effectiveness of teaching and learning, and information that can be used in program evaluation.

~~(d)~~ 2.1.1.5 Assessment may have unintended or negative consequences. For example, an assessment which ranks students in order of merit may encourage competitive attitudes and activities, which may not be appropriate in a world where co-operation, collaboration and teamwork are increasingly valued. Likewise, an assessment which is marked solely by academic staff may not be the best way of encouraging teamwork and peer-review, if these are valued activities. Again, an assessment which rewards the recall of isolated facts is unlikely to encourage students to explore the meaning of what they are learning, and to synthesise information from different sources. Thus the potential unintended and negative consequences of an assessment should be explored carefully before a particular type of assessment is implemented.

~~(2)~~ 2.1.2 Efficient Assessment

~~(a)~~ 2.1.2.1 An assessment that is efficient for **students** will maximise the benefit that they derive from the assessment for the effort that they expend on preparation for it. The benefit will depend on the type of assessment: for a final (summative) examination, the benefit will be the mark or merit grade obtained. For a primarily formative assessment, the benefit will be the quality, and quantity and timeliness of feedback information that students receive to assist their future learning.

~~(b)~~ 2.1.2.2 An assessment that is efficient for **academic staff** will likewise maximise the benefit arising from the effort invested in developing, implementing and marking and providing feedback to students on the assessment. Benefits will include the benefits to students described above, but also feedback to staff on the effectiveness of teaching and learning, and the intangible benefit of contributing to a quality learning environment. Against this must be set not only the effort invested, but also the opportunity costs of assessment – the benefits foregone through non-participation in other valued activities, e.g. research.

~~(c)~~ 2.1.2.3 The minimum number of assessment tasks needed to make judgements about students' progression and learning should be used. ~~Especially in semester courses there is a danger of over-assessing units of study, and this should be avoided.~~

(3)2.1.3 Acceptable Assessment

(a)2.1.3.1 Any assessment system has to be acceptable to a number of stakeholders: the general community, the professions, Government, the University, academic staff, and students. While some of these stakeholders' requirements will be largely met by assessments that are effective and efficient, other factors contributing to acceptability should also be recognised:

(b)2.1.3.2 For the **community**, there must be an assurance of the competence of graduates to carry out whatever roles and functions in society their degree has qualified them to undertake.

2.1.3.3 For the **professions**, there must be an assurance that the education and training components of the registration or licensing requirements for their industry will be met by a recognised course of study conducted by the University.

(c)2.1.3.4 For **Government**, there must be confidence that the public funds invested in the University are being well spent. In addition, the assessment system should comply with any quality standards imposed by funding agencies.

(d)2.1.3.5 The **University's** assessment system must match contemporary best practice, ~~and must be seen to be consistent with current trends such as the move towards competency based training and assessment.~~ The assessment system must also be consistent with the image and ethos of the University. Assessments must be conducted in such a way that they do not attract negative publicity to the University, e.g. through the exposure of academic dishonesty, or impersonation, or unreliable marking. The system must also maximise opportunities for students in the University's equity target groups to realise their full potential, and should take account of the diverse cultural backgrounds of students enrolled at the University.

(e)2.1.3.6 For **academic staff**, effectiveness and efficiency will contribute largely to the acceptability of the assessment system.

(f)2.1.3.7 Likewise, for **students**, effectiveness and efficiency will contribute largely to acceptability. However, for students, there are three additional considerations. First, the assessment system should not generate levels of stress which are so high that they interfere with performance. Secondly, students have an increasing financial investment in their tertiary education, and they too will require value for money. Finally, the assessment system must be seen to be fair and transparent.

(4)2.1.4 Student-centred Assessment

Assessment plays an important role in determining what students learn and understand. Indeed, a substantial amount of research in student learning in higher education has established a tight link between (1) students' perceptions and understanding of what the assessment aims to test, and (2) what and how much students learn. Consequently, the student-centred or student-focussed perspective of teaching and learning encouraged by the Academic Board requires not only that assessment systems be effective, efficient and acceptable but also that students be helped to understand the assessment system, what is to be assessed and why it is to be assessed and how it is to be assessed.

2.2 Criteria for Effective, Efficient and Acceptable Assessment

The principles of efficiency, effectiveness, acceptability and student-centredness imply that the University's assessment system should satisfy the following criteria.

~~(1)~~2.2.1 Curriculum

- ~~(a)~~2.2.1.1 Each unit of study has an explicit statement of the generic and specific goals of the unit.
- ~~(b)~~2.2.1.2 The curriculum for each unit of study is consistent with the University's Generic Attributes of Graduates

~~(2)~~2.2.2 Scope of Assessment

- ~~(a)~~2.2.2.1 The assessment is generally representative of the generic and specific goals of the unit of study. While it will rarely be appropriate to test the achievement of all goals on every occasion, each assessment can be shown to address a balanced portfolio of goals.
- ~~(b)~~2.2.2.2 The scope and nature of the assessment for each unit of study is explicitly stated at the beginning of delivery of the unit. This statement should include details of all aspects of the assessment system process (but see 2.5.4 below). Reference should also be made to the Unit of Study outline requirements contained in the Academic Board Resolutions: *Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching*.
- ~~(e)~~2.2.2.3 The formative or summative nature of each assessment task is explicitly stated.

~~(3)~~2.2.3 Assessment Instruments

- ~~(a)~~2.2.3.1 The assessment instruments employed (written paper, practical task, etc.) are capable of validly testing the goals of the unit of study.
- ~~(b)~~2.2.3.2 The assessment instruments possess reliability and reproducibility.
- ~~(e)~~2.2.3.3 The length of each assessment balances the demands of validity and reliability on the one hand, and efficiency on the other.
- ~~(d)~~2.2.3.4 Students have had the opportunity for formative practice or experience on each type of instrument that is used summatively.

~~(4)~~2.2.4 Assessment Timetable

- ~~(a)~~2.2.4.1 Assessments are timetabled to take account of other academic demands on a student's time, e.g. other assessments, or the requirements of other units of study.
- ~~(b)~~2.2.4.2 Adequate arrangements are made to cater for students with disability or other special needs to ensure transparency, fairness and equity.
- ~~(e)~~2.2.4.3 Formative assessments are timetabled to provide adequate time for feedback and remediation before summative assessment.
- ~~(d)~~2.2.4.4 In courses or units where failure at summative assessment requires remediation and re-assessment before progression in the course or unit, summative assessments are timed, if possible, to allow adequate opportunity for remediation and re-assessment.

(e) 2.2.4.5 Where an assessment ~~task~~ requires the submission of an assignment, students are given reasonable opportunities to attempt and submit the assignment. Submission deadlines take reasonable account of practical difficulties that students might encounter, such as equipment failure and the temporary unavailability of materials, reference texts and so forth (technical and other difficulties should also be taken account where they affect other types of assessment, e.g. oral presentations, laboratory work, etc).

(5) 2.2.5 Assessment Tasks and Papers

(a) 2.2.5.1 Each task ~~or paper~~ is demonstrably valid (it tests achievement of one or more of the goals of the unit of study).

(b) 2.2.5.2 The set of tasks ~~or papers~~ comprising the assessment of a unit of study can be shown collectively to test a balanced and sufficient proportion of the goals of the unit of study.

(c) 2.2.5.3 The scope and nature of each task ~~or paper~~ is explicit. This includes such matters as the goals to be tested, the criteria against which performance will be measured, the weighting of items and of tasks / papers, the due date for submission or testing, the conditions under which examinations papers will be sat, the conditions for extensions of time (if any), the penalties for lateness or for violation of assessment specifications (e.g. length).

(d) 2.2.5.4 Any necessary modifications to the scope or nature of any assessment task are communicated in writing to all students enrolled in the unit before the halfway point of the unit, and are applied so that no student is differentially disadvantaged by the modification.

(6) 2.2.6 Marking

(a) 2.2.6.1 Tasks ~~and papers~~ are marked according to the published criteria (such as marking schema and grade descriptors) which have been provided to students when they receive the unit of study outline (as required under the Unit of Study provisions in the Academic Board Resolutions: Management and Evaluation of Coursework Teaching).

(b) 2.2.6.2 Decisions which may impact on a student's progression or graduation do not depend on judgments made by a single marker without review by colleagues for calibration or moderation.

(c) 2.2.6.3 Decisions which may impact on a student's progression or graduation are based solely on the assessments specified for that purpose.

(d) 2.2.6.4 When marks from tasks ~~and / or papers~~ are combined, the methods used are statistically and educationally defensible.

(e) 2.2.6.5 Any necessary retrospective modifications to the marking criteria are published at the same time as the results of the assessment.

~~(f)2.2.6.6~~ Academic judgments, particularly adverse academic judgments, are supported by documented evidence of failure to satisfy academic standards. Frequently, such documentation will be entered directly onto an assignment or examination script. Where documentation exists beyond such markings on assignments and scripts, such documents will be placed on the relevant student file maintained by the Records Management Services, registered in the University's records management system, TRIM.

~~(g)2.2.6.7~~ Due account is taken of the University's applications for special consideration policy in relation to arising from illness or misadventure.

~~(7)2.2.7~~ Feedback

~~(a)2.2.7.1~~ Feedback to students is sufficiently timely to allow remediation where necessary.

~~(b)2.2.7.2~~ Feedback to students, either individually or in a group, is sufficiently detailed to be a useful identification of strengths and deficiencies, yet not so detailed as to discourage self-reliance in learning and assessment.

~~(c)2.2.7.3~~ Feedback to students includes access to their own scripts, and to other relevant assessment material provided that students may not access test materials which are secured for re-use in subsequent assessments.

~~(d)2.2.7.4~~ Evaluative feedback from students to academic staff is incorporated into teaching and learning strategies, and into future assessments.

~~(e)~~ — Where results are posted publicly, students are identified by ID only.

~~(8)2.2.8~~ Remediation

~~(a)2.2.8.1~~ Adequate academic support is given to students to clarify errors, misunderstandings and so forth requiring remediation.

~~(b)2.2.8.2~~ Appropriate support is given to students undertaking remedial learning.

~~(9)2.2.9~~ Re-assessment

~~(a)2.2.9.1~~ Where allowed, the re-assessment of students refers to situations where failure at the first attempt requires remediation and subsequent re-assessment. Such re-assessment needs to be delayed long enough for useful remedial learning to have been possible. ~~who were unsuccessful at a first attempt at assessment is delayed long enough for useful remedial learning to have been possible.~~

~~(b)2.2.9.2~~ Re-assessment is conducted using assessment instruments which are either identical to those used at first assessment, or are demonstrably similar in their validity and reliability.

~~(c)2.2.9.3~~ The criteria for successful re-assessment are published, and consistent with the criteria applied to the first assessment.

~~(10)2.2.10~~ Appeals

The grounds for, and mechanism for, appeals against academic judgments which will impede progression or graduation are explicit.

2.3 Rights and Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the University, departments and faculties, academic staff, and students in meeting these criteria for effective, efficient and acceptable assessment are detailed in this section.

~~(1)~~2.3.1 Responsibilities of the University

The University, through the Vice-Chancellor and the Academic Board, has a responsibility to ensure that:

- ~~(a)~~2.3.1.1 assessment practices are explicit, fair, transparent and consistent across the institution;
- ~~(b)~~2.3.1.2 assessment practices and procedures are monitored at the level of departments and faculties to ensure that they meet the criteria set out in this document;
- ~~(c)~~2.3.1.3 resources are available to provide staff with access to information and expertise on the theory and practice of assessment;
- ~~(d)~~2.3.1.4 facilities to sustain good assessment practice are ~~is~~ available to staff and students;
- ~~(e)~~2.3.1.5 policies regarding special consideration pursuant to illness or other misadventure, and for students with special needs, are explicit and consistently applied;
- ~~(f)~~2.3.1.6 policies on academic honesty, legitimate cooperation, plagiarism and cheating, including sanctions and penalties for breaches, are explicit and consistently applied; and
- ~~(g)~~2.3.1.7 appropriate mechanisms of appeal are available and publicised.

~~(2)~~2.3.2 Responsibilities of Departments and Faculties

Faculties and departments have responsibilities to ensure that:

- ~~(a)~~2.3.2.1 the principles and criteria for assessment are adopted;
- ~~(b)~~2.3.2.2 policies, consistent with the principles and criteria, are clear and available to all staff;
- ~~(c)~~2.3.2.3 wherever required, individuals are identified and given appropriate authorities to act as the Principal Examiner of each unit of study;
- ~~(d)~~2.3.2.4 information on all aspects of assessments, including criteria for satisfactory and meritorious performance, penalties for plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty, attendance and class requirements and the weighting of those assessments, are explicit to students within one week of commencing a unit of study;
- ~~(e)~~2.3.2.5 assessment tasks reflect the relevant objectives of the unit of study, the goals for the degree and the generic attributes of graduates, as appropriate to the academic level of the students;
- ~~(f)~~2.3.2.6 formative assessment is incorporated so that feedback is provided in a timely fashion during each unit of study;
- ~~(g)~~2.3.2.7 appropriate amounts and a range of valid assessment instruments ~~methods~~ are applied, monitored by Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees;

- ~~(h)~~ 2.3.2.8 students have an opportunity to become familiar with all assessment instruments ~~methods~~ that will be used summatively;
- ~~(i)~~ 2.3.2.9 assessments ~~events~~ are coordinated as far as possible to provide appropriate workloads for students across their units of study;
- ~~(j)~~ 2.3.2.10 when marks are combined, statistically defensible methods are applied;
- ~~(k)~~ 2.3.2.11 sanctions and penalties are made clear in the unit of study outline ~~advance~~ and are applied fairly;
- ~~(l)~~ 2.3.2.12 examination scripts and other forms of summative assessment (other than secure databanks) are held for the mandated script retention period and appeal period for review by students;
- ~~(m)~~ 2.3.2.13 publicly posted results are identified only by student number (students' names may only be used with the permission of the student, in accordance with the University Privacy Policy);
- ~~(n)~~ 2.3.2.14 mechanisms of appeal against decisions on assessments, consistent with University policy, are in place;
- 2.3.2.15 accurate records of assessments and supporting academic judgements, and how they were formed, are made and kept for the mandated retention periods (see General Disposal Authority 9 governing University records); and
- 2.3.2.16 that all documentation arising from assessment action of a non-routine nature are placed on the relevant student's file (reference should be made to the University of Sydney By-law 1999, the Academic Board Resolutions: *Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions* and the University Recordkeeping Policy for the procedures for dealing with documentation relating to misconduct and appeals).

~~(3)~~ 2.3.3 Responsibilities of Academic Staff

Individual members of staff have responsibilities to:

- ~~(a)~~ 2.3.3.1 familiarise themselves with the University and faculty requirements for best practice in assessment;
- ~~(b)~~ 2.3.3.2 ensure that each assessment is congruent with the objectives of the unit of study;
- ~~(c)~~ 2.3.3.3 adhere consistently to the policies of the faculty and department on submission of assignments and other assessment items;
- ~~(d)~~ 2.3.3.4 review and give timely and adequately detailed feedback on work submitted;
- ~~(e)~~ 2.3.3.5 communicate clearly the requirements for assessment (including the balance of formative and summative assessment, procedures, weighting of marks and methods to be used, as well as penalties for plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty) at the commencement of each unit of study and, if changes are needed, discuss them with the students; such changes should not occur later than halfway through the relevant teaching period and should be applied so that no student is significantly disadvantaged;
- ~~(f)~~ 2.3.3.6 ensure that reports of students' progress and achievement are based only on relevant evidence;

- ~~(g)~~ 2.3.3.7 contribute to the setting and review of assessment tasks within their discipline to ensure fairness and the application of agreed standards;
- ~~(h)~~ 2.3.3.8 ensure that students are assessed in a variety of ways and have opportunities to develop their own skills in self-evaluation;
- ~~(i)~~ 2.3.3.9 evaluate their own performance as assessors and examiners against the principles and criteria. Such evaluations will assist in the continued enhancement of the learning environment and provide evidence to support applications for promotion;
- ~~(j)~~ 2.3.3.10 not to discuss or disclose personal information, such as results, about students to anyone who does not have a legitimate right and need to have access to the information in order to carry out their duties (refer to the University's Privacy Policy); and
- 2.3.3.11 ensure adequate records relating to feedback, assessment, re-assessment and appeals are made and attached to the appropriate student file.

~~(4)~~ 2.3.4 Rights and Responsibilities of Students

Students have a right to:

- ~~(a)~~ 2.3.4.1 be informed of all aspects of assessment policies and practices in each unit of study, including the criteria to be met and sanctions or penalties for breaches;
- 2.3.4.2 ~~expect~~ consistent application of policies and practices;
- ~~(b)~~ 2.3.4.3 the timely return of the results of assessments with appropriate feedback;
- ~~(c)~~ 2.3.4.4 information which allows them to calibrate their own performance against the criteria for each unit of study;
- ~~(d)~~ 2.3.4.5 review their examination scripts and other forms of summative assessment (except those saved for reuse in subsequent testing) for the duration of the script retention period;
- ~~(e)~~ 2.3.4.6 have access to their student file ~~containing the~~ and any other documents relating to the assessment;
- ~~(f)~~ 2.3.4.7 appeal against academic decisions made on the basis of flawed processes, during the appeal period; and
- ~~(g)~~ 2.3.4.8 be informed of mechanisms for appeal.

Students have a responsibility to:

- ~~(a)~~ 2.3.4.9 behave ethically and appropriately, avoiding any action or behaviour which would unfairly disadvantage or advantage another student;
- ~~(b)~~ 2.3.4.10 be aware that a major objective of assessment is the facilitation of learning rather than the achievement of grades;
- ~~(c)~~ 2.3.4.11 use assessments to help them develop strategies for self-assessment;

- ~~(d)~~ 2.3.4.12 be aware of the rules of progression for each unit of study and the requirements for the award of the degree, diploma or certificate;
- ~~(e)~~ 2.3.4.13 be aware of ~~inform themselves about~~, and abide by, assessment policies and practices, including the University policies about academic honesty, legitimate cooperation, plagiarism and cheating;
- ~~(f)~~ 2.3.4.14 be aware of the means for seeking assistance and advice on assessment within departments and the university;
- ~~(g)~~ 2.3.4.15 ensure that they understand the requirements, including timetables, for examinations and other assessment tasks;
- ~~(h)~~ 2.3.4.16 submit work on time, ensuring that it is their own except when they share ownership of a group project;
- ~~(i)~~ 2.3.4.17 notify staff as early as possible if difficulties arise with the timing or other requirements of assessment tasks;
- ~~(j)~~ 2.3.4.18 advise departments or faculties as appropriate of any substantial absence and be aware of the appropriate use of medical and other certificates in applications for special consideration;
- ~~(k)~~ 2.3.4.19 ensure that they understand the advantages and possible adverse implications of discontinuation or withdrawal; and
- ~~(l)~~ 2.3.4.20 be aware ~~inform themselves~~ of appropriate mechanisms for appeal.

Part 3 - Grades

This Part summarises the merit grades awarded in the University's assessment system, and the University's approach to the determination of grades, ~~Honours and Medals~~.

3.1 Common Result Grades

The Academic Board has adopted a set of grades that will be common to all undergraduate and postgraduate courses which award merit grades for coursework, effective from Semester 1, 1999, as set out in the following Table.

Permanent results			
Grade	Description	Mark Range, if applicable	Comments
HD	High Distinction	85-100	-
D	Distinction	75-84	-
CR	Credit	65-74	-
P	Pass	50-64	-
R	Satisfied requirements	-	This is used in Pass/Fail only outcomes.
UCN	Unit of Study continuing	-	Used at the end of a semester for units of study which have been approved to extend into a following semester. This will automatically flag that no final result is required until the end of the last semester of the unit of study.
PCON	Pass (Concessional)	46-49	Use of this grade is restricted to those courses which allow for a Concessional Pass of some kind to be awarded. A student may re-enrol in a unit of study for which the result was PCON. Each faculty will determine and state in its course regulations what proportion, if any, may count – e.g. “no more than one sixth of the total credit points for a course can be made up from PCON results”.
F	Fail	0-49	This grade may be used for students with marks from 46-49 in those faculties which do not use PCON
AF	Absent Fail	-	Includes non-submission of compulsory work (or non-attendance at compulsory labs, etc) as well as failure to attend an examination
W	Withdrawn	-	Not recorded on external transcript. This is the result that obtains where a student applies to discontinue a Unit of Study by the HECS Census Date (i.e., within the first four weeks of enrolment).
DNF	Discontinued - Not to count as failure	-	Recorded on external transcript. This result applies automatically where a student discontinues after the HECS Census Date but before the end of the

			seventh week of the Semester (or before half of the unit of study has run in the case of units of study which are not semester-length). A faculty may determine that the result of DNF is warranted after this date if the student has made out a special case based on illness or misadventure.
DF	Discontinued - Fail	-	Recorded on <u>external</u> transcript. This applies from the time DNF ceases to be automatically available up to the cessation of classes for the unit of study.
Temporary results			
MINC	Incomplete with a mark of at least 50	50-100	<p>This result may be used when examiners have grounds (such as illness or misadventure) for seeking further information or for considering additional work from the student before confirming the final mark and passing grade.</p> <p>Except in special cases approved by the Academic Board [1], this result will be converted to a normal passing mark and grade either:</p> <p>(a) by the dean following a review of examination results pursuant to Part 4 (3)(5) of these Resolutions; or (b) automatically to the indicated mark and grade by the third week of the immediately subsequent academic session.</p>
INC	Incomplete	-	<p>This result is used when examiners have grounds (such as illness or misadventure) for seeking further information or for considering additional work from the student before confirming the final result.</p> <p>Except in special cases approved by the Academic Board[1], this result will be converted to a normal permanent passing or failing grade either:</p> <p>(a) by the dean at the review of examination results pursuant to Part 4 (3)(5) of these Resolutions; or (b) automatically to an AF grade by the third week of the immediately subsequent academic session.</p>

3.1.1 Special Cases

At its meeting of 13 October 1999, the Academic Board approved the following policies for dealing with special cases:

~~(a)~~ **3.1.1.1 Incomplete Units of Study**

Where a MINC or INC grade arises because all or many students in a Unit of Study have not completed the requirements of the Unit, the grade will be converted to UCN on the advice of the relevant dean. The students may be engaged in practicum or clinical placements, or in courses programs extending beyond the end of the semester (e.g. Honours). Heads of departments are encouraged to return UCN and not INC for students in such extended Units of Study. Deans are asked to avoid approving the use of UCN to deal with late results from a completed Unit of Study.

~~(b)~~ **3.1.1.2 Students with incomplete results**

Deans are authorised to approve the extension of a MINC/INC grade for individual students having a valid reason for their incomplete status.

3.2 Distribution of Merit Grades

~~(1)~~ **3.2.1** There are two main approaches to the award of merit grades. The **standards-referencing** approach assesses the achievements of students against a pre-determined standard. The **norm-referencing** (with associated scaling of marks) approach, on the other hand, grades students by comparing their achievements with that of other students undergoing the same assessment. (Here standards referencing is not to be confused with criterion referencing. Criterion referencing refers to the criteria to be used to make judgements – it does not usually refer to standards to be used in making the judgements. Standards based assessment usually refers to the general standards to be used in allocating grades.)

~~(2)~~ **3.2.2** Traditionally, merit grades have been awarded largely on a norm-referenced (with scaling) basis, based on the expectation that, within a certain range, from year to year a relatively constant proportion of the class will achieve a High Distinction, a Distinction, etc. These proportions have been refined over a number of years to provide a basis for equity of examination results particularly in cases where students are shared between faculties, particularly the 'generalist' faculties of Arts, Economics and Science, as well as Education and which shares many of its students with the other three faculties. The proportions are cumulative and are based on the number of students who gain a Pass or better in the particular unit of study.

	%HD	%D+	%CR+
First Year	3	14	42
Senior/Upper	4	18	50

It is important to note that the proportions of merit grades may vary from unit of study course to unit of study course, and from year to year, reflecting differences in the capabilities of different groups of students. ~~Care must be taken in interpreting the~~ Proportions should not be interpreted too literally, particularly with small numbers of students or in units that traditionally set exceptionally high academic standards. The proportions should apply at highly aggregated levels.

~~(3)~~**3.2.3** Norm-referencing (with scaling) has several advantages over standards-referencing. It requires no additional information or specification of standards, no estimates of how students will perform in a given assessment, no pre-specification of expected levels of achievement, and it compensates for a range of parameters that are hard to standardize, such as the quality of curriculum and instruction, adequacy of assessment practice, and variation in student cohorts. It also assists the control of grade inflation and the intercomparison of achievements between different disciplines.

~~(4)~~**3.2.4** Norm-referencing (with scaling), however, has several disadvantages when compared with standards-referencing. It will fail to take account of changes in the quality of students enrolled in the program. It does not require specification of the academic standards reached in the course or unit, making it difficult to benchmark those standards. It is difficult to provide a clear statement of expected levels of achievement using the norm-referencing (with scaling) approach, and it is known that undergraduate students complain frequently about the absence of such information.

~~(5)~~**3.2.5** Recognizing the deficiencies of norm-based assessment, some faculties and departments already engage in standards-based assessment. Each Faculty will have a policy statement on standards applying in that faculty and how those standards are being assured. Two major approaches to this are (a) a standards-referenced approach, with explicit statement of standards and (b) a norm-referenced (with scaling) approach, incorporating some form of external check on standards. The Academic Board recommends *encourages* greater use of standards-based assessment, while acknowledging that many faculties and departments *will wish* to retain norm-based approaches to review the distribution of moderate merit grades.

3.2.6 Faculties are required to submit an annual report to the Academic Board outlining the approach to be used for awarding grades (i.e. standards-referenced or norm-reference with scaling) in the following academic year. This report will be collated by the Dean of each Faculty from reports submitted by Heads of Schools.

~~(6)~~**3.2.7** The Academic Board commends the following approach for faculties and departments in the implementation of ~~planning to introduce~~ standards-based assessment:

~~(a)~~**3.2.7.1** at unit of study level, identify examples of students' work that are characteristic of achievement at different merit grades (benchmarks);

~~(b)~~**3.2.7.2** describe the differences between work at different achievement levels in information given to students. Descriptions are likely to be statements such as the following:

“At HD level a student demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the unit material, and exhibits initiative and self-reliance in critically evaluating and synthesizing ideas related to the unit.”

~~(c)~~**3.2.7.3** provide students with samples of work at different achievement levels (Note: If samples mean examples of real students' work, then a copy of the signed permission of the student author must be kept for as long as the example is used for this purpose);

~~(d)~~**3.2.7.4** grade assessments and examinations against the benchmarks, discussing the outcomes with colleagues teaching within the unit and in similar units to refine the standards;

~~(e)3.2.7.5~~ use norm-referenced statistics to review the distribution of merit grades moderate the results of standards-based assessment, seeking further justification from Unit of Study Co-ordinators if the distribution appears too aberrant. Such a review must adhere to the policy and adhering to any guidelines established by the faculty or department or provided in unit of study descriptions;

3.2.7.6 if some form of scaling of marks is considered necessary by the Unit of Study Co-ordinator because the distribution of grades is not considered appropriate, a statement justifying the scaling with reference to appropriate standards will be included with the submission of final grades and marks. Evidence of a discussion of the justification with a colleague in a similar unit will also be submitted and the final report will be submitted by the Head of School to the Dean of the relevant faculty (the report to be made available to students on request). Scale marks are to represent a relation to the standard/s but not a position in a cohort;

3.2.7.7 as part of the information provided to students regarding assessment procedures (see Part 2, Section 2 (6) (a)), it must be clearly stated whether or not scaling (against standards) may be used and the implications of the use of scaling on students' final marks (as mentioned above, the report on any use of scaling is to be made available to students on request).

(Note: the following section has been replaced by the policy "Academic Board Resolutions: Award with Honours" which was approved by the Academic Board on 13 August 2003)

~~3. Honours Courses and Grading~~

- ~~(1) An Honours degree is awarded by the University to signal a high standard of academic achievement at undergraduate level. Each Honours degree awarded by a faculty will have an identifiable, discipline-specific, individual research, scholarly or creative component.~~
- ~~(2) Annually, faculties will publish a clear statement in plain English:

 - ~~(a) describing the Honours component in degrees in which the award of honours is made;~~
 - ~~(b) explaining what is to be achieved by students to graduate with Honours;~~
 - ~~(c) describing the means by which the final grade of Honours is determined and the formulae that are applied; and~~
 - ~~(d) describing the criteria for admission and selection into honours courses which require an additional year of study (the 'Honours' year).~~~~

~~4. University Medals~~

- ~~(1) A faculty may recognise signal outstanding achievement in a Bachelor course by the award of a University Medal to one or more students who have satisfied the requirements of an Honours degree.~~
- ~~(2) Faculties should discuss and agree on the normal minimum levels of academic performance required for the award of a Medal, preferably using broadly comparable University wide criteria based on the conditions for the award of First Class Honours. In those cases where departments submit results and recommendations to more than one faculty, the award of both Medals and First Class Honours in all of the faculties should be consistent overall with the departmental order of merit.~~
- ~~(3) The merits of each candidate for a Medal should be debated by each faculty honours board. The award of a Medal should not be based solely on a numerical mark/faculty formula (i.e. a minimum criterion should be regarded as a necessary but not sufficient condition for the award of a Medal).~~

- ~~(4) — A distinction should be made between the requirements for the award of First Class Honours and of Medals. For example, in courses in which an Honours Fourth Year is prescribed the Honours awards could be based solely on final year marks. On the other hand, Medals should be awarded taking account of students' academic performance throughout their university studies in that course. Recipients of Medals would be expected to have not only outstanding performances in the Honours year, but also meritorious undergraduate performances (particularly in their major subjects), especially after first year. Faculties should allow consideration of students who exhibit ever improving academic performance.~~
- ~~(5) — Faculty honours boards should consider candidates for Medals within the context of the whole field of candidates for First Class Honours within the course in question. Members of honours boards should have before them the complete academic records of students recommended by departments for the award of First Class.~~
- ~~(6) — Honours students entering the University with advanced standing should be assessed for Medals in the same way as students undertaking their entire studies within the University.~~

Part 4 - The Conduct of Examinations

4.1 Principles

~~This Part presents the policies adopted by the University to ensure that assessments are fair. A~~ The University's commitment to fairness has a number of implications for the conduct of the University's assessment system, including the conduct of examinations.

~~(1)~~ 4.1.1 Implementation of the University's Equal Opportunity in Education Policy includes the provision of special examination conditions for students with disabilities or other needs, as published in Part 6 of this document.

~~(2)~~ 4.1.2 The University's assessment system practice aims to be fair to all students. Students who experience illness, misadventure or other circumstances beyond their control may therefore receive special consideration as described in Part 5 of this document.

~~(3)~~ 4.1.3 Students may appeal against the procedures used to arrive at an academic decision. The policies and procedures in respect of student appeals are found in the documents:

~~(a)~~ 4.1.3.1 Principles and Procedures for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Awards: Academic Board Resolutions.

~~(b)~~ 4.1.3.2 Principles and Procedures for Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions for Postgraduate Research Awards: Academic Board Resolutions.

~~(c)~~ 4.1.3.3 Appeals Against Academic Decisions: Senate Resolutions.

4.1.3.4 Academic Board Resolutions: Academic Honesty in Coursework.

4.2 Examination Procedures

~~(1)~~ 4.2.1 Examiners are strongly encouraged to require no more than 30 minutes of examination per credit point; a shorter time is quite acceptable, especially when students are also assessed progressively. Examinations during the formal examination period will normally be no longer than two hours. The responsible dean may make provision for three-hour examinations in special cases, provided that no unit of study has examinations which are in total longer than the equivalent of 30 minutes per credit point.

~~(2)~~ 4.2.2 Assessment strategies must be appropriate for the learning objectives of a unit of study, so that there is no requirement that units of study must be examined in the formal examination period. Where a formal examination is conducted for a unit of study:

~~(a)~~ 4.2.2.1 any unit of study with a value of 6 or fewer credit points will be examined in no more than one examination in the formal examination period; and

~~(b)~~ 4.2.2.2 any unit of study with a value of more than 6 credit points will be examined in no more than two examinations in the formal examination period.

~~(c)~~ 4.2.2.3 two two-hour and one three-hour examination session(s) may be scheduled each day during the examination period. The three-hour session will be the last one of each day in order to allow students to complete by 6.00 p.m.

~~(d)~~4.2.2.4no student will be required to sit for more than two examinations on the same day. In cases where a student has three examinations scheduled for the same day, provision must be available for one of those examinations to be taken at an alternative time.

~~(3)~~4.2.3 There is no formal provision for supplementary examinations, but departments may arrange for further testing in cases of special consideration, in accordance with Academic Board policy and any relevant faculty policies.

~~(4)~~4.2.4 Examinations may be held during classes provided that faculties ensure that the assessment ~~practices~~ regimes for all units of study are reasonable and not structured in a way that may disrupt attendance at other classes. Examiners should consider which forms of assessment may be appropriate to use during classes.

~~(5)~~4.2.5 The week after the end of teaching, e.g. lectures, in each semester will be a study break (Stuvac) with examinations to commence the following week.

~~(6)~~4.2.6 Faculties whose examination processes are fully quarantined or contained may conduct examinations outside these guidelines, within the spirit of the agreed procedures. This dispensation cannot apply when it leads to timetable clashes, for example for students taking combined degrees.

4.3 Conduct of Examinations and Determination of Results

~~(1)~~4.3.1 The head of the relevant department shall be responsible for all academic aspects of the conduct of examinations in the undergraduate and postgraduate coursework units of study taught in that department and shall ensure that they are conducted in accordance with the policies and directions of the Academic Board and the relevant faculty.

~~(2)~~4.3.2 In cases where the teaching of a unit of study is shared by more than one department, the relevant dean(s) will appoint a head to undertake the responsibilities of a head as set out in section 1 above, following consultation between the departments concerned.

~~(3)~~4.3.3 The head shall appoint a Principal Examiner for each unit of study. Principal Examiner(s) are responsible for:

~~(a)~~4.3.3.1 providing a copy of examination paper(s) to the Examinations Section by the specified deadline or, failing this, to print the examination paper(s) locally; copies of all examination papers must be forwarded to the Examinations Section for retention by the University Archives (GDA 9, 19.4.2);

~~(b)~~4.3.3.2 ensuring security of working papers developed in preparation for the examination, and ensuring that all secure papers are accounted for;

~~(c)~~4.3.3.3 justifying the returned result from evidence such as marksheets, annotated examination scripts, minutes of departmental meetings, in case an appeal process requires such evidence. If an appeal is made, all documentation relevant to that student's assessment must be placed on the student's appeal file (such files to be created and maintained on TRIM in accordance with Records Management Systems procedures). ~~In the absence of an appeal, All other~~ annotated scripts are to be retained together for each examination for the appeal period (GDA 9, 10.4.1), marksheets for 12 months (GDA 10.5.1) and minutes of departmental meetings are to be centrally filed where they will be retained for 5 years (GDA 2, 2.4.1)

~~(d)4.3.3.4~~for all students candidates in the unit of study concerned, ensuring the security of marks, arranging the collation of marks, and transmitting final results to the head by a date specified by the head.

~~(4)4.3.4~~The relevant faculty will determine the award of honours degrees and the levels at which they are awarded.

~~(5)4.3.5~~The relevant faculty will establish mechanisms for review of results, including those for students affected by illness or misadventure, in accordance with any policies of the Academic Board.

4.4 Processing and Releasing Results

~~(1)4.4.1~~The head will forward the results to the Student Records Office on a date to be determined by the Registrar (where spreadsheets are used for recording final results there needs to be an authorised read-only copy – electronic or paper - which is maintained in the department). In order to minimise delays in the transmission of results to students, the Registrar will normally set this date no later than five working days after the last scheduled examination. This tight timetable requires that special attention be given to scheduling large enrolment examinations as close as possible to the commencement of the examination period.

~~(2)4.4.2~~Results not forwarded to the Student Records Office by the due date must be approved by the relevant dean. Heads seeking late approval should forward the unapproved results to the Student Records Office who will contact the appropriate dean.

~~(3)4.4.3~~Departments are normally expected to make results available to students directly after they have been confirmed by the head.

~~(4)4.4.4~~The Registrar shall ensure that results are released to students as soon as possible after receiving them from the head. The final numerical marks obtained by undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students in completed units of study will be made available to them by printing such marks on the Examination Result Notices forwarded to them.

~~(5)4.4.5~~Departments are required to make arrangements for providing undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students, on request, with the numerical marks for each the various components of assessment task (where there is more than one), which comprise the final numerical mark reported on Examination Result Notices. Records of such marks should be retained for 12 months (GDA 9, 10.5.1).

~~(6)4.4.6~~Departments are asked to make arrangements for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students, on request, to peruse and, where they so desire, to obtain (a copy of) their examination scripts or any other written answers to examination questions, provided that:

~~(a)4.4.6.1~~the request is made within the script retention period, and

~~(b)4.4.6.2~~in the case of examinations involving confidential examination papers, where examination questions are used on more than one occasion, students may peruse under supervision, but not obtain a copy of, the examination paper and their answers to the questions.

~~(7)4.4.7~~The destruction of examination scripts and marking sheets after the respective retention periods should be documented and authorised by the head of the unit on a form available from Records Management Services.

4.5 Security of Examination Papers and Results

- (1)**4.5.1** In the preparation of examinations, it is essential to ensure the security of questions and papers so that examinations are fair to all students and preclude (as far as possible) opportunity for unfair advantage for any individual or group. There is also a need to keep results secure while they are being entered and summed so that they cannot be changed.
- (2)**4.5.2** Computer systems used to prepare examinations and to record results are potential sources of security breaches. Information transmitted over networks (including networked printers and email), and information saved on shared devices is potentially insecure. The most secure computer system may be a non-networked computer with data stored on removable media (e.g. floppy discs) that are normally locked away, and with a non-networked printer. Care should be taken to avoid casual observation of computer screens by unauthorised persons.
- (3)**4.5.3** Working papers should be kept secure at all times, without clearly indicative labelling. After use, all working papers should be shredded or discarded via the University's Confidential Bag Waste service.
- (4)**4.5.4** To prevent any breakdown in security when questions are re-used in subsequent examination papers, variation is encouraged as much as is practicable, within the constraint that questions requiring selected responses (including multiple choice variants) need to be trialled adequately to ensure their validity and reliability.
- (5)**4.5.5** The Principal Examiner of a unit of study is responsible for security of working copies of examination papers during the examination preparation process for that unit. Complete copies of the examination paper should not be circulated by mail, by fax or by any other electronic means, but should be delivered by hand or courier.
- (6)**4.5.6** It is assumed that the University Printing Service and Central Duplicating are secure. All final examination papers should be delivered to Examinations by hand or courier. All reproduction of examination papers should be undertaken by University Printing Service through the Examinations Office.
- (7)**4.5.7** The Principal Examiner will ensure that all secure papers used in the examination are returned/accounted for by the Examinations Office or internally if the examination was a departmental one.
- (8)**4.5.8** Students' ~~written papers~~ examination scripts should be retained by the department for the specified script retention period. During this time, students have a right to access their own written paper. Papers should be destroyed after the script retention period.
- (9)**4.5.9** All examination results recorded by individual staff members must be held securely, and handed on expeditiously to Principal Examiners.
- (10)**4.5.10** Final results, appropriately checked and validated, whether recorded in the form of hard copy or electronic media, should be sent by courier or by hand to the Student Records Office, or transmitted electronically with appropriate security protocols.
- (11)**4.5.11** Possible breaches of security or misconduct during an examination must be reported to the Principal Examiner and, if appropriate, to the Registrar. All unusual events, breaches of security or difficulties encountered in the setting, transport, marking or entering of marks should be reported to the head, if possible before the head determines the results of the examination.
- (12)**4.5.12** Any paper whose security may have been compromised should be re-set.

4.6 The Use of Computers and Calculators in Assessments

- (1)4.6.1 It is generally expected that “written” student assignments will be presented as ~~word-processed documents printed from a relevant computer program~~. The ability to prepare such documents is an expected generic skill of graduates, and the University provides access in a variety of ways to computers that may be used by students to prepare assessment items. Where the submission of word-processed work is required, students shall be given adequate advanced notice of the requirement.
- (2)4.6.2 Departments should recognise that hand-held computing devices may allow students to take large amounts of information into examinations. Acknowledging the equity issues associated with the cost of powerful advanced hand-held computing technologies, and the difficulty faced by examination supervisors in assessing the power of particular devices, it is University policy that ~~such hand-held devices laptop or palmtop computers~~ normally are not permitted in formal examinations. Departments may however develop examinations and assessments in which such devices are permitted, and in doing so should consider the equity, supervisory and logistical implications.
- (3)4.6.3 The University will provide suitable non-programmable calculators to be supplied to students during examinations. Each department will decide whether students are supplied with these calculators during all or some of its examinations. Departments or faculties may elect to provide students with an approved list of calculators for use in examinations (e.g. the approved calculator list for 2 Unit Mathematics issued by the NSW Board of Studies).

4.7 Examinations – Emergency Evacuations

When an examination room is evacuated, the relevant Dean shall determine whether the examination shall be resumed at the earliest opportunity, or whether the examination shall be re-sat by the affected students. Where the Dean is not available, the appropriate Associate or Sub-Dean shall be consulted. If this person also is not available then the examination is deemed to be abandoned. ~~the University accepts and endorses the following principles and procedures: The following principles are also to be employed:~~

- (1)4.7.1 Only the examination/s in the affected rooms ~~is/are~~ deemed to be abandoned. Students should be advised by the room Supervisor-in-Charge that the examination will not resume after the evacuation. Where the examination is also being held in other buildings (not affected by the emergency), those sessions will continue as normal. Where an examination room has been evacuated, students must remain in the immediate vicinity and examination supervisors must continue to ensure that no communication occurs between students.
- (2)4.7.2 The moment the Supervisor-in-Charge leaves the examination room, the examination question papers, whether confidential or not, are deemed to be compromised and must be declared invalid for future use.
- (3)4.7.3 The moment the Supervisor-in-Charge leaves the examination room, students' work (i.e., answer booklets, computer answer sheets, etc) must be deemed null and void for the purposes of marking.
- (4)4.7.4 At the time of evacuation, examination supervisors must inform the department concerned of the abandonment of the examination and advise the students to contact their department in person as soon as possible and no later than the following working day to obtain information about re-assessment.
- (5)4.7.5 In the event of the abandonment of an examination, departments should ensure that the affected students re-sit the examination/s as soon as possible.

~~(6)~~**4.7.6** Students are advised to remain in Sydney and not make any overseas or interstate travel plans until the official end of the examination period.

The University's policy on Illness and Misadventure applies in the circumstances of an abandoned examination.

(Note: the following section has been amended – changes were approved by Academic Board on 13 August 2003)

Part 5 – Special Consideration Due to Illness and Misadventure.

5.1 Introduction

~~(1)~~**5.1.1** Assessments are designed to provide feedback on performance or to establish that students have achieved an adequate standard to proceed or to graduate. The University's assessment practices are designed to ensure that conditions are fair to all students, as consistent as possible and that individual students are not disadvantaged by adverse personal circumstances beyond their control or by the activities of other students.

~~(2)~~**5.1.2** Generally, serious illness or misadventure will be taken into account when considering a student's performance in a course or unit of study. There is, however, a clear distinction between longstanding illness or difficulties which prevent students from attending classes or completing required work or which seriously interfere with their capacity to study for long periods and short-term illness or misadventure that may prevent a well-prepared student from sitting for an examination or completing a particular assignment.

5.2 Principles for the dealing with cases of special consideration

The University's approach to cases of special consideration should be:

~~(a)~~**5.2.1** Equitable;

~~(b)~~**5.2.2** Consistent;

~~(c)~~**5.2.3** Procedurally fair;

~~(d)~~**5.2.4** Timely

~~(e)~~**5.2.5** Effective; and

~~(f)~~**5.2.6** Consistent with the University's privacy policy.

5.3 Responsibilities

(1)5.3.1 Responsibilities of the University

The University has a responsibility and obligation to:

~~(a)~~**5.3.1.1** ensure that its policies on special consideration are publicised to all academic staff and students;

~~(b)~~**5.3.1.2** ensure that its policies on special consideration are implemented and applied consistently across all faculties;

~~(c)~~**5.3.1.3** promote best practice in considering applications for special consideration;

~~(d)~~**5.3.1.4** ensure that fair and well-publicised procedures are applied for the consideration of any cases where students are applying for special consideration.

(2)5.3.2 Responsibility of faculties

The faculties have a responsibility and obligation to:

~~(1)~~5.3.2.1 develop procedures for considering applications of special consideration which ensure:

~~(a)~~5.3.2.1.1 timeliness of consideration of applications of special consideration;

~~(b)~~5.3.2.1.2 fair consideration of applications of special consideration;

~~(c)~~5.3.2.1.3 accurate reporting of how an academic judgment was formed;

~~(d)~~5.3.2.1.4 respect for privacy; and

~~(e)~~5.3.2.1.5 that all parties are informed of their rights and responsibilities in relation to the application of special consideration.

~~(2)~~5.3.2.2 ensure consistent application of University policies and faculty procedures both at a faculty and department level;

~~(3)~~5.3.2.3 Each faculty has a responsibility to ensure that there are clear and appropriate processes in place, consistent with the University's policies, so that students are treated fairly and equitably. These processes should be published and displayed on faculty websites and noticeboards in plain English. Faculties have a particular responsibility to ensure that policies and practices are applied consistently throughout the faculty.

~~(4)~~5.3.2.4 Each faculty has a responsibility to ensure that two or more academic staff are involved in reaching an academic judgment regarding a student's special consideration application and that the process of determining that academic judgment is recorded in detail.

~~(3)~~ 5.3.3 Responsibility of Students

Students who, through serious illness or misadventure, are unable to complete an assessment, may apply for special consideration.

Students have a responsibility and an obligation to:

~~(a)~~5.3.3.1 act in accordance with the principles of special consideration as set out in this Resolution;

~~(b)~~5.3.3.2 become familiar with University policy and faculty procedures relating to special consideration;

~~(c)~~5.3.3.3 provide the relevant information to their faculty offices as soon as practicable and certainly within one week from the end of the appropriate semester so that an academic judgment of the circumstances and severity of their experiences can be made; and

~~(d)~~5.3.3.4 act honestly when applying for special consideration.

5.4 Serious illness or misadventure

~~(1)~~**5.4.1** It should be noted that only well-attested serious illness or misadventure during a semester or occurring at the time of an examination will warrant special consideration for academic performance. Occasional brief or trivial illness would not normally be regarded as sufficient to explain an absence or a poor performance and students are discouraged from submitting certificates for absences totalling less than one week, although frequently recurrent short absences would need documentation. While it is important to ask for a medical certificate for serious illness of longer than a few days duration at the time of the first visit, there is no need to submit it unless the illness becomes prolonged or further frequent absences are required. The exact nature of misadventure will vary, but serious illness or death of a close family member, particularly at the time of the examinations, would clearly warrant consideration.

Special Consideration will NOT be given in the following instances:

- ~~(a)~~**5.4.1.1** occasional brief or trivial illness of a one or two week duration that occur one week or more before an assessment is due or an exam undertaken;
- ~~(b)~~**5.4.1.2** workloads from other units of study, disciplines and faculties, except where the request for special consideration is made within the first three weeks of semester
- ~~(c)~~**5.4.1.3** employment where the request for special consideration is made less than four weeks before the date of the assessment;
- ~~(d)~~**5.4.1.4** illnesses and misadventures that have prevented students from acquiring a Pass level of knowledge/skills (including all illnesses/misadventures resulting in the student missing six weeks or more of lectures or tutorials);
- ~~(e)~~**5.4.1.5** adequate standards of documentation and processes have not been met;
- ~~(f)~~**5.4.1.6** requests for extensions for assignments made after the assignment is due or an assessment has taken place (except where the circumstances prevented earlier provision; no special consideration requests shall be processed if submitted more than one week after the assessment);
- ~~(g)~~**5.4.1.7** the supporting documentation post-dates the period for which special consideration was sought;
- ~~(h)~~**5.4.1.8** the performance of the student was equivalent or superior to that demonstrated in other assessments in the unit of study; and they pertain to planned commitments, such as elective surgery, holiday or work, where the student could reasonably be expected to have scheduled the commitment or their studies to not adversely affect their studies;
- ~~(i)~~**5.4.1.9** computer-related problems, except where a police report is provided indicating that burglary or calamity has resulted in the loss of both a computer *and* backups from the students' place of residence (NB: it is assumed that students keep regular backups of their work, so theft of a laptop is not grounds for special consideration).
- ~~(j)~~**5.4.1.10** Jury Service, Military Service, National Sporting and religious or cultural commitments which prevent a student from attending scheduled examinations would not normally be considered as cases of misadventure. Whilst faculties are encouraged to consider significant religious and cultural events when scheduling examination dates they may make allowances for these circumstances and consider these applications on a case by case basis.

Students who, because of serious illness or misadventure, are prevented from attending classes for prolonged periods should seek an interview with the relevant Sub-Dean. Even if they do not exceed any specified permitted period of absence, they may need to consider whether their best academic interests are served by discontinuing with permission from the course until they are able to resume their studies effectively. International students may need to seek advice regarding visa requirements prior to making any changes to enrolments. Assistance can be sought from the International Office.

5.5 Procedures

Faculty procedures should include:

- (a) **5.5.1** a clear statement about the requirements to provide documentation and where information should be sent or handed in;
- (b) **5.5.2** an indication of the use to which medical and other certificates will be put and an indication of when it is appropriate to submit a Professional Practitioner Certificate (see later);
- (c) **5.5.3** although it is impossible to outline the possible range, an indication of the seriousness of circumstances that would lead to decisions to allow latitude in handing in assignments or requirements for normally compulsory work;
- (d) **5.5.4** in all cases, consistent penalties need be indicated for failure to complete an assignment or for late submission in the absence of an explanation accepted by the faculty;
- (e) **5.5.5** possible arrangements for late submission of assignments when evidence of serious illness or misadventure is provided either beforehand or after the due date, including dates beyond which they would not be considered (eg after return of work to other students);
- (f) **5.5.6** if attested absences have occurred, whether marks are aggregated and averaged;
- (g) **5.5.7** in the case of serious illness necessitating a substantial absence from classes, the maximum period of absence beyond which the student's work could not be considered completed must be indicated. The period will differ given that faculties may require regular attendance at activities considered essential for successfully completing the program or course (practical classes, clinical work, excursions, group work);
- (h) **5.5.8** when marks are awarded for ongoing attendance or participation, an indication should be made of the way in which absence will be handled (both that without adequate excuse and that due to attested serious illness or misadventure);
- (i) **5.5.9** any means to make up work missed or to complete assignments not submitted during a prolonged period of serious illness or misadventure must be indicated;
- (j) **5.5.10** a process of appeal to the faculty against a decision needs to be established and publicised so that appeals can be dealt with rapidly.
- (k) **5.5.11** consistent advice should be given to students who become seriously ill or experience misadventure during the examination period or on the day of the examination (e.g. whether they are best advised to sit if at all possible even if special arrangements are needed - for example through the Health Service - or whether it is considered more appropriate to resit at a later date);
- (l) **5.5.12** the means of requesting special consideration in relation to the period of the annual examinations must be specified;

~~(4)~~**5.5.13** arrangements for students who fail to sit examinations at the end of first semester or at the annual examinations when evidence of serious illness or misadventure is accepted need to be made clear. For fairness, any retest should be similar to the style of the original examination.

5.6 Privacy and Record Keeping

The faculty office must retain all special consideration applications and associated documentation for the specific period (see below). Students should be notified promptly if the documentation is inadequate or if the circumstances are not considered sufficiently serious as to warrant leniency.

The records related to applications for Special Consideration contain sensitive personal information, which must be managed in accordance with the University's Privacy Policy and Privacy Management Plan. Access to the information must be limited to those staff who require it in order to carry out their responsibilities. Special Consideration records must be stored securely in a manner that prevents unauthorised access. If sent through the internal mail Special Consideration records must be in sealed envelopes. Special Consideration records must be retained for a minimum of 12 months after last action, and then destroyed in a manner that ensures privacy is not breached. In addition, the proper destruction of Special Consideration records must be appropriately documented by Archives and Records Management Services. Further information on privacy issues may be obtained from www.usyd.edu.au/arms/privacy and questions regarding proper storage, management and eventual destruction of the records should be directed to disposal@rms.usyd.edu.au.

Statistics should be maintained by the faculty office of the total number of special consideration applications submitted, the number of applications that were accepted and the number that were rejected.

5.7 Documentation

~~(4)~~**5.7.1 Professional Practitioner Certificate** is supplied with the special consideration form and should be completed by a registered medical practitioner, or counsellor for a student whose work during a teaching period or whose performance in an assessment task, including examinations, has been affected by illness or misadventure. Certificates signed by family members are not acceptable.

The Professional Practitioner Certificate includes;

~~(a)~~**5.7.1.1** dates of consultation;

~~(b)~~**5.7.1.2** an evaluation by the practitioner, psychologist etc. as to the severity, duration and effect on the student's ability to attend classes, learn or complete assessment requirements;

~~(c)~~**5.7.1.3** a description of the nature and seriousness of the student's problems, within the limits of confidentiality, so that an academic assessment can be made of the possible effects of the illness or accident on the student's performance;

~~(d)~~**5.7.1.4** any other relevant information relating to the student's illness, trauma etc.;

~~(e)~~**5.7.1.5** any other documentation that may be relevant; and

~~(f)~~**5.7.1.6** the practitioner authorises the University to contact them to confirm the authenticity of the certificate.

~~(2)~~**5.7.2 Other documentation** will depend on the nature of the misadventure, but it should be provided to support the student's account of the circumstances and indicate the likely duration and the effect of the problem on the student's performance.

~~(3)~~**5.7.3** The above information is to be publicised in handbooks and displayed in appropriate notice boards and websites. Where substantial absence has been documented during a semester, faculties should establish mechanisms to review each case to ensure that each student has been treated consistently by relevant departments

5.8 *Aegrotat* and posthumous awards

In exceptional circumstances involving serious illness or death, award of *aegrotat* and posthumous degrees and diplomas may be made. In this circumstance, the Dean, acting on behalf of the Faculty, would then authorise the Registrar to certify that the conditions for the award of the degree or diploma had been met.

Part 6 – ~~Special Examination Conditions~~ Accessible Examination and Assessment Arrangements for People ~~Students~~ with Disabilities or Other Special Needs

Students who have registered with the Disability Services Office and have satisfied the University's requirements for supporting documentation may be eligible for Accessible Examination and Assessment Arrangements. Students seeking registration with the Disability Services Office must meet the definition of disability within the Disability Discrimination Act (1992).

- (1)~~6.1~~ 6.1 Students may apply for ~~special-accessible examination conditions~~ and/or assessment arrangements if they have a medical, physical, sensory or psychiatric condition or impairment, or if they have a documented learning disability, which will impact on their ability to demonstrate ~~prevent them from demonstrating~~ the extent of their knowledge and ability in an examination. The provision of ~~the any accessible examination conditions and/or assessment arrangement~~ is in keeping with the University's Equal Opportunity in Education Policy.
- (2)~~6.2~~ 6.2 A register of students likely to need to ~~use the conditions~~ accessible examination and/or assessment arrangements is maintained by the Disability Services Office. ~~Those students are sent an~~ The Disability Services Office sends those affected students an email with an attached-attaching an application form about at the time the draft examination timetable is released. The completed form is submitted to the Disability Services Office.
- (3)~~6.3~~ 6.3 Students must supply current relevant documentation in support of their application. Many students are referred to services (Health and Counselling) on campus for supporting documentation and/or validation of their condition and its impact on their academic ability in examinations or other forms of assessment ~~application~~, thus helping to ensure consistency and equity in the application of these procedures.
- (4)~~6.4~~ 6.4 Central Examinations under special conditions are organised and supervised by the Examinations Branch, using a designated room and experienced supervisors, or a separate room if a scribe or computer is used. In-Department examinations, as outlined in the Examiner's Handbook, are organised and supervised by the Department. The Disability Services Office forwards advice to Departments regarding reasonable accommodations for In-Department examinations. Departments are occasionally asked to arrange special conditions for in department exams and to supervise those examinations-then arrange relevant accommodations, including supervision, scribes and equipment with the support of the Disability Services Office.
- (5)~~6.5~~ 6.5 Special Examination Conditions include, but are not limited to: extra time for reading, writing, or resting or writing or toilet breaks, use of a scribe or a computer, examination papers in Braille or large print alternative formats, ergonomic furniture, better-modified lighting, etc.
- (6)~~6.6~~ 6.6 Students, if taking an unfamiliar form of examination under special conditions, should be advised to practise and become familiar with that method of examination as far as practicable. Information to assist students is available from the Disability Services Office.

Part 7 – Glossary

In this document:

Academic unit means a faculty, academic college, board of studies, school, department, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the University.

Appeal period means the interval of time, measured from the date of release of results to students, in which a student may appeal against the assessment outcome. The appeal period is 4 months.

Assessment or **examination** means assessment by written/oral examination, assignments, presentation, theses, etc.

Award course means a formally approved program of study which can lead to an academic award granted by the University.

Coursework award course means an award course not designated as a research award course. While the program of study in a coursework award course may include a component of original, supervised research, other forms of instruction and learning normally will be dominant. All undergraduate award courses are coursework award courses.

Dean means the dean of a faculty or the director or principal of an academic college, or chairperson of a board of studies.

Department means a faculty (if the faculty does not have an internal departmental structure), board of studies, school, centre or interdisciplinary committee of the university. Departments are responsible for determining and implementing assessment, including examinations, in units of study, and in this document the term refers to the department responsible for assessing and examining the unit of study concerned.

Faculty means a faculty, college board or the Australian Graduate School Of Management Limited, as established in each case by its constitution, or, where applicable, a board of studies. Faculties are responsible for award courses, and in this document the term refers to the faculty responsible for the award course concerned.

GDA (General Disposal Authority) means a General Disposal Authority issued by the State Records Authority under the NSW State Records Act 1998. The University is required to comply with these GDAs in keeping its records.

IPP means an Information Protection Principle under the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998.

Norm-referencing means the interpretation of scores on a measure that focuses on the rank ordering of students not their performance in relation to criteria.

Scaling means any system for the adjustment of scores or marks where such scores or marks are to be compared against a norm.

Script Retention Period means the period from the date of release of results to students during which departments are required to arrange for coursework students to request, peruse and if required copy their script. The Script Retention Period is 4 months.

Standards-referencing means a form of referencing against predetermined standards for grades. Predetermined standards are written in terms of grade descriptors, identifying key characteristics of performance for each grade and key differences in performance between the grades.

Student means a person enrolled as a candidate for an award course or unit of study.

Unit of study or **unit** means a stand-alone component of an award course. Determining and implementing assessment, including examinations, in each unit of study is the responsibility of a department.